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Aims

This is the inaugural Small Group Meeting co-sponsored by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and the Society for Australasian Social Psychologists (SASP). It is hoped that biennial meetings in Australasia (with meetings in North America in the off years) will bring together researchers from around the world to address research topics of joint concern.

The 2015 meeting on Collective Harm-doing brings a research focus on perpetrators across a range of contexts. We aim to explore the association between perpetrators’ harm-doing and their well-being, and the processes through which people engage and disengage from harm-doing.
When, Where, and With What Catering

The Small Group Meeting will be held on Tuesday and Wednesday April 7 and 8. The days open with coffee at 8:30am, with proceedings starting at 9am and finishing at 5pm.

The venue is the Terrace Room, Level 6 of the Sir Llew Edwards Building (building no 14), Campbell Road, St. Lucia campus, Brisbane. For those using public transport, there are the options of catching a bus to the St. Lucia Campus or the City Cat (ferry) to the “University of Queensland” stop. Navigating the campus is not easy for the uninitiated, however. Please refer to campus maps (http://www.uq.edu.au/maps/?id=280) or Google Maps:

![Campus Map](http://www.uq.edu.au/maps/?id=280)

Both days are catered for morning tea, lunch, and afternoon tea.

On Tuesday there will be a conference dinner (details below). The food is paid for to invited guests (you will receive a ticket with registration), but drinks are not included. The venue is licensed and also allows BYO alcohol.

Contacts. Questions? Contact 0401 180 252 or w.louis@psy.uq.edu.au.

Thanks are due to our sponsors, CRISP, SPSSI, and SASP; to Christine McCoy, who has done a lot of admin work, sometimes at the last minute, with grace, kindness, and supreme attention to detail; and to our student volunteers. You are much appreciated!
Conference Program: Tuesday April 7

8:30am Coffee

9:00 Welcome and Housekeeping – Winnifred Louis

9:05 Stefania Paolini, Opening words

9:10 SPSSI video introduction; Alice Eagly video introduction

9:15 Stefania Paolini, *Negative intergroup contact back to the foreground: Returning a more realistic and context-dependent outlook for intergroup changes through intergroup contact.*

9:55 Fiona Kate Barlow, *The relationship between majorities’ expressions of intergroup warmth, health and wellbeing over time.*

10:35 Morning tea

11:05 Pete Techkesari, *A cross-cultural test of positive and negative contact as predictors of intergroup attitudes in the United States, Hong Kong, and Thailand.*

11:45 John Dixon, *The kinder, gentler face of collective harm.*

12:25 Lunch


1:25 Mengyao Li, *Stepping into perpetrators’ shoes: How ingroup transgressions and victimization shape support for justice through perspective taking of perpetrators.*


2:45 Afternoon tea

3:15 Matthew Hornsey, *Intergroup apologies from the perpetrator’s perspective.*

4:00 Daniel Bar-Tal, *How societies engaged in an intractable conflict manage the narratives of their collective atrocities.*

4:45 Closing words – Winnifred Louis

6:30 Conference dinner:

A Night in India, 58 High St., Toowong QLD 4066, (07) 3217 7955.

Banquet free to invited guests (you will receive a ticket at registration), but drinks are not included. The venue is licensed but also allows BYO alcohol.
Conference Program: Wednesday April 8

8:30  Coffee

9:00  Tom Denson, Alcohol-fuelled aggression in the brain.

9:40  Khandis Blake, “She wants sex, lacks agency, and is easy to sexually exploit”: The unintended negative consequences of women’s self-sexualizing behaviours.

10:20  Morning tea

10:50  Catherine Amiot, Collective harm-doing and the puzzle of internalizing harmful group norms in the self.

11:30  Winnifred Louis, Intergroup conflict as collective action.

12:00  Jolanda Jetten, Stepping in the shoes of leaders of populist right-wing parties: Promoting anti-immigrant views in times of economic prosperity.

12:40  Lunch

Video presentations: Cristina Montiel, Military Institutions as Perpetrators of a State-Violence Storyline; Fathali Moghaddam, Political Systems and Collective Harmdoing.

1:40  Maarten Zaal, By any means necessary: How regulatory focus affects support for hostile collective action.

2:20  Leda Blackwood, From benign intentions to collective harm doing: The ‘official’ model of radicalisation and its consequences for government interventions.

3:00  Afternoon tea

3:30  Bernhard Leidner, Healthy and unhealthy wars: The effects of ingroup-committed violence on stress and well-being.

4:10  S. Alexander Haslam, What makes a perpetrator — blind obedience or engaged followership?

4:50  Closing words – Catherine Amiot
List of Presenters

Catherine Amiot, *Collective harm-doing and the puzzle of internalizing harmful group norms in the self.*

The current research brings together intergroup and humanistic theories – which have been rarely used in conjunction and that diverge in their assumptions about human nature – in an aim to increase our understanding of how individuals internalize and make sense of their pro-social vs. harmful intergroup behaviors. Five experiments were specifically conducted to investigate how group norms and congruence with these norms predict how people internalize and compartmentalize two types of intergroup behaviors (merit-based/parity vs. discrimination) and the level of intra-individual conflict they feel when engaging in such behaviors. Experiments 1 and 2 (Ns = 100, 139) manipulated ingroup norms in favor of merit vs. of discrimination, and assessed the behavior participants displayed (congruent or incongruent with the norm), and the extent to which these behaviors were internalized in the self. Among participants whose behaviour was congruent with the ingroup norm, those who conformed to a pro-discrimination norm reported lower internalization of this behaviour compared to participants who conformed to a pro-parity norm. Experiments 3-5 (Ns = 122, 161, 149) replicated and extended these findings by investigating how harmful normative behaviours are more likely to be compartmentalized in the self and to trigger intra-individual conflict. Mediated moderation analyses also revealed that intra-individual conflict mediated the association between the norm by congruence interaction and the outcome of compartmentalization. That is, following discriminatory norms or going against parity norms was associated with more intra-individual conflict, and this conflict was associated with higher compartmentalization.

Catherine Amiot is an Associate Professor at the Department of Psychology of Université du Québec à Montréal. Her research program is composed of three principle axes which aim to understand: (1) how new identities (for example, cultural identities) are integrated into an individuals' self-concept, (2) how pro-social and anti-social norms endorsed by social groups are internalized and adopted in a manner that is self-determined, and (3) how social psychological principles apply to human-animal relations. Within these three research axes, Catherine seeks to understand how group processes, norms, and identities affect social and psychological well-being. Her publications have been influential in the fields of social psychology, industrial/organizational and cultural psychology.

Daniel Bar-Tal, *How societies engaged in an intractable conflict manage the narratives of their collective atrocities.*

Societies involved in intractable conflicts form narratives supporting conflict that include such major themes as glorification of the in-group and its perception as the victim in conflict, as well as delegitimization of the opponent. These narratives play an important role in satisfying the basic socio-psychological needs of the involved individuals and collectives such as the need to maintain self-collective positive view and positive social identity. In order to fulfill this role the narratives tend to be biased in favor of the in-group, selective, distorting and simplistic. Thus one major function is to omit any information about the atrocities carried by societies that can harm satisfaction of the basic needs. First of all the presentation will outline the methods with which they are constructed: Reliance on supportive sources, marginalization of contradictory information, magnification of supportive themes, fabrication of supportive contents, omission of contradictory contents, and use of framing language. Also on the societal level the presentation will elaborate how the formal and informal institutions make efforts to maintain the conflict supporting narratives and prevent information that negates them: Control of access to information, censorship, discrediting of contradicting information, monitoring, punishment, encouragement and rewarding, as well as closure.
of archives. Also it refers to the additional used socio-psychological mechanisms such as conformity, obedience and self-censorship that close the flow of free information. Finally, it will describe how on the individual level society members use psychodynamic mechanisms to cope with the guilt and dissonance and thus avoid information that tells about their misdeeds.

Daniel Bar-Tal is Branco Weiss Emeritus Professor of Research in Child Development and Education at the School of Education, Tel Aviv University. His research interest is in political and social psychology studying socio-psychological foundations of intractable conflicts and peace building, as well as development of political understanding among children and peace education. He has published twenty books and over two hundred articles and chapters in major social and political psychological journals, books and encyclopedias. He served as a President of the International Society of Political Psychology and received various awards for his work, including the Alexander George Award of the International Society of Political Psychology for the best book in Political Psychology. In 2006 he also received Peace Scholar Award of the Peace and Justice Studies Association for great scholarship and hard work in studying conflicts and peacemaking. In 1991 and again in 2009, he was awarded the Otto Klineberg Intercultural and International Relations Prize of SPSSI. Then he received the Lasswell Award and the Nevitt Sanford Award of the International Society of Political Psychology and the Morton Deutsch Conflict Resolution Award of the Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict, and Violence (Div. 48 of APA).

Fiona Kate Barlow, *The relationship between majorities’ expressions of intergroup warmth, health and wellbeing over time.*

Multiple studies demonstrate that for minority or victim group members, experiencing discrimination is associated with a raft of negative health outcomes. Little research, however, looks at how expressing prejudice, or enacting intergroup harm might affect the health of members of majority or perpetrator groups. In the present study we draw on data from the New Zealand Attitudes and Values Survey. In this survey Pakeha (European) New Zealanders (amongst others) have been surveyed over the last five years. Using this data we test the association between intergroup attitudes (measured by feelings thermometers towards members of various outgroups) and indices of health and wellbeing (including self-reported health, number of doctor’s visits, and BMI). Further, we aim to speak to causality by testing this model longitudinally, using changes in prejudice to predict changes in health and wellbeing. This data then will be the first to establish whether or not prejudice expression (and changes in prejudice expression) affect majorities’ health over time.

My research focus is on intergroup relations. I am particularly interested in intergroup metacognitions and metaemotions insofar as they affect intergroup prejudice and discrimination. I approach my research utilising social identity theory, intergroup emotions (esp. collective guilt, anxiety) research, and system justification theory.

Leda Blackwood, *From benign intentions to collective harm doing: The ‘official’ model of radicalisation and its consequences for government interventions.*

There are several psychological analyses of the processes of ‘radicalisation’ that can lead to terrorism. However, we know little about how authorities understand the psychological dynamics to radicalisation. In this paper I present a detailed account of a UK counter-terrorist intervention, the Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent, designed to enlist front-line professionals in identifying
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and referring those at risk of radicalisation. I will report data gathered during an observation of this intervention delivered by the police in Scotland. This intervention provides insight into the psychological model of radicalisation being disseminated in the UK. I will assess the adequacy of this model in the light of current psychological theory and research conducted with Scottish Muslims; and discuss how and why the surveillance warranted by the official model may lead Muslims to disengage from majority group members. Through considering the wider implications of such policy and practice for minority group members’ social identities, this analysis encourages reflection on how social and political psychology currently informs public policy and practice.

Dr Blackwood is a social psychologist whose research examines inter and intra-group processes of leadership, politicization, and social movement participation. She has recently completed research examining Muslim experiences of being ‘othered’ in airports and is currently funded by the Leverhulme Trust to examine how the actions of government and other authorities shape intra-community struggles over leadership and identity.

Khandis Blake, “She wants sex, lacks agency, and is easy to sexually exploit”: The unintended negative consequences of women’s self-sexualizing behaviours.

Self-sexualizing behaviour refers to behaviour intended to increase a woman’s sex appeal, for example, wearing clothing with “pornstar” and “Playboy Bunny” slogans or partaking in wet t-shirt competitions. Although such behaviours can elevate women’s attractiveness, they may have unintended negative consequences that increase women’s risk of sexual assault. In three studies, we examined why self-sexualized women may be viewed as easier to sexually exploit. We demonstrate that women who self-sexualize are seen as highly sexually available and are objectified: Such women are perceived as lacking agency and therefore as easier to sexually exploit. We further find that displays of sexual availability increase a woman’s perceived ease of sexual exploitability even if she is highly agentic and conservatively dressed. Moreover, these effects were observed while controlling for individual differences related to sexual assault perpetration. This work demonstrates that displays of sexual availability disempower women in the eyes of others and may increase their likelihood of being targeted for sexual aggression.

Khandis R. Blake is a PhD candidate in the University of New South Wales. Her primary research focuses on the causes and prevention of sexual aggression. She is especially interested in situational and evolutionary factors that encourage perpetrator decisions to commit acquaintance assault (e.g., date rape). Khandis has undergraduate degrees in Gender Studies and Psychology. She has previously worked as a life coach, educational trainer, and women’s advocate, and has 2000+ hours experience facilitating leadership and communication workshops. In her spare time, Khandis practices surfing (terribly), bakes her own sourdough (passable), and hotsmokes as many types of meats and fish as she can (addictively good).

Tom Denson, Alcohol-fuelled aggression in the brain.

Alcohol intoxication is implicated in over half of all violent crimes. Over the past several decades, numerous theories have been proposed to account for the causal role of alcohol on violence. Nearly all of these theories imply that reduced functionality in the prefrontal cortex is the proximal cause. However, no study has directly tested this assumption. In the present functional magnetic resonance imaging experiment, 50 young men (the primary perpetrators of alcohol-fuelled violence) consumed either alcohol beverages or placebo beverages. The mean breath alcohol concentration in the alcohol group was .05. Both groups reported feeling significantly intoxicated, suggesting effective alcohol and placebo procedures. After consuming the beverages, participants completed the Taylor
Aggression Paradigm in the scanner. During acts of aggression, relative to participants in the placebo condition, men in the alcohol condition showed reduced activation in the dorsal medial prefrontal cortex, ventral medial prefrontal cortex, and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. These brain regions are implicated in regulation of emotions, adaptive decision-making, impulsivity/behavioral control, empathy, and social cognition. There were no differences in any subcortical structures implicated in aggressiveness. These findings provide strong support for a central tenet of most models of alcohol-fuelled aggression. Specifically, alcohol intoxication reduces functioning in areas of the prefrontal cortex, which would normally inhibit violent behavior.

Thomas F. Denson is an Associate Professor in the School of Psychology at UNSW. He is an experimental social-personality psychologist. His primary research focus is on the causes, consequences, and prevention of anger-driven aggression. Tom received his PhD in 2007 from the University of Southern California, after which he received a lectureship at the School of Psychology at UNSW. He has won several awards for his research including the Association for Psychological Science’s ‘Rising Star’ Award, the NSW Young Tall Poppy Science Award, and the Society for Australasian Social Psychologists’ Early Career Researcher Award. Since 2009, he has been lucky enough to have received nearly $3 million in funding from the ARC and NHMRC. He was an ARC DECRA Fellow and is currently an ARC Future Fellow. He is also an academic editor at PLOS ONE and has published nearly 70 articles and book chapters. In his spare time, he enjoys eating and walking his fluffy white dog.

John Dixon, *The kinder, gentler face of collective harm.*

Most work on collective harm has focused on the negative, often violent mistreatment of others, as captured by hate crimes, practices of overt discrimination, and even genocide. In such work, hostile prejudice towards others is often treated as both the hallmark and underlying cause of harm. In this paper, I argue that collective harm also has a kinder, gentler face, as expressed via paternalistic relations of dependency and the establishment of bonds of affection, loyalty and even love. In order to develop this argument, I discuss some recent research on intergroup helping, benevolent prejudice and common identification. In addition, I draw examples from an ongoing study of domestic labour relations in post-apartheid South Africa. This study is exploring how participants’ accounts of such relations resolve their moral and political tensions by (re)constituting exploitative exchanges between black ‘maids’ and white ‘madams’ in the language of caring, helping and reciprocal exchange.

John Dixon is Professor of Social Psychology and Head of Department at the Open University, having worked previously at Lancaster University and the University of Worcester in the UK and at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. He is a former co-editor, with Jolanda Jetten, of the *British Journal of Social Psychology*. His publications include *Racial Encounter: The Social Psychology of Contact and Desegregation* (2005, Routledge), co-authored with Kevin Durrheim, and *Beyond prejudice: Extending the social psychology of intergroup conflict, inequality and social change* (2012, Cambridge University Press), co-edited with Mark Levine.

S. Alexander Haslam, *What makes a perpetrator — blind obedience or engaged followership?*

Classic studies in social psychology have been used to advance arguments that normal decent people will perpetrate tyrannical acts (a) when ordered to do so by their superiors, and (b) when placed in groups and given power over others. This evidence has been particularly influential in embedding the ‘banality of evil’ thesis within the public consciousness — appearing to indicate that ordinary people
commit atrocities without awareness, care, or choice. This presentation argues against this view on the basis of a reappraisal of relevant historical and psychological evidence. This indicates that those who perpetrate evil on behalf of tyrannical regimes act thoughtfully, creatively, and with conviction. Drawing on work which re-examines Zimbardo’s Stanford Prison Study and Milgram’s notions of Obedience to Authority, the case is made for an interactionist approach which explains the emergence of tyranny and evil in terms of three dynamics that (a) initially draw particular people to extreme and oppressive groups, (b) transform them through membership in those groups, and (c) allow them to gain influence over others and hence normalize oppression. These dynamics can make evil appear banal, but are far from banal themselves. They also suggest that when people act in evil ways they typically do so willingly — not because they know they are doing wrong, but rather because they believe that what they are doing is right, even noble.

Alex Haslam is Professor of Social and Organizational Psychology and Australian Laureate Fellow at The University of Queensland. His research focuses on the study of group and identity processes in social, organizational, and clinical contexts. Together with colleagues, he has written and edited 11 books and published over 170 peer-reviewed articles on these topics and this work has been cited more than 16,000 times (h=63). His most recent books are The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power (with Steve Reicher & Michael Platow, Psychology Press, 2011), The Social Cure: Identity, Health and Well-being (with Jolanda Jetten and Catherine Haslam, Psychology Press, 2010), and Social Psychology: Revisiting the Classic Studies (with Joanne Smith, Sage, 2012). Alex’s work with Michelle Ryan on the Glass Cliff was identified by the New York Times as one of the ‘Best 100 Ideas’ of 2008, and in 2013 The New Psychology of Leadership won the International Leadership Association’s Outstanding Leadership Book Award. He is a Fellow of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research and a Co-Director of its Social Interactions, Identity and Well-being program. He is on the editorial board of 10 international journals including Scientific American Mind for which he writes regularly.

Matthew Hornsey, *Intergroup apologies from the perpetrator’s perspective.*

I review a series of studies highlighting the ambivalent relationship perpetrator groups have with collective apologies made on their behalf. First, I review research showing that perpetrator groups see apology rejection as a type of victimization, and respond with outgroup derogation and withdrawal from the reconciliation process. I then examine the role of qualified apologies (i.e., apologies qualified by explanations, excuses and “buts”) in helping transgressor groups manage their identity protection needs. The attraction of qualified apologies is that they help apologizers wriggle away from full responsibility for the events. The downside is that the qualified apology is less likely to result in the public moral restoration that perpetrator group members crave. In three studies we exposed members of a perpetrator group (White Australians) to qualified or unqualified apologies offered on their behalf to members of a victim group (Aboriginal Australians). Participants expected qualified apologies to be rejected by the victim group more than unqualified apologies. But, irrespective of apology type, participants felt more moral and (consequently) more willing to reconcile when they were told that others had accepted the apology, even if that acceptance came from the transgressor ingroup. Thus, we demonstrate that perpetrator group members can effectively “apologize to the mirror”, gaining moral redemption by accepting their own apologies, even substandard, guilt-minimizing ones. Finally, I review research showing that perpetrators are motivated to see collective transgressions as interpersonal rather than intergroup events, thus denying the moral pressure to make a collective apology.

Matthew J. Hornsey is a Professor of Social Psychology at The University of Queensland. His research interests are in the areas of group processes and intergroup communication, with particular interests in how
people respond to trust-sensitive messages such as criticisms, recommendations for change, and gestures of reconciliation. He is currently an associate editor at Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.


The assumption that populist right-wing parties (PRWPs) thrive when the economy slows down is remarkably pervasive. What is often neglected is evidence showing PRWPs can thrive in times of economic prosperity. In three studies, we examine these processes in greater detail. In Study 1, we conducted an experiment in which participants were exposed to different appraisals of the future of the national economy, and subsequently asked to evaluate an anti-immigration speech (Study 1). Results showed stronger anti-immigrant sentiments when the national economy was presented as prospering rather than contracting. In Study 2, we analysed speeches by PRWP leaders who secured electoral victories during economic prosperity, and found that these leaders encourage a sense of injustice and victimhood by portraying ordinary citizens as the victim of an alliance between powerful groups (the elite) and less powerful groups (refugees, immigrants, minorities). In a third study, we examine the type of narrative used to justify anti-immigrant sentiments. We predicted that symbolic threat narratives are more likely to emerge in times of economic prosperity than in times of economic hardship because realistic conflict threat narratives do not map onto the reasons for the public’s discontent — i.e., flourishing economies constrain the viability of realistic threat arguments. We found support for these predictions in a study were economic prosperity was manipulated after which participants were asked to take on the role of speechwriter for a leader with an anti-immigrant message. We conclude that there are no simple correlations between economic performance and support for anti-immigrant parties. Rather, we predict that support for such parties is more a function of the presence of a leader who is motivated and able to provide a legitimising discourse for these sentiments by focusing on specific threat narratives.

Jolanda Jetten is Professor of Social Psychology at The University of Queensland. After being awarded her PhD in 1997 from the University of Amsterdam, she took up positions at The University of Queensland, and at the University in Exeter (UK) after which she joined The University of Queensland in 2007 as a Research Fellow. She is currently employed as an ARC Future Fellowship. Her research is concerned with group processes, social identity and intergroup relations, as represented by her most recent books: *Rebels in groups: Dissent, deviance, difference, and defiance* (co-edited with Matthew Hornsey; Wiley-Blakcwell, 2011) and *The Social Cure: Identity, Health and Well-being* (co-edited with Catherine Haslam and Alex Haslam; Psychology Press, 2011). Jolanda is the former co-Chief Editor of the British Journal of Social Psychology (2009-2013). She has served as an Associate Editor for the British Journal of Social Psychology, and for Social Psychology and is currently an associate editor with *Comprehensive Results in Social Psychology*. She is an Editorial Consultant for 6 international journals. She was awarded the British Psychological Society Spearman Medal in 2004 and the Kurt Lewin Medal from the European Association of Social Psychology in 2014. Jolanda is the former President of the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists (SASP) and currently serves on the ARC College of Experts.

Bernhard Leidner, *Healthy and unhealthy wars: The effects of ingroup-committed violence on stress and well-being.*

Intergroup violence can profoundly affect the health of involved parties. Complementing existing research on ingroup-suffered violence and health, we propose an integrative framework explicating how and why ingroup-committed violence can positively or negatively affect the health of ingroup
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members. Based on different models of social identity and health, we argue that ingroup identification (i.e., attachment and glorification) determines how people cope with ingroup-committed violence. We lay out different non-defensive strategies critically identified group members are likely to engage in, and defensive strategies uncritically identified members are likely to engage in. We further posit that non-defensive strategies are less adaptive for maintaining and/or improving health in the short (but not long) term than defensive strategies, and that ingroup identification can act as both moderator and mediator of the effects of ingroup-committed violence on health. Last, we report first experimental studies demonstrating that harming outgroup members can hurt or help ingroup members in terms of negative vs. positive affect and perceived stress, depending on their identification with the ingroup.

Bernhard Leidner is currently an Assistant Professor in the Psychology of Peace and Violence Program of the Department of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. As a social and political psychologist, Dr. Leidner’s research focuses on intergroup violence, international conflict (reduction), and justice, primarily in the context of large social categories such as nations and ethnic groups. His work, often conducted in multiple countries and world regions, and making heavy use of online surveys and experiments, has been published in top-tier outlets in psychology in general and social psychology in particular, as well as in more multidisciplinary journals in the area of conflict studies. Dr. Leidner has received both federal funding (e.g. NSF) and funding from private foundations (e.g. Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation), and both his publication and his grant funding record have recently been recognized by the Association of Psychological Science, from which Dr. Leidner received the APS Rising Star Award in 2013.

Mengyao Li, Stepping into perpetrators’ shoes: How ingroup transgressions and victimization shape support for justice through perspective taking of perpetrators.

Three experiments examined people’s demands for justice in the aftermath of intergroup violence either committed or suffered by their own group. Experiment 1 demonstrated that Jewish Israeli participants demanded significantly less justice when their ingroup was portrayed as the perpetrator rather than victim in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This effect was further moderated by ingroup glorification – the differences in justice demands depending on ingroup’s role as perpetrator or victim were more pronounced among high glorifiers than low glorifiers. Replicating these effects in the context of the conflict between the United States and Iran, Experiment 2 further showed that taking the perspective of perpetrators explained why high glorifiers demanded less justice when the ingroup was the perpetrator rather than the victim. Experiment 3 compared people’s attitudes toward justice following a conflict involving their ingroup to those following a conflict involving two third parties. Results suggest that the differential justice demands in response to transgressions versus victimization through perspective taking of perpetrators are largely limited to conflicts that involve the ingroup. Experiment 3 also tested perspective taking of victims as an alternative mediator, and showed that perspective taking of perpetrators, but not victims, explained the decreased support for justice among highly glorifying members of the perpetrator group. The negative implications of perspective taking for intergroup relations and conflict resolution are discussed.

Mengyao Li is originally from Nanjing, China, and is currently a third-year doctoral student at the Psychology of Peace and Violence Program at UMass Amherst, under the supervision of Dr. Bernhard Leidner. Prior to UMass, she completed her undergraduate degree in Psychology and Human Rights at Bard College. Broadly speaking, her research interests center around the psychology of intergroup relations, conflict resolution, reconciliation, and justice. Her recent work examines the complex relationship between peace and justice in the context of large-scale intergroup conflicts. Her master’s thesis investigated the effects of exposing to a past (intrastate or interstate) conflict on the propensity for future conflict. She hopes to conduct empirical research
that will help better understand human rights issues and will contribute to a more peaceful international community.

Winnifred Louis, *Intergroup conflict as collective action.*

This presentation addresses collective harm-doing and intergroup conflict in relation to the collective action literature. Two threads of research have led to the interest in well-being and harm-doing: the extent to which normative harm-doing can be endorsed out of self-determined, authentic motives, and the work on antecedents and outcomes of radical and violent collective action and its pro-social (or at least, pro-ingroup) motives. Both threads have led us to ask whether there are well-being consequences for collective harm-doing, which is leading us to target the present gap in the literature.

Winnifred R. Louis (PhD McGill, 2001) is an Associate Professor in the School of Psychology at The University of Queensland. Her research interests focus on the influence of identity and norms on social decision-making. She has studied this broad topic in contexts from politics and community activism to health and environmental choices. She is Associate Editor of Peace and Conflict: The Journal of Peace Psychology, Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, and The Australian Journal of Psychology. She serves on the editorial board of the Journal of Social and Political Psychology, the Asian Journal of Psychological and Social Issues, and has served on Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression. She is a member of numerous professional associations including the the Centre for Research in Social Psychology, at The University of Queensland; the Association for Psychological Science; the Australian Psychological Society; the Society for Personality and Social Psychology; the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues; the International Association of Conflict Management, and the Society for Australasian Social Psychology. Some research projects are summarised on-line, at http://www.psy.uq.edu.au/~wlouis.

Stefania Paolini, *Negative intergroup contact back to the foreground: Returning a more realistic and context-dependent outlook for intergroup changes through intergroup contact.*

Due to a focus on corrective prejudice reduction, social psychological analyses of intergroup contact have traditionally shied away from negative intergroup contact and negative-positive contact comparisons. These analyses provide a more positive report for contact than related disciplines; one that disagrees with global trends of intergroup conflict. This paper showcases Australian-led research aiming to redress these research disconnects by bringing negative intergroup contact back to the foreground of social psychological analyses. Based on a self-categorization theory’s inspired model of negative valence asymmetries in intergroup relations (Paolini, Harwood, & Rubin, 2010), negative experiences with the outgroup should worsen intergroup judgments more than positive experiences with the outgroup improve them because negative contact causes higher category salience than positive intergroup contact. Stefania Paolini will present a systematic program of research testing the basic tenets of this model in a variety of intergroup settings and with several research paradigms. Stefania will contrast evolutionary and functional accounts of valence asymmetries and identify a series of theory-driven moderators capable of exacerbating, mitigating, and even reversing negative valence asymmetries on social categorization and intergroup judgments. Stefania will discuss the implications of these findings for theory, social interventions, and future research.

Stefania Paolini trained in social psychology at the Universita’ di Padova (Italy), under the supervision of Prof Dora Capozza, and completed her doctoral work in 2001 under the supervision of Prof Miles Hewstone at Cardiff University (UK). For her PhD, she used models and methods of intergroup contact and social
categorization to explore ‘when’ and ‘why’ information about individual members of a social group affects the judgements of the group as a whole. Since, she has published in leading international journals and has been regularly invited to act as reviewer for leading journals and grant bodies on the topics of member-to-group generalization, intergroup contact, intergroup friendship, and intergroup emotions. Her current research focuses on valence asymmetries on categorization and attitudes, on motivational predictors of intergroup contact, and on the learning mechanisms of intergroup anxiety and stereotyping. As part of this work, she has investigated conflict-ridden intergroup contexts, like Northern Ireland, Cyprus, and Arizona’s southern border. Stefania is currently senior lecturer in social psychology at the University of Newcastle (Australia), co-chair of the internationalisation committee of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), and will be the main organiser of the upcoming 2015 annual meeting of the Society of Australasian Social Psychologists (SASP). For more information on Stefania’s research, visit: http://www.newcastle.edu.au/profile/stefania-paolini and https://sites.google.com/site/uonsocialpsychlab/


Although relationship restoration is an important outcome of forgiveness, relatively little is known about how forgiveness facilitates such an outcome. In addition, in forgiveness research, little attention is paid to the perspective of the offender. We address these two shortcomings simultaneously, testing the idea that forgiveness promotes offender gratitude, which in turn encourages offenders to respond pro-relationally, thereby contributing to the re-establishment of valued relationships. Across three experimental studies, participants were induced to believe they had transgressed (N = 44); recalled a time when they had transgressed (N = 118); and imagined transgressing (N = 70). In Studies 1 and 2, forgiveness was manipulated; in Study 3 the perceived victim motive for forgiving was manipulated. Across all three studies, state gratitude—in comparison to guilt, indebtedness, and positive affect—was consistently found to play the primary mediating role between forgiveness and relationship-restoring intentions.

I am a Senior Lecturer in the School of Psychology at the University of Adelaide. My primary research focus is on interpersonal forgiveness, in particular the extent to which forgiveness possesses functional properties. More broadly, I am interested in the extent to which two constructs relevant to transgressions—justice and forgiveness—may be compatible, depending on the circumstances.

Pete Techekesari, *A cross-cultural test of positive and negative contact as predictors of intergroup attitudes in the United States, Hong Kong, and Thailand.*

Negative intergroup contact has become the central focus of contact research in the past few years. Recent evidence suggests that negative contact is a strong predictor of prejudice and can disrupt the beneficial effects of positive contact on prejudice reduction (Barlow et al., 2012; Paolini et al., 2010; Pettigrew, 2008). In spite of this, several aspects of negative contact have remained unexplored, including (a) the process that mediates the relationship between negative contact and intergroup attitudes, (b) the effects of negative contact on intergroup outcomes beyond prejudice, and (c) the detriments of negative in non-Western nations. In the present research, we addressed these gaps in the literature by drawing on data from White Americans (N = 207), Hong Kong Chinese (N = 145), and Buddhist Thais (N = 161). In particular, we examined positive and negative contact as predictors of prejudice toward, and negative metaperceptions about, Black Americans, Mainland Chinese, and Muslim Thais respectively. Results revealed that negative contact was a more robust and consistent predictor of both prejudice and negative metaperceptions than positive contact across all three
cultures. Intergroup anxiety emerged as a critical mediator of the association between negative contact and intergroup attitudes. Implications and future research directions are discussed.

Pete Techakesari is a Postgraduate Student in the School of Psychology at The University of Queensland, Australia. His research focuses on the role of intergroup contact in facilitating (or disabling) prejudice, collective action engagement, and psychological well-being among racial majorities and minorities.

Maarten Zaal, *By any means necessary: How regulatory focus affects support for hostile collective action.*

I will present the results of a program of research designed to investigate how regulatory focus (Higgins, 1997) affects support for hostile collective action. Regulatory focus theory distinguishes between two motivational systems: promotion focus (an orientation on the approach of positive outcomes) and prevention focus (an orientation on the avoidance of negative outcomes). According to RFT, motivation is experienced in different ways, depending on which focus is active: Strong motivation is experienced as necessity under prevention focus and as desire under promotion focus. We argue that for individuals with a strong motivation to achieve social change, this goal should be construed in different ways, depending on whether the individual is focusing on promotion or prevention, and that these goal construals should differentially affect support for hostile collective action. More specifically, we predicted that for individuals with a strong social change motivation, the adoption of a prevention focus (because it involves construing achievement of the goal of social change as a necessity) would lead to more support for hostile collective action than the adoption of a promotion focus. These predictions were investigated in three research lines. Line 1 (2 studies) demonstrated that the adoption of a prevention (vs. promotion) focus increases support for hostile collective action among individuals strongly (morally) motivated to achieve its goal. Line 2 (2 studies) provided evidence for the mediating process: The adoption of a prevention focus led supporters of a political cause to see its achievement as more necessary, which explained why support for hostile collective action was stronger for individuals under prevention focus than for individuals under promotion focus. Finally, Line 3 (2 studies) demonstrated an important boundary condition of these effects: Prevention (but not promotion) focus only increased support for hostile collective action when peaceful action was deemed unlikely to succeed.

Maarten Zaal is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Exeter (UK). He completed his PhD at Leiden University in 2012. Maarten’s PhD research focused on the effects of different Regulatory Foci on collective action behaviors, looking specifically at individuals’ commitment to collective action, the justification of more hostile forms of collective action, and the choice between pursuing status improvement at the individual or group level. Maarten has been working as a postdoc at the University of Exeter since 2013. His work there broadly revolves around the consequences of having a moral motivation to engage in collective action. Other lines of Maarten’s research focus on the effects of religiosity on moral reasoning and on the consequences of these differences for the relations between the religious and the non-religious.
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Rebecca Littman, *Does perpetrating violence increase identification with violent groups? Evidence from Liberia and Uganda.*

This presentation considers the association between perpetration of violence and group identification.

Rebecca Littman is a doctoral student working with Betsy Levey Paluck at Princeton University, USA.

Fathali Moghadam, *Political Systems and Collective Harm-doing.*

This presentation considers collective harm-doing in relation to macro-level forces, and in particular to the social psychology of dictatorships and of democracies.

Prof. Fathali Moghaddam is a social psychologist and peace psychologist who works at Georgetown University, USA.


This presentation considers differences in the normative, social representations of social change by civilians and the military as antecedents of military coup attempts and briefly presents a research project on this topic.

Cristina Montiel is a peace psychologist who works in the Psychology Department of Ateneo de Manila University, in the Philippines.

Angela Nickerson, *Moral injury in traumatized refugees.*

This presentation considers refugee and post-conflict mental health, in relation to the ‘moral injury’ caused by bearing witness to harm-doing.

Angela Nickerson is a clinical psychologist and Lecturer who works in the School of Psychology of the University of New South Wales.