



Kazimierz Dolny 06-09.06.2008

EAESP Small Group Meeting on Dehumanization

Determinants and Consequences of Perceiving Others as Less Than Humans

Schedule of Events

Friday, June 6

20:00 DINNER (at U Fryzjera Restaurant)

Saturday, June 7

9:10-9:25 Welcome message

9:25-11:40 Session 1: The Nature of Dehumanization Processes

Title: Rethinking subtle dehumanization as denial of the human essence. Author: Paul Bain
Title: The relationship between denials of humanness and likening others to non-humans. Authors: Steve Loughnan & Nick Haslam
Title: Relationship between attribution of uniquely human and animal characteristics to groups Author: Chiara Storari

10:40-11:10 COFFEE BREAK

11:10-12:25 Session 2: Stereotyping, Objectification, and Dehumanization

Title: The uniquely human content of stereotypes Authors: Jeroen Vaes & Maria Paola Paladino
Title: Dehumanisation as a factor triggering linguistic discrimination Authors: Flavia Albarello & Monica Rubini
Title: The influence of stereotype content on expression of infrahumanization Authors: Aurore Krebeck, Michael Platow

12:25-15:30 LUNCH BREAK

15:30-17:10 Session 3: Dehumanization and morality

Title: The Dynamics of exclusionary and inclusionary change Author: Susan Opotow
Title: Dehumanization and moral dimensions of person perception: Moral blame, moral praise and moral patency Authors: Brock Bastian, Simon Laham, Sam Wilson & Nick Haslam
Title: The cycle of righteous violence: Forces that increase and decrease support for terrorism Authors: Tom Pyszczynski & Abdolhossein Abdollahi
Title: Dehumanization and moral responsibility as predictors of outgroup-focused outcomes and support for terror threat prevention Authors: Anja Zimmermann, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel, & Tendayi Viki

17:10-17:40 COFFEE BREAK

17:40-19:20 Session 4: Dehumanization and morality (continued)

Title: Denying Human Nature to Victims of the Ingroup Authors: Bernhard Leidner, Patricia Slawuta, & Emanuele Castano
Title: Effects of perceived ingroup responsibility on victim derogation and its linkage to empathy Authors: Sabina Cehajic, Rupert Brown, & Roberto Gonzalez
Title: Shared culture, collective guilt, and (de)humanization of a victimized outgroup Authors: Patrycja Slawuta & Mirosław Kofta
Title: The language of moral disengagement Authors: Emanuele Castano, Bernhard Leidner & Patricia Slawuta

19:30 DINNER

Sunday, June 8

9:25-10:40 Session 5: Infrahumanization and Intergroup Relations

Title: Does infra-humanization protect individual ingroup members? Authors: Julie Collange, Jacques-Philippe Leyens, & Stéphanie Demoulin
Title: Is emotional infrahumanization independent of group status? Intergroup and interpersonal differentiation in white, gipsy and black adolescents Authors: Mariana Miranda & Maria Gouveia-Pereira
Title: Ingroup bias and infrahumanization: Related or unrelated phenomena? Authors: Mirosław Kofta, Monika Mirosławska & Joanna Błogowska

10:40-11:10 COFFEE BREAK

11:10-12:50 Session 6: Infrahumanization and Intergroup Relations(continued)

Title: Evolution: for the ingroup but not for the outgroup Authors: Dora Capozza, Giulio Boccatto, Luca Andrighetto, & Rossella Falvo
Title: Infrahumanization of outgroup members in intergroup relations: The role of social categorization, co-operation and competition Author: Tomasz Baran
Title: Dehumanization of ethnic groups: Socio-cognitive and ideological aspects Authors: Afrodita Marcu, Peter Hegarty, & Evanthia Lyons
Title: The role of psychological closeness in infrahumanization Authors: Friederike Eyssel, Thomas Denson, Alexandra Cislak & Flavia Albarello

12:50-15:55 LUNCH BREAK

15:55-16:20 Session 7: Infrahumanization, Racism, and Social Exclusion

Title: Doomed to repeat it: Historical continuities in racial representations and anti-Black violence Author: Phillip Atiba Goff
Title: Infrahumanization and attitudes towards the ill-treatment and social exclusion of Muslims Authors: G. Tendayi Viki & Anja Zimmerman

17:40-18:10 COFFEE BREAK

18:10-19:10 Poster Session

19:30 DINNER

Monday, June 9

9:50-11:10 Session 8: Dehumanization: Basic Issues

Title: Dehumanizations (plural) Author: Nick Haslam
Title: "If this is darwinism..." representations of human evolution reduce sensitivity to racial inequality Authors: Shantal Marshall & Jennifer L. Eberhardt
Title: Afterthoughts about infra-humanization Author: Jacques-Phillippe Leyens

11:10-12:00 BREAK

~12:00 First bus departs to Warsaw and Okecie Airport

12:00-14:00 LUNCH

14:00-16:00 Sightseeing in Kazimierz (The Renaissance Market Square, The Synagogue, Jewish Cemetery, Fara Church, Ruins of the Castle)

~17:00 Second bus departs to Warsaw and Okecie Airport

Oral Sessions

Session 1: The Nature of Dehumanization Processes

Rethinking subtle dehumanization as denial of the human essence.

Paul Bain (Murdoch University).

Subtle forms of dehumanization are often explained with reference to essentialism, specifically the idea that the ingroup is attributed “the human essence” more than outgroups, and hence outgroups are implicitly seen as “non-human”. Using uniquely human emotions to instantiate the human essence, studies have shown that these emotions are more typical and faster to recognize for ingroups than for outgroups, and people are motivated to recognise them in ingroup members but discount their existence in outgroups. However, several recent findings are presented that indicate that using “the human essence” to explain subtle dehumanization effects is more complex and problematic than previously thought.

First, “the human essence” is not unitary, with at least two construals: human uniqueness and human nature, and only the latter associated with key essential properties (e.g., capacity to support inductions). Second, these construals of the human essence can be attributed to groups in inconsistent ways, i.e., attribution of lesser human nature but greater human uniqueness to an outgroup, or vice versa. Third, humanness is not denied consistently across different types of (non-status related) characteristics, such as emotions and values. Together, these findings indicate that attributions of humanness to groups is not unitary but multifaceted, and can be attributed in complex and complementary ways. This poses problems for ideas that dehumanization involves denial of “the human essence”. Finally, the common method of using typicality of characteristics for groups to assess attributions of the human essence is critiqued on the grounds that atypicality does not imply a lack of essence.

To reconcile these issues and findings, a non-essentialist account of subtle dehumanization is proposed, where the category “human” has a graded typicality and membership structure. This approach means that groups can be viewed as better or worse examples of the “human” category, and the way that typicality and membership is decided can be flexible, pragmatic, and motivated. It allows dehumanization to occur by degrees, and to take a variety of subtle forms, rather than the more dichotomous view implied by the denial or granting of an essence. This approach retains all key dehumanization findings and implications, but places them within a more consistent theoretical frame which also generates novel predictions and implications.

The relationship between denials of humanness and likening others to non-humans.

Stephen Loughnan & Nick Haslam (University of Melbourne).

At least two distinct approaches have been employed in recent dehumanization research. One approach has been to investigate denials of humanness to the other (e.g., particular emotions, personality traits, or values). This ‘attribute-based’ dehumanization characterizes the other as lacking the attributes essential to being fully or uniquely human, and has typified early dehumanization research (Haslam et al., 2005; Leyens et al., 2001). Another approach has been to investigate the likening of people to non-humans, typically animals or machines. This ‘metaphor-based’ dehumanization results in the other being viewed as closer to the non-human than the ingroup or self, and has recently received empirical scrutiny (Goff et al., 2008; Loughnan & Haslam, 2007; Viki et al., 2006). Little work has been conducted on how these two approaches might relate to one another. Both Haslam (2006) and Leyens et al. (2007) suggested that denials of specific senses of humanness (e.g., human uniqueness) might relate to likening to particular non-humans (e.g., animals), and vice versa, however this claim has yet to be examined. In two studies we investigated how dehumanization might spread from attribute-based to metaphor-based forms. In Study 1, 114 participants read a scenario where a novel group either lacked a form of humanness (human nature, human uniqueness) or were like a non-human (animal, robot). Explicit and implicit dehumanization were subsequently measured. We found that participants not only directly learned to dehumanize, but inferred attribute-based from metaphor-based dehumanization and vice versa. Moreover, this inference was consistent with dehumanization theory (Haslam, 2006). For instance, participants who learned that a group lacked human nature viewed the group as more robot-like, whereas those who learned the group were like animals viewed them as lacking human uniqueness. In Study 2, we replicated this effect using a different learning paradigm. Eighty-two participants completed a concrete learning task and demonstrated both direct learning and theoretically consistent inference of metaphor-based dehumanization from denials of human attributes. In both studies the effect was stronger explicitly than implicitly. Based on the findings of these studies and drawing on the cognitive psychology literature, we propose a cognitive model of how the two types of dehumanization relate. Specifically, we will argue that the relationship between attribute-based and metaphor-based dehumanization can be understood as a special case of analogy-making, where various minor characteristics (attributes) underlie more complex representations (metaphors).

Relationship between attribution of uniquely human and animal characteristics to groups

Storari Chiara (Catholic University of Louvain at Louvain-la-Neuve).

Recently, two senses of humanness have been proposed: uniquely human and human nature. The negation of each sense of humanness determines animalistic or mechanistic dehumanization. Therefore, the negation of uniquely human characteristics implies the attribution of animal characteristics. Animal characteristics have been almost defined in negative terms and as opposed to uniquely human characteristics. We propose that groups can be animalized by positive terms, which aren't the simple opposition to uniquely human characteristics. A pre-test identified animal traits, distinct from human nature. Our purpose was to investigate the relationship between attribution of uniquely human and animal traits to groups.

In study 1, participants attributed positive uniquely human and animal traits to the in-group (Swiss) and to four out-groups, and they completed the blatant and subtle racism scale. Results showed that the in-group was perceived as more uniquely human and less animalistic than out-groups. Attribution of less positive uniquely human traits to out-groups than to the in-group positively correlated with blatant and subtle racism. Attribution of more positive animal traits to out-groups than to the in-group negatively correlated with subtle racism. This latter result let us suppose that the attribution of positive animal traits could represent a paternalizing prejudice, concerning low status and low competitive groups.

In study 2, participants attributed positive uniquely human and animal traits to nine out-groups and the in-group, and they indicated groups' perceived status and competitiveness. Analyses showed that high status groups tended to be more uniquely human and less animalistic than low status groups. However, no group was identified as competitive.

Study 3 investigated perception of artificial groups of different status and competitiveness. Participants attributed positive uniquely human and animal traits to an in-group and to an out-group, varying in status and competitiveness. As expected, high status out-group tended to be perceived as less animalistic than low status out-groups. However, the double interaction between status and competitiveness didn't reach significance. Unexpectedly, status didn't affect attribution of uniquely human traits to out-groups, but competitive out-groups were perceived as less uniquely human than cooperative out-groups.

We conclude that attribution of positive animal traits represents a distinct phenomenon from attribution of positive uniquely human traits. In addition, groups' status plays a major role in the perception of groups as animalistic.

Session 2: Stereotyping, Objectification, and Dehumanization

The uniquely human content of stereotypes

Jeroen Vaes & Maria Paola Paladino (University of Padova).

In the present work two studies analyzed the human content of stereotypes in various inter-group situations. Drawing predictions from recent developments in dehumanization research and extensions of the stereotype content model (SCM), which showed inter-group stereotypes to fall along two separate dimensions of warmth (low-high) and competence (low-high), the following three hypotheses were tested. First of all, infrahumanization theory predicts that the infrahumanization bias understood as people's tendency to see their in-group as relatively more human than the out-group should occur in all inter-group comparisons independently of the out-group's position according to the SCM. Secondly, in line with the recent findings of Harris & Fiske (2006) who demonstrated that only extreme out-groups that are marked by a lack of both warmth and competence were clearly dehumanized, we predicted that the extreme, low-low out-groups will be infrahumanized more strongly than the other out-groups. Finally, if as Loughnan & Haslam (2007) suggested the uniquely human dimension largely matches the competence dimension of the SCM, one can expect that among the out-groups especially the high competence / low warmth groups will be seen as most uniquely human. In Study 1 all three hypotheses were tested and confirmed directly comparing 9 different inter-group situations that varied in terms of competence and warmth. In Study 2, competence and warmth dimensions were directly manipulated and focusing on participants' out-group humanity judgments the latter two hypotheses were confirmed. Theoretical implications of the dynamics that make up the process of infrahumanization in terms of in-group humanization, out-group dehumanization or both are discussed.

Dehumanization as a factor triggering linguistic discrimination

Flavia Albarello, Monica Rubini (University of Bologna).

Social psychological literature provides the basis to contend that humanity is a crucial dimension in the relationships with the others, leading to severe consequences such as aggression or harm doing.

In this regard, it should be noted that the contributions directly and empirically addressing this role of dehumanisation in aggravating social discrimination are very scarce. In addition, literature on social discrimination has mainly considered prejudice as due to intergroup categorisation without considering that the superordinate human categorisation may also be at stake.

A set of three studies was conducted in order to test whether relative dehumanisation vs. humanity of a target would trigger social discrimination, and also whether group membership would moderate the effects of relative dehumanisation on linguistic discrimination expressed through an implicit linguistic measures - language abstraction used in target descriptions (Study 1 and Study 2) - and also a more explicit and derogating one - the language of insults (Study 3).

Drawing from the available literature, in these three studies, relative dehumanisation was manipulated in terms of the target being characterised by prosocial values and expressing him/herself with secondary emotions vs. being characterised by lack of prosocial values and expressing him/herself with primary emotions.

Evidence showed that the relative dehumanised target was discriminated to a greater extent than the human target. Group membership affected linguistic discrimination only towards the human target, with the being discriminated to a lower extent. Moreover, findings also showed that extremely derogating forms of discrimination assuming dehumanising contents, such as animalising insults, were addressed to relatively dehumanised outgroup members, thus revealing that not all outgroup might be dehumanised. The role of perceptions of humanity of the others - besides that of group membership - on discrimination will be discussed, contending that it is worthy to consider the co-salience of intermediate level self categorisations and of the superordinate human categorisation contrasting the human group to less/not human groups in order to human beings to explain discrimination outcomes and dehumanisation consequences on intergroup behaviour. The relevance of linguistic implicit, uncontrolled, measures as well as, of explicit, relatively uncontrollable measures of discrimination will be discussed.

The influence of stereotype content on expression of infrahumanization.

Aurore Krebeck, Michael Platow (Australian National University)

This research explores the construct of infrahumanization, and if context mediates the effect of threat on infrahumanization rather than either economic or cultural threat generally enhancing infrahumanization. The dependent variable is infrahumanization, as measured by emotion attribution. The independent variables are threat context, threat type, and whether the participants were asked to make emotion attributions to Australians or migrants. The in-group is Australians; the out-group is migrants. Part 1 of the survey is a manipulation of threat context using a biased identity survey to influence participants to either think of Australia as being characterized by its culture/habits or its economic stability. The second manipulation presents the threat type in a census data summary containing either threatening information on migrants relating to culture or economy. Participants are asked to rate the extent to which either migrants or Australians experience emotions. There are 12 emotions from four theoretical clusters: primary positive (happiness, surprise, pleasure), primary negative (pain, anger, fear), secondary positive (optimism, hope, nostalgia), and secondary negative (guilt, shame, remorse).

Two hypotheses are made: 1) Findings will replicate previous infrahumanization research, showing higher ratings of the in-group on secondary emotions and equal ratings on primary emotions. 2) In conditions where the threat context and the threat type “match” (cultural context and cultural threat; economic context and economic threat), there will be more infrahumanization of the out-group than in conditions where threat context manipulation do not make salient the presented threat type.

Results are evaluated with a 2 (migrant, Australians) x 2 (habits, stability) x 2 (culture economics) x 2 (positive, negative) x 2

(primary, secondary) mixed ANOVA. Results do not support hypothesis 1 that infrahumanization is affected by threat salience. Findings for hypothesis 2 show an interesting partial replication of previous findings. Negative secondary emotions are attributed less to the out-group than the in-group. However, positive secondary emotions are more strongly attributed to the migrant out-group, a pattern opposite to infrahumanization. Is the migrant out-group at once infra- & “ultra”humanized (i.e., elevated to a status of more human than the in-group)?

Results are discussed with regard to stereotype content. Stereotypes can include both positive and negative content and can vary as a function of context and comparison group. Therefore, with the comparative context of Australians and migrants, the specific secondary emotions chosen may be compromised by group stereotypes. Given their life circumstances, migrants are stereotyped as particularly nostalgic, hopeful and optimistic. In the context of recent debates and legislation on migration, Australians may feel guilt, shame and remorse. Results have important implications for the measurement of infrahumanization and show that stereotype content is a significant influence on emotion ratings. Further study is needed to determine whether stereotype content may help to humanize the out-group and infrahumanize the ingroup, or rather whether stereotype content is a potential confound to infrahumanization measurement.

Session 3: Dehumanization and morality

The dynamics of exclusionary and inclusionary change

Susan Opatow (City University of New York).

Moral Exclusion Theory describes how people come to see others as outside the scope of justice and therefore as invisible, expendable, and targets of exploitation and harm. This paper examines changes in the scope of justice, particularly the structural changes associated with extending justice to groups that had formerly been excluded. It does so by examining the wellbeing of African Americans in the American South in two periods following the American Civil War (1861-1865) – the Reconstruction (1863-1877) and Jim Crow (late 19th to mid-20th century). Using moral exclusion and inclusion theory as a lens and historical sources as data, I first discuss the Reconstruction, a period of inclusionary gains in social, economic, legal, and political spheres as well as setbacks. Jim Crow followed, a period characterized by white supremacy, complete racial segregation, the dehumanization of black Americans, and the normalization of violence. The exclusionary ethos of Jim Crow declined in mid-twentieth century with the emergence of the Civil Rights Movement, dedicated to ending racial violence and fostering the inclusion of African Americans in society. This study offers insight in the dynamics associated with changes in the scope of justice, from expansion to contraction, and contributes to psychological theory on the extension of justice to previously-excluded groups.

Dehumanization and moral dimensions of person perception: Moral blame, moral praise and moral patency.

Brock Bastian, Simon Laham, Sam Wilson, Nick Haslam. (University Melbourne).

A recent surge of interest in the moral dimensions of person perception has shown that attributions of agency and experience form two dimensions along which various entities (e.g., robots and babies) can be understood (Gray, Gray and Wegner, 2007). These two dimensions are similar to Aristotle's notion of moral agency and moral patency and are associated with judgements of punishment and harm respectively. The current work attempts to develop a more nuanced understanding of how these basic dimensions may distinguish between different kinds of people by drawing on two dimensions of human nature that have recently been proposed by Haslam (2006). The dimensions distinguish between attributes that define our human uniqueness (UH) and those that define the core properties of our human nature (HN) with dehumanization occurring when a person is denied one or both of these. This research provides a convenient theoretical orientation from which to investigate how different forms of humanness may be related to moral dimensions of person perception.

Specifically we tested the hypotheses that qualities associated with human nature (e.g., emotional responsiveness, warmth and depth) are associated with attributions of moral patency or an increased desire to protect from harm, and that qualities associated with human uniqueness (e.g., civility, refinement and

rationality) are associated with moral agency or increased responsibility and blame for moral transgressions. Furthermore, drawing on the work of Bandura we proposed that there are in fact two dimensions of moral agency and that these are differently associated with the dimensions of humanness. Inhibitive agency refers to the capacity to refrain from behaving inhumanely, therefore requiring restraint (a UH related trait), whereas proactive agency refers to the capacity to behave humanely, requiring empathy (a HN related trait).

The findings support our hypotheses demonstrating that moral agency and moral patency appear to be connected to dimensions of UH and HN respectively. Furthermore, evidence was found for two forms of moral agency, with inhibitive agency attached to UH traits (or being blamed for failures of inhibition) and proactive agency attached to HN traits (or praise for doing good deeds). This research extends the previous work on mind states by demonstrating that moral dimensions of person perception are also related to dimensions of human traits and that attributions of morality may be related to different forms of dehumanization. The work also provides evidence for two kinds of agency that are associated with different forms of humanness.

The cycle of righteous violence: Forces that increase and decrease support for terrorism

Tomasz Pyszczynski & Abdolhossein Abdollahi (University of Colorado at Colorado Springs).

Terror Management Theory provides a psychological analysis of the functions of culture and why cultural differences often lead to lethal conflict. Recent experiments exploring the role that terror management processes play in the current conflict in the Middle East have shown that subtle reminders of death increase support for suicide bombings among Iranians, harsher military tactics among Israelis and support for extreme military interventions among Americans. Experiments have also shown that subliminal reminders of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and media coverage of terrorism increase the accessibility of death-related thoughts outside of conscious awareness, and that reminders of either death or 9/11 increase support for President Bush and his policies in Iraq among Americans. On a more encouraging note, research shows that subtle activation of a sense of "common humanity" reverses anti-Arab prejudice among Americans, that priming compassionate passages from the Christian Bible reverse the effects of death reminders so that they reduce support for extreme military interventions among Americans, and that priming compassionate values from the Koran have a similar conflict-reducing approach among Iranians. The role of humanization and dehumanization processes in the promotion of violence and peace will be discussed.

Dehumanization and moral responsibility as predictors of outgroup-focused outcomes and support for terror threat prevention

Anja Zimmermann, Bertjan Doosje, Sven Zebel (University of Amsterdam), Tendayi Viki (University of Kent).

This research investigates the relationships of the four different de-humanization components (ingroup/outgroup humanity and

ingroup/outgroup animality) with outcome variables related to terror threat prevention. We hypothesized a positive relationship between outgroup humanity and positive outgroup-focused outcomes (e.g. motivation to approach outgroup members and support for integration and negotiation of compromises with the Islamic world) and a negative relationship between outgroup animality and negative outcomes (e.g. prejudice and support for military intervention). Moral responsibility, as the adherence to moral principles and the motivation to change the status quo, is considered as mediator between outgroup humanity and the positive outcomes. A study conducted in the United Kingdom (N = 170) assesses the different components of dehumanisation considering different outgroups who were victims of ingroup wrongdoing in the past (Kenyan) and in the present (Iraqis). The findings reveal the unique relationships in line with the hypotheses. The second study (N = 160) manipulates different types of terrorist threat (realistic, symbolic, personal and no threat) and assesses implications of dehumanization on the different threat perceptions, intergroup anxiety, ingroup- and outgroup anger and support for different forms of terror threat prevention (mild, moderate, harsh). It is shown that outgroup animality is associated most strongly with symbolic threat, greater anxiety and support for harsher terrorist prevention. Implications of the findings for terror threat perception and prevention policies are considered and the distinct functions of outgroup humanity and outgroup animality for positive and negative outcomes are discussed.

Session 4: Dehumanization and morality (continued)

Denying human nature to victims of the ingroup

Bernhard Leidner, Patricia Slawuta, & Emanuele Castano (New School for Social Research).

Denying human status to others, or dehumanizing them, does not only lead to their exclusion from morality (Opotow, 1990) and enables us to conduct violence against fellow human beings (Bandura et al. 2001, 1975). In its lesser form, by denying *humanly unique* features such as secondary emotions to others (infrahumanization; Leyens et al., 2000), it is also strategically used on intergroup level to morally disengage from past transgressions committed by the ingroup against an outgroup (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006).

In two experiments we investigated whether another form of infrahumanization – the denial of personality traits indicative of high *human nature* to others (Haslam, 2007) – (1) is not only an interpersonal (Haslam et al., 2005) but also an intergroup process, (2) whether such a process even occurs in the absence of an established meaning for the ingroup vs. outgroup distinction, and (3) whether this process is used as a moral disengagement strategy. Also, the moderating role of ingroup glorification (Roccas et al., 2006) was tested.

In Study 1, after making three aesthetic choices between pairs of pictures and thereby becoming members of their minimal groups based on aesthetic preference, 28 U.S. citizens attributed 32 personality traits (varying in terms of desirability,

human uniqueness, and human nature) to both the ingroup and the outgroup. A 2 (ingroup vs. outgroup) x 2 (high vs. low human nature) x 2 (high vs. low desirability) MANOVA revealed that traits low in human nature were not differentially attributed to ingroup and outgroup, while traits high in human nature were attributed to a significantly higher extent to the ingroup than to the outgroup.

In Study 2, 103 U.S. citizens read about an atrocity committed either by the U.S. (ingroup) or France (outgroup) against the Nigerian state of Ondo. After attributing the same traits as in Study 1 to the Ondonians, participants' ingroup glorification was measured. The same effect as in Study 1 emerged, but only in the ingroup-perpetrator condition and only for high but not for low glorifiers.

These findings provide evidence for denial of human nature as an intergroup process that even occurs in minimal groups and, like its "emotion-based brother", is used as a moral disengagement strategy. The moderating role of ingroup glorification adds to other findings that it is high glorifiers who use morally disengaging language (Slawuta et al., under review), minimize outgroup suffering, explicitly dehumanize the wronged outgroup, and are less willing to repair ingroup atrocities (Leidner et al., under review).

Effects of perceived ingroup responsibility on victim derogation and its linkage to empathy

Sabina Cehajic (Sarajevo School of Science and Technology), Rupert Brown (Sussex University), Roberto Gonzalez (Pontifica University).

Current research examined the effects of perceived ingroup responsibility on attribution of emotions to members from the victim group. Following the recent empirical evidence by Castano and Giner-Sorolla (2006), it was predicted that being reminded of ingroup responsibility for some morally violated behavior would elicit employment of defense mechanisms such as victim derogation. Experiment 1 manipulated the level of ingroup responsibility and assessed the impact of this manipulation on attribution of both primary and secondary emotions to members of the victim group. The capacity to feel secondary emotions is thought to be one of the characteristics that make us human (Demoulin et al., 2004; Leyens et al., 2000) and therefore attribution of secondary emotions to the outgroup is conceptualized as a subtle attribution of the human essence. Using the context of intergroup relations in Chile, hence the mistreatment of Indigenous Chileans (Mapuche) by Non-Indigenous Chileans (N = 124), the results revealed that perception of high ingroup responsibility led to decreased attribution of secondary emotions to the victim group whilst the effect on attribution of primary emotions was not significant. Moreover, attribution of secondary emotions to the victim group predicted empathic feelings felt for the same. Experiment 2 replicated the effects of ingroup responsibility on attribution of emotions and a more blatant self-reported dehumanization measure in a different context using Bosnian Serbs (N = 158) as participants and the recent 1992-1995 conflict as the context. Consistent with our predictions, both attribution of secondary emotions and the dehumanization measure predicted empathy felt for the victims (Bosnian Muslims). Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Shared culture, collective guilt, and (de)humanization of a victimized outgroup

Patrycja Slawuta (New School for Social Research) & Miroslaw Kofta (University of Warsaw).

The study addressed the role of sharing cultural worldview with the victimized outgroup in collective guilt and humanization of outgroupers. Expectations: When victimized outgroup is seen as culturally close, it will: (a) make people feel guilty for crimes committed by ingroup members on outgroup members, (b) increase perceived humanity of the victims, and (c) decrease approval for group-defending ideologies (conspiracy theory of the outgroup).

In the study we asked how awareness that some Poles were engaged in cruel actions toward Jews (pogroms) soon after the WW2 affects Polish students' perception of the victims and attitudes of the former toward present-day Jews. Results: mere crime reminder did not elicit guilt feelings or repair intent, nor willingness to contact outgroupers, increasing instead acceptance of the conspiracy theory of Jews. Conversely, the same crime reminder - when accompanied by perceived cultural closeness of contemporary Jews and Poles - gave rise to feelings of collective guilt, generated repair intent, and increased willingness to develop more contacts with Jewish people and Jewish culture & history. Of particular interest, in the shared culture condition (a) victims' families were seen as more human (on emotion ascriptions), (b) participants' self-reported guilt emerged as strong, specific predictor of ascribed secondary, but not primary emotions, (c) the relationship between conspiracy theories and infrahumanization of Jews was weakened. Overall, the study implies that perception of outgroups as sharing worldview with the ingroup included the outgroup members into the "moral community", i.e., led participants to humanize the victimized outgroup and feel guilty for own group's crimes on the outgroup in the past.

The language of moral disengagement

Emanuele Castano, Bernhard Leidner & Patricia Slawuta, New School for Social Research).

Denial, minimization, and justification are processes humans engage in on a regular basis to maintain psychological equanimity, self-esteem, a positive regard by others. The experiment presented here investigates similar processes in the context of wrongdoings committed by fellow ingroup or outgroup members. Participants read an article depicting torture and killing of prisoners by either U.S. (ingroup) or Iraqi (outgroup) guards, and were then asked to summarize the article in writing so that it could be understood by another person. Computer-assisted analysis of the texts revealed that participants used language differently depending on the group membership of the perpetrator and their own score on an ingroup glorification measure. The most morally disengaging language, in the form of minimization of the events and deresponsibilization of the perpetrators, was utilized by high ingroup glorifiers when describing events committed by the ingroup.

Session 5: Infrahumanization and Intergroup Relations

Does infra-humanization protect individual ingroup members?

Julie Collange (University Paris Descartes), Jacques-Philippe Leyens, & Stéphanie Demoulin (Catholic University of Louvain at Louvain-la-Neuve).

Compared to non uniquely human emotions, uniquely human ones last longer and are associated to moral concerns. Feeling an overload of secondary emotions may thus affect the well being of ingroup members taken as individuals. In a series of studies using affectively-loaded events (sad or happy), participants infer or attribute more uniquely human emotions to the ingroup than to the outgroup in line with classic results of infra-humanization. Affective information is also better memorized for the ingroup while descriptive information is better remembered for the outgroup. When helping, empathy, perspective taking, personal distress, and discomfort are measured, participants always favor the ingroup. However, inferences (or attributions) of uniquely human emotions never mediate the link between membership and discomfort (or personal distress). Infra-humanization does not seem, therefore, to have a protective function for individual members of the ingroup. This lack of an additional function may be due to the fact that the latter one focuses on individuals rather than groups, and that infra-humanization is an intergroup phenomenon. These studies also consistently show that the more participants infer or attribute negative uniquely human emotions to a suffering outgroup, the better they feel. Further research is needed to understand this last finding.

Is Emotional infrahumanization independent of group status? Intergroup and interpersonal differentiation in white, gipsy and black adolescents

Mariana Miranda & Maria Gouveia-Pereira (ISPA [Higher Institute of Applied Psychology] - UIPCDE).

Infra-humanization, namely emotional infra-humanization, has been described as independent from group status^{1,2}.

Therefore, this study's aim is to describe and compare the processes of intergroup and interpersonal differentiation, which occur based on the features which gipsy, a much discriminated group, and white adolescents identify as uniquely human (UH).

We asked 30 white (WA) and 30 gipsy adolescents (GA) what is UH. Afterwards subjects ascribe the features they have written to the ingroup, the outgroup and to themselves.

The verified that representations of what is UH are distinct. We highlight the absence of secondary emotions in the gipsy group. Regarding the intergroup differentiation, WA infra-humanize gipsies based on intelligence and learning dimensions. As to secondary emotions we found a pattern similar to Cortes and colleagues³, as WA ascribe more secondary emotions to the ingroup than to the outgroup and equally to the ingroup and self. However, in this group there is evidence of differentiation at the interpersonal level in what concerns intelligence and learning. Even though it is contrary to the definition of infra-humanization, described as an intergroup process⁴, it has

already been assumed the possibility that this process can also take place at an interpersonal level⁵. We argue that it might occur whenever the features are relevant to the specific social context⁶. As to the GA, we did not verify any differentiation made at the intergroup and interpersonal levels, although a social creativity strategy was possible.

Is such absence of secondary emotions exclusive of the gipsy group? To answer this question we replicated this study with WA and black adolescents (BA) and verified that 1) there is a much more similar representation of the UH between them; and 2) BA do refer secondary emotions.

Results will be discussed within the general understanding of emotional infra-humanization as a universal process.

Ingroup bias and infrahumanization: Related or unrelated phenomena?

Miroslaw Kofta & Monika Miroslawska & Joanna Błogowska (University of Warsaw).

Ingroup bias is a pervasive human tendency to be more positive about ingroupers than outgroupers on a variety of comparison criteria. It probably increases ingroup value and strengthens positive group identification, resulting in more benign within-group relations. The question arises how is infrahumanization (a tendency to approach outgroupers as less human than ingroupers) related to ingroup bias; Is it so that infrahumanization is but another expression of less positive attitude toward outgroupers, or the discussed phenomena are unrelated and possibly play different functions.

Two studies in the minimal-group paradigm revealed both ingroup bias and infrahumanization effect. However, they appeared to be statistically unrelated. Moreover, only ingroup bias intensity, but not infrahumanization intensity, was moderating the outgroup-homogeneity effect, the finding again suggesting independence of the phenomena under consideration. The studies on real groups confirm this conclusion. Catholic students showed both ingroup bias toward Orthodox Church believers, Jews, and Muslims, and (strongly) infrahumanized them. However, these effects appeared unrelated (the only thing we found was that ingroup bias predicted ascription of positive emotions to the ingroup but not the outgroups).

To conclude, our studies demonstrate that (a) just as ingroup bias, infrahumanization emerges in the minimal group paradigm (suggests that mere social categorization is sufficient to elicit the latter); (b), however, the effects are independent of each other in minimal and real groups as well. We discuss possible reasons for this independence and suggest that the discussed phenomena may play different role in group life. Whereas the major task of ingroup bias seems to form attachment with ingroupers and increase value of one's own group, infrahumanization may serve to prepare group to decisive actions against potentially threatening outgroupers (such as attack, extermination, enslaving). Infrahumanization, we suggest, is an automatically triggered psychological set that makes it easier to release outgroup aggression without moral constraints. Thus, we postulate close links between infrahumanization and "blatant" dehumanization phenomena.

Session 6: Infrahumanization and Intergroup Relations(continued)

Evolution: For the ingroup but not for the outgroup

Dora Capozza, Giulio Boccato, Luca Andrighetto, Rossella Falvo (University of Padova).

In two studies, we tested the hypothesis that people are inclined to protect the human purity of ingroup, but not that of outgroup. We used, as stimuli, two faces of males and a face of monkey (a chimpanzee). Each human face was merged with the monkey face, obtaining two continua with seven levels: at the first level, there was the human face; at level 2, 95% of the face was human; at level 6, 95% of the face was monkey; level 7 was defined by the monkey exemplar. Levels 3, 4, 5 were ambiguous, however more human than animal: for level 3, 63% of the face was human, for level 4, 58%, for level 5, 53%. We chose these levels, on the basis of previous studies, where a 20-step continuum of morphing was used. Only for levels 3, 4, 5, different results for ingroup and outgroup were obtained. Differences however were weak, probably because too many stimuli were presented.¹ The 14 exemplars (two continua of seven levels) were showed three times. For each of the 42 trials, participants had to decide if the exemplar was human or animal.

Two experimental conditions were used: Ingroup and Outgroup; participants were Northern Italian students. In the Ingroup condition, participants were informed that human exemplars showed were Northern, in the Outgroup condition they were told human exemplars were Southern. Our hypothesis was that, in the Ingroup condition, the three ambiguous exemplars would have classified as monkey at a higher degree than that expected on the basis of face composition. Namely, for this condition, we assumed effects of overexclusion of exemplars from the human category. In contrast, for the Outgroup condition, we expected less strong or no effects of overexclusion.

In Study 1, hypothesis was fully confirmed. In the Ingroup condition, participants tended to include the ambiguous exemplars in the animal category. In the Outgroup condition, ambiguous exemplars were correctly classified, namely identified as human or animal at a rate equal to that expected on the basis of face composition. Results were replicated in Study 2, where a response-window of 800 ms was used. Thus, people exclude that non clearly human exemplars may be members of ingroup, while they accept these exemplars may belong to outgroup. Ingroup is perceived as more human, and its humanity is actively protected.

Infrahumanization of outgroup members in intergroup relation: The role of social categorization, co-operation and competition.

Tomasz Baran(University of Warsaw).

The studies on intergroup relation, conducted so far concentrated mainly on in-group bias effects. Only recently researchers started to prove that tendency to infrahumanization of out-group members could be an equally important after-effect of social categorization. It means that outgroupers are not only evaluated worse than ingroupers but unlike ingroupers they are not recognized as fully humans. Studies of Leyens and his team (Leyens et al., 1999, 2000, 2001) prove a tendency to attribute specifically human, positive and negative secondary emotions more to the ingroup than to

outgroups, without parallel differences on primary emotions. The experiments presented in this presentation show that the infrahumanization of outgroup member and in-group bias could be modified in a different way by the type of intergroup relation. Among other things it turned out that members of rivalry group are very negatively evaluated but not infrahumanized.

Dehumanization of ethnic groups: Socio-cognitive and ideological aspects

Afrodita Marcu, Peter Hegarty, Evanthia Lyons (University of Surrey).

My research explored why certain stigmatized and marginalized groups such as the Gypsies are dehumanized by being considered less than human. The aim was to identify the factors that predispose ethnic minority and immigrant groups to being dehumanized by majority members. In this sense, potential antecedents of dehumanization such as cultural differences between in-group and out-group, the out-group's poor socio-economic status, perceived threat (material or symbolic), and the relative power status of the out-group were at the core of the investigation. At the same time, the present research was concerned with whether dehumanization may function as a form of in-group favoritism or whether it is contingent upon certain features of the out-group, e.g. poverty or low status. Last but not least, the present research was also concerned with how dehumanization may be best operationalized, and it examined why the human-animal paradigm has been implicitly adopted in research on dehumanization.

My research was conducted in Britain and Romania. Firstly, focus groups interviews probed how the human-animal binary as well as anthropocentrism can inform theories of dehumanization. It indicated that rational autonomy differentiates humans from animals, while sentience makes them similar, and that the motives underlying the ideology of speciesism may underpin dehumanization, too. Secondly, questionnaire surveys measured on a 7-point scale the human typicality of twelve emotions and twenty traits that were used in the operationalization of dehumanization in the present research. Some emotions and traits were rated as more typically human than others, and their human typicality ratings were not significantly correlated to their animal typicality ratings, suggesting that what is typically human is not necessarily un-typically animal. Thus, dehumanization was measured through the lesser association of typically human attributes with the out-group than with the in-group. Thirdly, three vignette experiments employing artificial out-groups revealed that while the target out-groups were overall dehumanized, the out-groups culturally different from the in-group, as well as the poor ones, were more dehumanized than the culturally similar out-groups and the rich ones, respectively. Concerning real groups, a questionnaire survey and a vignette experiment revealed that the Gypsies were dehumanized, but that the Germans were not, in both countries. I will talk about how dehumanization is not an automatic process of in-group bias, and that it may be shaped by ideologies that justify the system and place poor, low-status and marginalized people at the boundaries of the category 'human'.

The role of psychological closeness in infrahumanization

Friederike Eysel, (Bielefeld University), Thomas Denson (University of New South Wales), Alexandra Cislak (Warsaw School of Psychology) & Flavia Albarello (University of Bologna)

The infrahumanization effect is commonly interpreted in terms of a group phenomenon, where an outgroup is ascribed lesser human essence as compared to an ingroup.

Haslam and colleagues (e.g., 2005), however, have shown that the effect may well be found at an interpersonal level. Drawing on this idea, the present research aims at investigating the moderating effect of psychological closeness ("closeness to self") on infrahumanization. Accordingly, it is predicted that the extent to which any person or object is humanized depends on the degree of closeness to the self (see also Aron, Aron & Smollan, 1992).

To test this assumption, psychological closeness is operationalized in various ways (e.g., ownership, morphing, temporal distance, humanoid features in automatons) within a series of studies. In addition, our research also integrates the aspect of entitativity of a social group and examines its role for the infrahumanization effect. Finally, taking a broader theoretical perspective, the notion that infrahumanization may be interpreted as one end of a continuum, with anthropomorphism on the other, will be addressed and discussed.

Session 7: Infrahumanization, Racism, and Social Exclusion

Doomed to repeat it: Historical continuities in racial representations and anti-Black violence

Phillip Atiba Goff (Pennsylvania State University).

During the 19th and early 20th century, ape-like representations of Blacks pervaded European popular, visual, and literary culture. These representations often adorned lynching fliers, aided pro-slavery propaganda, and inspired some of the most extreme instances of state-sanctioned anti-Black violence. The Negro/ape metaphor, as the philosopher Lott calls it (1999), was so pervasive that it came to signify all that was reviled about peoples of African descent. Stereotypes of Black violence and hyper-sexuality were both embodied in the substitution of simian bodies for Black people.

While these hateful representations of Blacks have mostly disappeared from popular media, my colleagues and I find evidence that they have not disappeared from our culture. Across several studies, we find that people continue to associate Blacks and apes. However, this is an association to which people lack conscious access. Nonetheless, we demonstrate its influence on basic cognitive processes and highlight its significance in the criminal justice context. Specifically, this Black/ape association is shown to influence visual perception and attention. Activating this association increases explicit endorsement of violence against Black targets

and the perception of Blacks as violent and dangerous. Similarly, White males who were primed with the myth of Black male sexual prowess were more likely to associate Black males with apes. This association, in turn, predicted support of anti-Black violence.

In an applied context, my colleagues and I demonstrate that this Black/ape association can be spontaneously activated in newspaper coverage of criminal cases involving death-eligible Black defendants. In addition, this association is more strongly activated in criminal cases involving defendants who were ultimately sentenced to death (as compared with those sentenced to life in prison). Preliminary evidence also suggests that this association may profoundly affect the way police officers interact with Black citizens. Taken together, this research suggests that even when individuals lack conscious awareness of historical representations, that history can critically affect present day psychological and justice processes—suggesting further the importance of remembering our history, lest some among us be doomed.

Infrahumanization and attitudes towards the ill-treatment and social exclusion of Muslims

Viki G. Tendayi (University of Kent) & Anja Zimmermann (University of Cardiff/University of Amsterdam)

We will present data from our research that has explored the relationship between infrahumanization and support for the ill-treatment and social exclusion of Muslims. Over two studies, we have obtained evidence replicating infrahumanization effects among Christians (with Muslims as the outgroup). We also found that the more Christians infrahumanized Muslims, the more they supported their ill-treatment and exclusion from western society. We also predicted and found that symbolic threat, but not realistic threat, was related to infrahumanization. Perceived symbolic threat then mediated the relationship between infrahumanization and support for the ill-treatment and social exclusion of Muslims. In other words, Christians who infrahumanized Muslims viewed them as threatening to their cultural way of life and, therefore, supported their ill-treatment and social exclusion.

Session 8: Dehumanization: Basic Issues

Dehumanizations (plural)

Nick Haslam (University of Melbourne)

This paper will review evidence that dehumanization take several distinct forms rather than being a single phenomenon. In particular, I argue that it is necessary to distinguish two main forms, each of which has several varieties. First, I review the diverse ways in which “dehumanization” has been employed in scholarly discourse across the disciplines. Second, I propose that people distinguish between two distinct senses of what it is to be human, and present preliminary evidence that this

distinction holds across cultures. Third, I present evidence that two dimensions underlie contrasts between humans and various kinds of nonhuman, that these contrasts map directly onto the two senses of humanness, and that these contrasts are cross-culturally consistent. Fourth, I briefly review studies indicating that different groups are dehumanized in the two proposed ways: one form may tend to occur when the group is perceived as relatively primitive and the other when it is seen as relatively advanced. Finally, I present evidence that the two proposed forms of dehumanization may have different behavioral consequences. I conclude by arguing that although the human-animal contrast dominates research on dehumanization, it is important not to neglect other nonhuman contrasts and other senses of what it is to be human.

“If this is darwinism...” representations of human evolution reduce sensitivity to racial inequality

Shantal Marshall & Jennifer L. Eberhardt, (Stanford University)

The common understanding of human evolution places human beings at the end of a grand evolutionary race, having beat out less “fit” species by being the most evolved, as evidenced by our ability to walk upright, to use tools, to speak, and—above all—to reason. Included in this representation are the incorrect assumptions that evolution has a goal—to create a “best” species—and that the goal has been reached with human beings. This portrayal is then coupled with yet another incorrect assumption: that human civilization began only when our ancestors left Africa. This assumption is supported by standard evolution timelines that, more often than not, end with a White man. In the research I will present, I examine how such assumptions might lead people to conclude that Blacks are merely a stepping-stone between apes and Whites, and that they are therefore inherently inferior. In the first study, I presented participants with a common human evolution representation and then with a news story outlining current racial inequalities. The findings indicate that after being exposed to the evolution representation, as opposed to a control scientific representation, participants were less interested in learning about racial inequality and were also less emotionally moved and concerned for the disadvantaged group. In the second study participants were first exposed to the same human evolution representation as in the first study, and then asked to rate their interest in a variety of articles. Participants were less interested in an article on racial inequality after exposure to human evolution, in comparison to the control article, but this effect was not found for other articles dealing with inequality. Further studies and implications will be discussed.

Afterthoughts about infra-humanization

Jacques-Philippe Leyens (Catholic University of Louvain at Louvain-la-Neuve)

After a summary of the main ideas presented in the meeting, I raise some unsolved problems. While the focus has been put on sufficient conditions for infra-humanization, I discuss necessary conditions. What do “meaningful categorizations” (Kofta &

Mirolawska) imply for infra-humanization? Tracks for solutions are suggested.

Poster Session

Infrahumanization: Something you cannot change by intervention.

Michał Bilewicz (University of Warsaw)

There is considerable amount of social psychological research reporting changes in intergroup attitudes and perceptions after interventions in school-settings (Aboud & Fenwick, 1999; Houlette et al., 2007; Cameron & Rutland, 2006; Turner & Brown, 2007). The poster presents results of 3 high school interventions that applied social-psychological concepts (personalization, perspective-taking, positive-identity threat) to change attitudes, elicit guilt and reduce infrahumanization towards Jews among Polish high school students. Recent studies revealed that Poles and Jews are two groups with conflicted histories, for whom regular contact may be not sufficient to change attitudes (Bilewicz, 2007; Krzeminski, 1992). The findings revealed that certain high school interventions were effective in changing perceptions and attitudes toward Jews, and some of them elicited guilt. On the contrary, the effect of infrahumanization (attribution of secondary vs. primary emotions) remained unchanged. This proves the argument that the infrahumanization is a basic and essential phenomenon in intergroup relations (Leyens et al., 2001).

Fear and anger influences on intergroup attitudes

Marcin Bukowski & Małgorzata Kossowska (Jagiellonian University)

In this research we were exploring the idea that experiencing specific negative emotions (fear, anger) outside of the intergroup context might lead to a subsequent differences in evaluations of one's ingroup and outgroups. More precisely, we expected that by activating fear through autobiographic memories that evoked this emotion, the evaluation of the ingroup will increase whereas for the outgroup it will decrease. At the same time we expected that experienced anger will mainly decrease the evaluation of the outgroup not leading to self-enhancement effects for one owns group. We found support for the main predictions and these effects appeared for both, low and high status outgroups. Still, the tendency to derogate outgroups was the strongest among highly prejudiced participants who experienced anger. Our results are discussed in the context of the debate about influences of specific emotions on negative attitudes and prejudice. We also refer to the classic ideas of the affect displacement theory in order to explain some influences of not intergroup related emotions on evaluations of groups.

Implicit resistance sexist role relations: The effects of stereotype (in)congruency training on gender bias

Soledad de Lemus Martín, Juan Lupiáñez Castillo, Miguel Moya Morales (Universidad de Granada), Marcin Bukowski (Jagiellonian University) & Russell Spears (Cardiff University)

In two studies we tested implicit resistance to sexist role relations from the perspective of women participants as targets of this social disadvantage. In Study 1 (N=29), we tested the automaticity of the implicit intergroup bias using an evaluative priming paradigm. In Study 2 (N=70), we used an associative procedure to train two different groups either on stereotypical gender-role associations (emphasizing the stability of stereotypical roles), or on counter-stereotypical associations (suggesting that roles are changing and the position of the ingroup is improving). We looked at the effects of the training on women's implicit intergroup bias as a measure of their implicit resistance on both competence and warmth stereotypical dimensions. Results showed that ingroup bias was activated automatically at the implicit level, and was mainly due to ingroup favouritism, when no particular association is enhanced (Study 1), whereas when traditional gender-role associations were being trained participants activated implicit resistance in the form of outgroup derogation both on the competence and on the warmth dimension (Study 2). When training counter-stereotypical gender-role associations, participants significantly reduced their implicit resistance on the warmth dimension, but not on the competence dimension (Study 2). Results are discussed in relation to intergroup relations.

Not quite human, but effective: self-infrahumanization in people, who manipulate others

Małgorzata Gocłowska (University of Kent) & Mirosław Kofta (University of Warsaw)

We examined how an intentional act of exerting social influence, without partner's awareness (manipulation), changes the perception of self and the interaction partner.

The on-line study involved 90 volunteers recruited through a social network. Participants received an email asking for help in a study on pro-social behaviours: they were to log-in to an on-line chat-room and convince an unknown person to sign a petition letter. Control participants were to ask for a signature kindly; the experimental group ('intentional manipulators') received suggestions to use a 'social influence' technique relying on 'power of authority'. Following a carefully designed

script, the 'anonymous chat-room user' (confederate) always agreed to sign the petition. After the interaction, participants assessed the tendency to experience primary and secondary emotions in themselves and in the conversation partner.

A within-subjects ANOVA revealed that in the intentional manipulation condition participants inhumanized themselves, by ascribing more primary and less secondary emotions to self, than to their conversation partner. Proposed explanation of this intriguing finding: Manipulating others might be at odds with participant's moral standards. When people are led to commit an act violating their own standards of moral conduct, they are prone to moral disengagement. Inhumanizing themselves might be effective means of such disengagement, presumably resulting in reduced feelings of guilt and restoration of positive self-esteem.

The role of authoritarian orientations in terrorist perception

*Małgorzata Kossowska, Tomasz Kubik (Jagiellonian University),
Agnieszka Golec de Zavala (Middlesex University)*

Perhaps one of the most important questions one needs to answer in order to understand people's responses to terrorist threat, is the question of how people perceive terrorist, their characteristics and motivations. The way people cope with terrorist threat is likely to depend on their cognitive appraisal of the threat. Similarly, the decisions about collective actions against terrorism are made based on socially accepted representations of terrorists, their motives and characteristics. These perceptions, in turn, are likely to depend on people's broader worldviews and assumptions about the surrounding world.

In the proposed studies we attempt to identify the way students perceive Al Kaida terrorist. In addition, we examine how the emerging terrorist images are related to broader ideological orientations such as social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism. We expect that the different images people hold about Al Kaida terrorist will be related to their broader ideological orientations grounded in perception of the world as dangerous place or as competitive jungle.

Humanizing our flaws: People see their own imperfections as more human than the failings of others

Peter Koval & Nick Haslam (University of Melbourne)

Most research on dehumanization has located it within intergroup processes, and linked it to conflict, aggression and ethnocentrism (for a review see Haslam et al., 2007). Recently, a milder interpersonal variant, in which 'human nature' is attributed to the self more than to others, has been discovered (Haslam et al., 2005). The finding that this effect is stronger for undesirable than for desirable personality traits, created the main impetus for the present study. Participants (N=80) completed a questionnaire in which they selected 15 negatively valenced Big Five traits to describe themselves or an ingroup, rated themselves on the traits, and rated the traits on desirability, human nature, and several possible mediators of

self-humanizing (e.g., essentialism, prevalence, controllability). As predicted, participants selected traits rated high in human nature to describe themselves more than their ingroup, replicating the "self-humanizing" effect. Furthermore, human nature ratings predicted the degree to which negative traits were endorsed more strongly than and independently of all other factors (e.g., trait desirability, morality and controllability), indicating that human nature is an important dimension of social perception. Self-humanizing was found to be fully mediated by the rated essentialism, emotionality, and prevalence of the traits. In other words, participants attributed more human traits to the self because these traits were perceived to be deeply rooted in the personality, affective, and widespread in the population. This study also found evidence of self-projection, suggesting that people imposed their own imperfections onto their conception of human nature. Although strong causal inferences cannot be drawn from this correlational study, the findings suggest that self-humanizing may play a motivated role in mitigating people's personal failings. The tendency to 'humanize' one's own (but not others') imperfections may reflect a self-protective drive to make one's flaws seem less blameworthy.

Inhumanization through self-projection

Monika Miroslawska & Mirosław Kofta (University of Warsaw)

People tend to inhumanize outgroups, as demonstrated by more intense ascription of secondary (specifically human) emotions to ingroup than outgroup members (e.g., Leyens et al., 2000; 2003). In our study we examined the role of self-projection mechanism in inhumanization.

At the first meeting high-school participants ascribed personality traits (positive and negative) and emotions (positive and negative, each set including primary and secondary emotions) to the self. At the second meeting, in the minimal group paradigm (using a modified Kandinsky-Klee schema), participants made the same ascriptions, this time to the minimal ingroup and outgroup. In line with the self-projection approach, (1) ascription of emotions and traits to the self was highly correlated with ascription of emotions and traits to the ingroup but not outgroup, (2) participants attributing to the self more secondary than primary emotions inhumanized outgroups, whereas participants attributing to the self more primary than secondary emotions, did the reverse (humanized outgroups).

In conclusion, to the extent that secondary emotions dominate over primary emotions in the representation of the self, projection of own emotions on ingroup might account for the humanization of ingroup and inhumanization of outgroups. However, when primary emotions dominate over secondary emotions in the self image – the opposite effect occurs and projection of own emotions on ingroup results in inhumanization of ingroup and humanization of outgroup.

The inhumanization of objectified women: Why would women do it?

Elisa Puvia & Jeroen Vaes (University of Padova)

In the present research whether and why male and female participants inhumanize objectified women was explored. Two studies measured the spontaneous associations of both male and female participants between uniquely human versus animal related words and publicity photos depicting men versus women. The publicity photos were selected so that half of them depicted a man or a woman in a pre-tested "objectified" fashion, while the other half depicted a man or a woman in a comparatively more "personalized" way.

In the first study, a Single Target IAT (ST-IAT; Karpinsky & Steinman, 2006) was presented including either only male or only female pictures. In this study, results indicated that especially objectified women were associated less with human words than both objectified men and personalized women. Interestingly, this pattern of associations was observed for both male and female participants. While objectification theory would expect male participants to inhumanize objectified women, it is much less likely while women would do this. Likely, women subtype objectified women and depending on their identification with this subgroup inhumanize them. In Study 2 this hypothesis was tested. An identical ST-IAT was presented including only female pictures. Afterwards, participants were asked to judge, categorize and indicate their identification with the female publicity photos that appeared in the computer task before. Results indicated, as expected, that the more distant female participants felt from objectified women, the more they judged them as vulgar and superficial and the more they tended to inhumanize them.

Interestingly, this pattern was completely reversed for male participants: the closer (the more attracted) they felt towards objectified women, the more they inhumanized them.

Various reasons why males and females inhumanize objectified women are discussed.

Phenomenon of authoritarian reaction in the national group. The moderating role of ethnic threat

Piotr Radkiewicz (University of Warsaw)

The poster concerns a concept of group authoritarianism defined as the belief about the appropriate relationship between groups and their members. More specifically, it will refer to the research depicted by Stellmacher & Petzel (2005) showing the positive three-way interaction effect of RWA, group identification and social threat on group authoritarianism. The analyses depicted in this poster has been performed in order to check, whether such interaction might be also confirmed, when a national group is a reference category. It includes a claim that in certain cases (e.g., ethnic threat) a particular role of the social threat may be opposite to that hypothesized by Stellmacher & Petzel. The regression model has been performed on a data coming from a random sample of adult Poles. The model includes group authoritarianism (related to national group) as dependent variable, as well as RWA, national identification, threat, and interactions as predictors. The only difference was in respect to the measure of threat used in the model (ethnic threat). In general, the model revealed the same structure of main effects as Stellmacher & Petzel analyses, and substantial difference as for interaction effect. The three-way interaction turned out to be significant; however, the sign of the effect, contrary to expectations, was negative. Such reversed effect means that, in case of ethnic threat, instead of reinforcing impact of simultaneous high levels

of main predictors, one should rather expect weakest authoritarian reaction for most threatened individuals who are low on RWA and low on national identification.

The role of dehumanizing information in the perception of torture

Patrycja Slawuta, Bernhard Leidner & Emanuele Castano (New School for Social Research)

Investigating the role of dehumanization as one of the moral disengagement strategies, the experiment sheds light on how dehumanizing information shifts the subjective perception of the border between legitimate interrogation and torture.

An experiment was conducted exposing the participants to a description of torture committed by two Caucasian CIA agents on a Muslim suspect. The control and experimental condition differed in a way how the subject was portrayed to the participants of the study. In the control condition he was introduced as a regular American citizen, while in the experimental one in a dehumanizing way. The perception of what is considered as torture was measured as well as dehumanization of the victim, explanatory factors, self-reported emotional distress and general proneness to empathize.

Morally disengaging role of dehumanizing message about outgroup member was confirmed. Participants in the experimental condition showed less self-reported distress about what they saw as well as perceived the victim as less human (inhumanization) than in the control condition. Moreover, in the experimental condition the victim was seen as more responsible for what was happening to him, as well as the violent acts committed by federal agents were less frequently considered to be torture. Therefore, a shift in what is considered torture was observed.

These findings support the concept that initial dehumanizing information about an outgroup member influences how information about him and what is being done to him is being perceived by people.

The implications for media and their impact on intergroup processes are being discussed.

"Cold" and "competent" - Stereotype of Jew in Poland and the history of the intergroup relations

Mikolaj Winiewski (University of Warsaw).

Stereotypes are in area of interest of social sciences from almost eighty years. Early studies concentrated on persistence and stability of stereotype content. From seventies and "cognitive" revolution in social psychology studies become more focused on mechanisms of creating and activation of stereotypes. After almost seventy years from publishing Katz and Barly's (1933) work Fiske, Xu, Cuddy and Glick (1999) returned to interest in stereotype content proposing model based on two dimensions - warmth and competence. From one side this approach gives opportunity to compare stereotype content in perception of many different groups and from the other hand gives hint in understanding ambivalent traits attached to several groups.

Presented study is based on data from 3 national surveys conducted on representative samples (December 2004 - N=891, February 2007 - N=931, March 2007 - N=948). We asked open ended question about traits of typical Germans, Poles, Russians, Vietnamese and Jews. Then data was merged in to one corpus (3 surveys, 5 nationalities) and coded into semantic categories (N=215). This material was presented to judges (N=20) to assess competence and warmth ascribed to every term. Then data from surveys was recoded according to judges assessment.

Results show that SCM is good guideline to explain polish attitudes toward Jews. Analysis of demographic and geographic data shows that some historical issues like, after WW II territorial changes and connected to it migrations or before WW II political differences in different polish cities. Some results in specific territories can be explained by several socio-historical facts from 19th and 20th century.

Soldiers (b)log in Iraq! The infra-humanization of the out-group in natural language.

Adrian Wójcik & Justyna Ziemia (University of Warsaw)

Most of the research made so far on dehumanization processes were conducted in experimental design. That allowed to identify main functional and situational factors that underlie and determine the dehumanization occurrences. However, hitherto studies omitted the problem how the dehumanization processes occur in real-life. The history of last century can provide more than sufficient evidence of real-life dehumanisation processes' examples. Still the link between the socio-psychological insights into the nature of dehumanization and the mass social processes remains unclear. The presented analysis attempts to use the theoretical insights of social

psychology in order to analyse the real-life context of intergroup contact.

The presented study is based on analysis of the weblogs of American soldiers deployed in Iraq (N=400). All texts were analysed using Atlas.ti software suite in order to identify the co-occurrence between the words denoting the in-group (America, Americans, us etc.)/out-group (Iraq, Iraqis etc.) and the words denoting the secondary and the primary emotions.

Bridging social capital and intergroup relations

Katarzyna Growiec (Graduate School for Social Research, Polish Academy of Sciences) & Mirosław Kofta (University of Warsaw)

The notion of social capital refers to resources embedded in social networks and accessed and used by actors for actions. Putnam (2000) proposed that social capital is heterogenous in nature and includes: bridging capital (social ties with people in a different socio-economic position) and bonding capital (ties with people in a similar socio-economic position and close to us). Putnam hypothesized that it is bridging social capital which is specifically responsible for the development of positive intergroup relations.

The study had two major purposes: methodological (development of a reliable measure of bridging capital, so far nonexistent), and theoretical: (1) testing Putnam's hypothesis about the positive effect of bridging social capital on intergroup relations, and (2) examining the relationships between bridging social capital and generalized interpersonal trust in determining intergroup relations.

In line with Putnam's expectations, we found that bridging capital (1) made general attitudes toward other nations more positive (in a survey study, on measures of liking, trust, and similarity), and (2) interfered with ingroup bias (in experiment, on measures of Polish vs. Russian doctor' responsibility for patient's sudden death). Also interpersonal trust capital appeared to predict positive intergroup attitudes (only on survey, not experiment, however). Moderation analysis revealed interaction of predictors suggesting that they operate in "either-or manner": positive intergroup attitudes are either grounded in bridging capital (a tendency to transcend social barriers between groups) or in generalized trust in people (a tendency to assume the other persons' good will, or positive intentions).

List of participants

Albarelo Flavia (University of Bologna),
flavia.albarelo@unibo.it

Andrighetto Luca (University of Padova),
luca.andrighetto@unipd.it

Bain Paul (Murdoch University), p.bain@murdoch.edu.au

Baran Tomasz (University of Warsaw),
tomasz.baran@psych.uw.edu.pl

Bernhard Leidner (New School),
Leidnb82@newschool.edu

Bilewicz Michał (University of Warsaw / Maria
Grzegorzewska Academy of Special Education),
bilewicz@psych.uw.edu.pl

Boccatto Giulio (University of Padova),
giulio.boccatto@alice.it

Brock Bastian (University of Melbourne),
bbastian@unimelb.edu.au

Bukowski Marcin (Jagiellonian University)

Capozza Dora (University of Padova),
dora.capozza@unipd.it

Castano Emanuele (New School)
castanoe@newschool.edu

Cehajic Sabina (Sarajevo School of Science and
Technology), sabina.cehajic@ssst.edu.ba

Chiara Storari (Catholic University of Louvain-la-Neuve),
Chiara.storari@unil.ch

Cislak Aleksandra (Warsaw School of Social Psychology /
Institute of Psychology PAN), acislak@swps.edu.pl

Collange Julie (Universite Paris Descartes),
julie.collange@univ-paris5.fr

de Lemus Martín Soledad (UNIVERSIDAD DE GRANADA)
slemus@ugr.es

Eberhardt Jenifer (Stanford University),
jleberhardt@stanford.edu

Eyssel Friederike (Bielefeld University), feysel@uni-bielefeld.de

Gocłowska Malgorzata (University of Kent at Canterbury),
mg242@kent.ac.uk

Goff Philip (Pennsylvania State University),
philgoff@psu.edu

Growiec Katarzyna (Polish Academy of Sciences),
kgrowiec@sns.waw.pl

Haslam Nick (University of Melbourne),
nhaslam@unimelb.edu.au

Kofta Mirosław (University of Warsaw)
kofta@psych.uw.edu.pl

Kossowska Małgorzata (Jagiellonian University),
malgosia@apple.phils.uj.edu.pl

Koval Peter (University of Melbourne),
p.koval@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au

Krebeck Aurore (Australian National University),
Aurore.Krebeck@anu.edu.au

Leyens Jacques Philippe (Catholic University of Louvain-la-
Neuve) Jacques-Philippe.Leyens@uclouvain.be

Loughnan Stephen (University of Melbourne),
lost@unimelb.edu.au

Marcu Afrodita (University of Surrey),
A.Marcu@surrey.ac.uk

Miranda Mariana (ISPA Lisbon), mmiranda@ispa.pt

Mirosławska Monika (University of Warsaw),
mmirosła@psych.uw.edu.pl

Opotow Susan (City University of New York),
sopotow@jjay.cuny.edu

Pietrzak Jasia (University of Warsaw),
jasia@psych.uw.edu.pl

Puvia Elisa (University of Padova), elisa.puvia@unipd.it

Pyszczynski Tom (University of Colorado at Colorado
Springs), tpyszczynski@uccs.edu

Shantal Marshall (Stanford University),
shantal@stanford.edu

Slawuta Patrycja (New School),
slawp642@newschool.edu

Vaes Jeroen (University of Padova), jeroen.vaes@unipd.it

Viki Tendayi (University of Kent, Canterbury)
g.t.viki@kent.ac.uk

Winiewski Mikołaj (University of Warsaw),
mikk@psych.uw.edu.pl

Wójcik Adrian (University of Warsaw),
awojcik@uw.edu.pl

Zimmermann Anja (University of Cardiff/University of
Amsterdam), a.e.m.zimmermann@uva.nl

Index of Names

Abdollahi.....	7
Albarelo.....	5, 11
Andrighetto.....	10
Bain.....	4
Baran.....	10
Bastian.....	7
Bilewicz.....	13
Błogowska.....	10
Boccatto.....	10
Brown.....	8
Bukowski.....	13
Capozza.....	10
Castano.....	8, 9, 15
Cehajic.....	8
Chiara.....	5
Cislak.....	11
Collange.....	9
de Lemus Martin.....	13
Demoulin.....	9
Denson.....	11
Doosje.....	7
Eberhardt.....	12
Eyssel.....	11
Falvo.....	10
Gocłowska.....	13
Goff.....	11
Golec de Zavala.....	14
Gonzalez.....	8
Gouveia-Pereira.....	9
Growiec.....	16
Haslam.....	4, 7, 12, 14
Hegarty.....	11
Kofta.....	9, 10, 13, 14, 16
Kossowska.....	13, 14
Koval.....	14
Krebeck.....	6
Kubik.....	14
Laham.....	7
Leidner.....	8, 9, 15
Leyens.....	9, 12
Loughnan.....	4
Lupiañez Castillo.....	13

Lyons.....	11
Marcu.....	11
Marshall.....	12
Miranda.....	9
Mirosławska.....	10, 14
Moya Morales.....	13
Opotow.....	7
Paladino.....	5
Platow.....	6
Puvia.....	14
Pyszczynski.....	7
Radkiewicz.....	15
Rubini.....	5
Sławuta.....	8, 9, 15
Spears.....	13
Vaes.....	5, 14
Viki.....	7, 12
Wilson.....	7
Winiewski.....	15
Wójcik.....	16
Zebel.....	7
Ziomba.....	16
Zimmermann.....	7, 12