PROGRAM

► Before 02.00 PM: Informal get-together and lunch

Opening and Welcome

John Rauthmann (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin) & David Funder (University of California, Riverside)

► 02.00 – 03.30 PM

We warmly welcome the participants of this EAPP expert meeting on "Situations and Person x Situation Interactions" and wish us all a stimulating, lively, and productive time. We discuss several organizational and substantial issues of the meeting, including schedules, topics, and agenda. First, we give an overview of the schedule, structure, time management, and logistics of the meeting. Second, we briefly introduce the three key topics of the meeting: (1) definition and conceptualization of situations, (2) measurement and taxonomization of situations, and (3) person x situation interactions. Fourth, we outline the general and specific aims and scope of the meeting. This will also include planning ahead on specific and concrete outcomes of the meeting (e.g., a target article in the *European Journal of Personality*, chapters in the planned handbook on psychological situations, future symposia and meetings, a website, etc.).

► 03.30 – 04.00 PM: Coffee Break & Snacks

Situations as obstacles and opportunities for goal achievement

Ryne Sherman (Florida Atlantic University, USA)

► 04.00 – 04.40 PM

Why do situations exist? What is the functional role of situations? Borrowing from prior work, I suggest that situations consist of both components and characteristics (see Rauthmann et al., in prep). Components include the physical/biological properties of the environment (e.g., number of people, amount of light) while characteristics include the psychological interpretation of these components into meaningful socio-cultural factors such as rules, laws, norms, expectations, and threats. As such, behavior can be seen as functionally adaptive strategies to goal attainment stemming from appraisals of (a) one's own abilities, motives, and perceptions and (b) the obstacles and opportunities to goal achievement presented by the situation (Gibson, 1979; Neuberg, Kenrick, & Schaller, 2009). Using games as an analog for real-world situations, I discuss how goals, situation characteristics, and abilities work in combination to explain both nomothetic and ideographic behavior. Finally, real-world characteristics of situations are examined in terms of the obstacles and opportunities for goal achievement that they provide.

What can personality psychologists add to the study of situations?
Characterizing situations in terms of their influences on Big 5 traits

Will Fleeson (Wake Forest University, USA)

► 04.40 – 05.20 PM

The question addressed by this talk is "How should we define and structure situations?" Social psychology has made great progress in discovering countless ways to characterize situations – our focus in this talk is on what personality psychologists can offer to this broad question about situations. We argue that what personality psychologists can offer is characterizing situations in terms of their influences on Big 5 traits. That is, we should start with traits and work backwards to situations. The reason for this proposal is that personality psychologists are experts on the Big 5, and that personality psychologists have good evidence that the main ways in which individual differences in social behaviors are organized is in terms of the Big 5. If we want to study situations as impacts on main aspects of social behavior, then we should study situations as impacts on the Big 5. Not only would this lead to progress in characterizing situations, it also will inform personality researchers about the mechanisms underlying traits, thereby advancing the field in two important ways at once. We present results of studies demonstrating that situations do predict Big 5 manifestations and showing the ways that situations would be characterized in this approach.

► 05.20 – 05.40 PM: Coffee Break & Snacks

Persons as situations
Jens Asendorpf (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

► 05.40 – 06.20 PM

I focus on three key questions of the psychology of situations in the special case where a situation is defined by the personality of a (potential) interaction partner. First, any taxonomy of personality can be viewed as a taxonomy of situations. This recognition provides a special twist to lexically derived personality taxonomies as they mainly originate from perceptions of others' personality, thus, from perceptions of situations. Second, in this special case statistical person - situation interactions become person - person interactions which are discussed from a Social Relations Model perspective. Third, dynamic personality - environment transactions become personality - personality transactions which are discussed from a developmental perspective on social relationships. Some implications for the psychology of situations are highlighted.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: How can/should we define and conceptualize situations?

► 06.20 – 07.00 PM

This general discussion round among all participants of the expert meeting is devoted to such fundamental questions of: What is a situation? What is not a situation? How can or should we define and conceptualize situations? Which situational information is important for personality and social psychologists? How can we further refine our thinking of situations?

► 07.00 – 08.00 PM: Free time

► **08.00 PM – Open: Expert meeting dinner**

SATURDAY (August 24)

Some things you can do with the RSQ
David Funder (University of California, Riverside)

► 09.00 – 09.40 AM

Personality psychology has a long history of conceptualizing and measuring individual differences in personality traits, and using those measurements to predict and understand behavior. However, behavior also depends on the situations that people encounter, and until recently very little has been done to conceptualize or measure situations. The purpose of our research is to develop and use a new method for measuring the psychologically relevant attributes of situations, the Riverside Situational Q-sort (RSQ). My talk will seek to illustrate the usefulness of this instrument for situational assessment via three examples. First, a study of behavioral consistency found that people are more behaviorally consistent across situations that are similar; people encounter situations that are more similar to each other than they are to situations encountered by other people; people are consistent in their behavior over and above this situational similarity; people who manifest more behavioral consistency across situations tend to be psychologically better adjusted (Sherman, Nave & Funder, 2010, 2012). A second illustration will show how situational assessment can illuminate implications of needs identified by evolutionary psychology. Finally, I will briefly describe The International Situations Project, in which individuals in different cultures use the RSQ to describe a situation they experienced the previous day, along with their behavior in it. The project allows assessment of the degree to which people in different cultures experience the same or different situations on a daily basis, how they behave in those situations, and the ways in which situations are connected to behavior in different cultures.

The Situational Big Eight "DIAMONDS": Taxonomizing major dimensions of situation characteristics
John Rauthmann (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin) et al.

► 09.40 – 10.20 AM

Taxonomies for describing persons and their characteristics are well developed, while taxonomies for describing situations and their characteristics are scarce. After a review of situation taxonomy literature, we examine how people describe situations along key dimensions using the Riverside Situational Q-Sort (RSQ). We demonstrate that there are eight major, meaningful, important, and consequential dimensions of situation characteristics, the Situational Big Eight with the acronym "DIAMONDS": Duty, Intellect, Adversity, Mating, pOsitivity, Negativity, Deception, and Sociality. We examine agreement between different judges in these dimensions as well as their situational and behavioral correlates. We discuss the significance of the Big Eight, provide the RSQ-B8 as a short form of the RSQ tailored to the Big Eight, and sketch future lines of research with a Big Eight framework.

Filling the situational vacuum – A taxonomy capturing important interindividual differences in situation perception

Matthias Ziegler (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)

► 10.40 – 11.20 AM

Theories such as the Trait-Activation-Theory or Interactionism describe the complex interplay between person and situation characteristics for the expression of human behavior. Nevertheless, only few psychometrically well tested instruments exist to actually measure interindividual differences in situation perception. The present research project was two-fold. In a first series of qualitative and quantitative studies a hierarchical taxonomy describing major interindividual differences in situation perception was developed. To this end 216 semi-structured interviews using the critical incident technique were conducted. Additionally a lexical study was performed applying exploratory and con-firmatory factor analyses. The resulting taxonomy comprises two higher order factors and five facets. These facets were crossed with 52 Big 5 facets and items filling the cells of this rhombus were constructed based on interviews with human resource managers. The resulting questionnaire was tested in a student as well as a general population sample and allows the computation of individual test scores for personality and situation perception.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: How can/should we measure and taxonomize situations?

► 11.20 AM – 12.00 PM

This general discussion round among all participants of the expert meeting is devoted to questions such as: Which kinds of situational information can and should we measure? Which ways are the best of measuring them? Once they are measured, how can and should we derive taxonomies? What kinds of taxonomies will be most useful to personality and social psychology? How should those taxonomies look like?

► 12.00 – 02.00 PM: Expert meeting lunch

On P = f (S, B)

Yu Yang (China Europe International Business School in Shanghai, China)

► 02.00 – 02.40 PM

This talk will consider the conjecture P = f (S, B) in the context of empirically clarifying the key ingredients of person-ality traits, and connecting the trait and social cognitive perspectives on personality.

Who goes where?

Wendy Johnson (The University of Edinburgh, UK)

► 02.40 – 03.20 PM

What situations people encounter is generally far from random. People do a lot to seek out some situations and avoid others, and they tend to be quite but never completely successful. The personality characteristics and cognitive skills they use to do this are both genetically influenced and related to the characteristics and cognitive skills they use in responding to the situations they actually encounter. This needs to be taken into consideration in understanding per-son-situation transactions.

Virtual Milgram: Taking the opportunity to standardize the situation and explore individual differences from a person-environment transactions perspective

David Gallardo-Pujol & Macià Buades-Rotger (Universitat de Barcelona, Spain)

► 03.40 – 04.20 PM

Situational forces have gone down in the history of psychology to be powerful enough to make individual differences indistinguishable. However, not everyone submits to strong situational forces. The purpose of this talk is to claim that individual differences play an important role in obedience to authority and social conformity, a situation that has been repeatedly put forward to exemplify the power of the situation. Drawing from a comprehensive literature search, we found several individual differences that may explain why not everyone behaved the same way in Milgram's experiment or in Asch's social conformity study. Just to cite few, authoritarianism, assertiveness, locus of control, compliance, stability, plasticity, trustfulness, empathic concern or hostility are among theses explanatory variables. Additionally, we performed a virtual reprise of Milgram's experiment while we collected data on several individual differences. In so doing, we overcome ethical limitations using new tools such as virtual reality Research so far, though, relied on partial approaches and direct replication is not possible nowadays due to ethical limitations. Our results explicitly support some anecdotic findings that Milgram pointed out. More specifically, we found intelligence to be a consistent negative predictor of the number of shocks delivered over the experiment. Implications of this research will be discussed in the talk.

Developing a general model of nonlinear person x situation interaction
Manfred Schmitt & Gabriela Blum (Universität Koblenz-Landau, Germany)

► 04.20 – 05.00 PM

After an overview of previous person x situation interaction research, synergistic effects of functionally equivalent person and situation factors as well as person x situation interactions as moderators will be emphasized. Subsequently, the Nonlinear Interaction of Person and Situation (NIPS) Model (Schmitt et al, in press) will be introduced. This general model can be applicable to many traits and situations and can be linked to various trait and situation theories.

► 05.00 – 05.20 PM: Coffee Break & Snacks

How person-environment fit may be central in what we know about personality
René Mõttus (The University of Edinburgh, UK)

► 05.20 – 06.00 PM

When certain behaviours, thoughts and feelings co-vary, this is usually taken as evidence for there being hidden but causal properties of human mind that drive these variables and their covariance (latent traits). Recently, an alternative explanation was offered: the co-variations may result from direct (causal) relations between what are usually seen as mere indicators of latent traits. In this view, some behaviours, thoughts and feelings co-exist because they belong to the same causal network of intra-individual processes rather than being just reflections of latent traits. The present study offers one possible framework for parametrizing the emergence and stabilizing of such networks. The framework is based on three key principles: people strive for fluctuating equilibria between their characteristics and environments (person-environment fit), this is achieved via different person-environment transactions and there being both reinforcing and inhibiting connections between the network elements. The study uses a simulation design to show that such networks are capable of explaining some of the recurrent findings of personality psychology, including the five-factor model of inter-individual differences that emerges from a less saturated model and is replicable across independent samples of simulated individuals, correlations between trait-scores based on different samples of trait-indicators, high rank-order stability on the background of some intra-individual variability, and environment-triggered personality change. To the extent that some commonly observed findings may not necessarily refer to the existence of latent personality traits, the findings have implications for understanding the nature, causes and consequences of personality.

GENERAL DISCUSSION: How can/should we study person x situation interactions?

► 06.20 – 07.00 PM

This general discussion round among all participants of the expert meeting is devoted to questions such as: How can and should person x situation interactions or person-environment be studied? Which theoretical perspectives and conceptual horizons are best? Can we land at a synthetic and integrated framework for the study of persons, situations, and behavior? How would such a framework look like? How can personality and social psychology benefit in concrete ways from such a framework? How could future research look like, or which future research is needed?

► 07.00 – 08.00 PM: Free time

► **08.00 PM – Open: Boat trip with expert meeting dinner on boat**

SUNDAY (August 25)

Reflection, discussion, and farewell

► 09.00 AM – 12.00 PM

We recapitulate and reflect on the themes, topics, and outcomes of the meeting; discuss and plan future (joint) theoretical/conceptual and empirical research endeavors; and have enough room for further questions and discussions.

► 12.00 PM – Open: Lunch and sight-seeing in Berlin