

History of the Human Sciences

<http://hhs.sagepub.com/>

An evaluation of the impact of the European Association of Social Psychology : A response to Schruijer (2012)

Miles Hewstone, Karmela Liebkind, Maria Lewicka, János László, Alberto Voci, Alberta Contarello, Ángel Gómez, Alexandra Hantzi, Michal Bilewicz, Ana Guinote, Sylvie Graf and Kristina Petkova

History of the Human Sciences 2012 25: 117

DOI: 10.1177/0952695111434464

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://hhs.sagepub.com/content/25/3/117>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *History of the Human Sciences* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://hhs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://hhs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://hhs.sagepub.com/content/25/3/117.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Jul 5, 2012

[What is This?](#)

An evaluation of the impact of the European Association of Social Psychology: A response to Schruijer (2012)

History of the Human Sciences

25(3) 117–126

© The Author(s) 2012

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0952695111434464

hhs.sagepub.com



Miles Hewstone

University of Oxford, UK

Karmela Liebkind

University of Helsinki, Finland

Maria Lewicka

University of Warsaw, Poland

János László

Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary

Alberto Voci and Alberta Contarello

University of Padua, Italy

Ángel Gómez

Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Spain

Alexandra Hantzi

Panteion University, Greece

Michał Bilewicz

University of Warsaw, Poland

Corresponding author:

Miles Hewstone, Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3UD, UK

Email: miles.hewstone@psy.ox.ac.uk

Ana Guinote

University College London, UK

Sylvie Graf

Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic

Kristina Petkova

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria

There is a well-known joke about a tourist in Ireland who, unable to find his location, pulls over and asks a local farmer the way. The farmer studies the map for some time with an increasingly furrowed brow before eventually looking up and saying, 'Well if I were you, I wouldn't start from here!' We feel the same way about Sandra Schruijer's commendable and fascinating attempt to evaluate the impact of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology: 'Whatever happened to the "European" in European social psychology? A study of the ambitions in founding the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology'.

She has raised important questions in her provocative article; and we are grateful to her for opening up a debate concerning the achievements, and possible shortcomings, of the association, and for grasping the opportunity to interview some of the key players involved in its founding in 1967 (surprisingly only one year after its North American counterpart, the Society for Experimental Social Psychology). In effect, she is attempting, as a social psychologist should, to evaluate a social intervention: what impact(s) did the founding of the European Association of Social Psychology (EASP)¹ have? But a good social psychologist, using the methodological tools of his or her discipline, would first begin with appropriate research questions, such as 'What research design to use for this evaluation?' and 'What should the outcome variables be?' We submit that, notwithstanding the merits of her article, she has of necessity used a limited research design, but has aggravated this decision by failing to consider performance at baseline more critically and by choosing limited, even flawed, outcome measures. On this basis we are led to question the rather negative conclusions of her evaluation.

What is an appropriate research design for such an evaluation?

Schruijer has, in effect, used what is called a 'one-shot case study' (see Cook and Campbell, 1979). What conclusions can be drawn from such a design? Strictly speaking, the answer is *none* (although it can generate interesting hypotheses); the point is that there is nothing with which the measured outcomes can be compared, so the researcher cannot infer whether the intervention was effective, was ineffective, or had no impact whatsoever. In short, although we cannot provide a complete answer, because we lack a control group, we have to try to answer the question, *What would the state of social psychology be across Europe today if the EASP had not existed?*

What the researcher can do, however, and Schruijer attempts just this, is to track change over time since the intervention, and see whether *it appears as though* it has had

an impact. She does this, primarily, by looking at the proportion of articles published in the *European Journal of Social Psychology (EJSP)* whose authors come from various countries, and how this compares with the proportion of EASP members from these countries. There is, of course, no control group in this design, but we can still look at various aspects of the 'data' (e.g. a wider range of impacts than publications in a single journal), as we do below. On this basis we suggest that the impact of EASP has been highly significant, and hugely successful. The key, we argue, as in any good evaluation study, is to use multiple criteria by which to evaluate the intervention.

What are appropriate outcome variables for such an evaluation?

Schruijer considers the type of research that has been conducted by members of EASP, and the output from individual countries (or groups of countries) that has been published in the *EJSP*. We shall deal, briefly, with the type of research, and focus instead on output and on additional candidates for outcome variables, when evaluating the impact of EASP.

The type of research conducted by European social psychologists

We do not challenge Schruijer's conclusion that the vast majority (she reports it as 80%) of papers in the *EJSP* 'concern student samples and laboratory experiments', which is somewhat at variance with some of the more iconoclastic ideas voiced at the time the EASP was founded about how we should do social psychological research (this same trend is found in all leading journals in this field; see Carlson, 1984; Sears, 1986). We note, however, that when Henri Tajfel wrote of the kind of 'European dimension' that the founding fathers of EASP had in mind he argued that: 'social psychology *can* and *must* include in its theoretical and research preoccupations a direct concern with the relationship between human psychological functioning and the large-scale social processes and events which shape this functioning and are shaped by it' (1981: 7). He did not, however, argue on principle *against* either student samples or laboratory experiments.

Indeed, the two most salient examples of European ideas influencing social psychology in the United States are research on intergroup behaviour, conducted in Bristol (e.g. Tajfel, Billig, Bundy and Flament, 1971), and on minority influence, conducted in Paris (e.g. Moscovici, Lage and Naffrechoux, 1969). Both offer relatively easy and economical procedures for the study of intergroup behaviour and group processes, respectively, in the laboratory, and both paradigms have primarily made use of undergraduate participants. But the theoretical focus of both Tajfel and Moscovici, and many who have continued research in these areas, was and still mostly is true to the original aims that theory and research in European social psychology should devote substantial attention to the social context of its phenomena (Hewstone and Stroebe, 2009).

Research output of European social psychologists

Schruijer presents data showing that, from 1971 to 2009, there have been significant changes in the nationality profile of papers published in the *EJSP*. Among European authors, it is dominated by Dutch, British, and, to a less extent, German authors, even if there has been a decline over time in both British and German authors. More worrying to Schruijer is that papers by North Americans have increased, while those by French authors have decreased, and that the authorship of *EJSP* articles fails to reflect the breadth of Europe (notably its Mediterranean and Scandinavian members). These are interesting observations, to which we make several responses.

(1) *'Don't neglect the base rate'*. A generation of social psychologists brought up on Tversky and Kahneman's (e.g. 1973) work on cognitive heuristics in judgement and decision-making has learned to ask about base rates before interpreting statistics. Schruijer is careful to give us not only the percentage of papers published in *EJSP* by scholars of different nationality, but also the percentage of each nationality among EASP members. This allows her to point out that (using her most recent figures, for 2007–9) North Americans are over-represented in the pages of *EJSP* (25%) compared with their membership of EASP (7%), while in several categories authors of specific nationalities or geographical areas are under-represented (notably France, and the groupings of the 'Mediterranean' countries of 'Italy + Spain + Portugal + Greece', and the 'Former Eastern European countries'). In contrast, several countries publish at about the rate of their membership (the UK, the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, and the Scandinavian category of 'Finland + Norway + Denmark + Sweden').

Another base rate, however, is neglected; Schruijer does not report the percentage of *submissions* from each country. If you want to publish in *EJSP*, then you have to submit in the first place. Or, before we argue that 'the original intellectual and ideological ambitions regarding the strengthening of a European social psychology are barely reflected in EASP's ... publication practices' (Schruijer, this issue, p. 89), we need more, and better, data. It is apparent from data seen by the first author that submission rates to *EJSP* do vary significantly between countries. Thus, for example, US authors account for 18.75% of all submissions, and rates are correspondingly high for other countries whose authors are well represented among *EJSP* authors (the Netherlands: 10.50%; Germany: 9.09%; the UK: 12.18%). In contrast, countries that appear to be under-represented among *EJSP* authors are also under-represented in submissions data (France: 4.78%; Italy: 3.84%; Spain: 2.63%; Portugal: 1.75%; and Greece: 0.67%).² Thus, multiple processes may drive the outcome data on papers published in *EJSP*, and some of these may operate at the national level rather than within the policies of EASP. We do not, here, mean to identify exclusively authors in these countries, but also the professional organizations in those countries who should do more to promote and encourage publication in *EJSP* and similar journals.

It is not, however, a simple matter of being brave enough to submit to what is sometimes a brutal business. Some countries and regions (e.g. the Netherlands, Germany, Scandinavia) tend to have better second-language skills in English than others (e.g. France

and Mediterranean countries). The EASP could fulfil its mission and raise its impact by establishing bursaries for leading young scholars from the under-represented countries to spend time working in English-speaking countries, and by organizing national-level workshops on scientific writing in English. Yet, language proficiency is not the whole explanation, because Scandinavian social psychology is not well established (see below).

There is a final reason why some scholars may not be submitting to *EJSP*: it is neither the only nor the best journal in the field, and, quite contrary to Schruijer's thesis that the EASP has not fulfilled its founders' aims, increasingly some of Europe's leading scholars are 'going for gold' and seeking to publish their work in the best outlets, those with the highest impact factors, which, as Schruijer notes, are American. This may be a sensible strategy for other reasons too, since a 1982 survey of members of the (North American) Society for Experimental Social Psychology revealed that 33% and 43%, respectively, admitted that they never read the *European* or *British* journals of social psychology (Lewicki, 1982).

(2) *Is publishing in EJSP the non plus ultra for outstanding European scholars?* One way of looking at the founding of the *EJSP*, although we ourselves would not subscribe to this view, is that European social psychologists had to invent a journal in which they could publish their papers. Schruijer notes that early meetings between North Americans and Europeans were somewhat sensitive encounters with, in some cases, the former teaching the latter, and the latter feeling or being made to feel inferior to the former. Interestingly, Schruijer characterizes the *EJSP* as a 'flourishing journal that ranks 13th out of 50 social psychology journals' (this issue, p. 98), but its impact factor (IF) is still rather modest (1.59). What a resounding success it is, then, nearly 50 years later to note, compared with earlier periods, how many Europeans publish in leading North American journals, not just the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* (*JESP*; IF: 2.20) (for which Schruijer also reports publication trends by nationality of authors), but also the flagship *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (IF: 5.21), and *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (IF: 2.52), all of which have IFs that greatly exceed that of *EJSP* and are likely to have greater impact on granting foundations, appointment committees and promotion boards. Those facts are not restricted to North American journals either; within Europe, for example, the *British Journal of Social Psychology* (IF: 2.06) has a higher impact factor than the *EJSP*.

Are Europeans publishing in these journals? Yes. Schruijer's own analysis notes that while North Americans have, over time, published increasingly more in the *EJSP*, Europeans have published more in *JESP* (from 0% in 1971 to 27.5% in 2007), but she fails to highlight the implication of this change. She notes that 'Europeans are internationally active and publish in American journals' (this issue p. 101), but she chooses to argue that such participation is 'from a very constricted Europe'. Is this true, when a wider variety of journals is considered?

As an example, take the names of some of the leading figures from Poland (e.g. A. Nowak, B. Wojciszke; J. Karylowski); all have published in these journals. Likewise, one could provide names from Italy (e.g. L. Arcuri, L. Castelli), Spain (e.g. C. Huici, P. Brinol, J. F. Morales), Portugal (e.g. L. Garcia-Marques, J. Marques, M. L. Lima), Greece (e.g. G. Abakoumkin), Finland (e.g. I. Jasinskaja-Lahti), and so on (this list of authors is not exhaustive). It might be countered that some, if not many, of these

Table 1. Number of papers with Italian authors published in different journals from 1970s to 2011.

	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000–5	2006–11	TOTAL	<2000	>2000
<i>EJSP</i>	0	7	14	13	30	64	21	43
<i>BJSP</i>	0	2	5	6	8	21	7	14
<i>GPIR</i>	0	0	0	5	13	18	0	18
<i>PSPB</i>	0	0	0	5	10	15	0	15
<i>JPSP</i>	1	1	5	11	10	28	7	21
<i>JESP</i>	0	0	1	2	14	17	1	16
<i>SPQ</i>	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	2
<i>JASP</i>	0	2	2	7	12	23	4	19
<i>JC&ASP</i>	0	0	5	15	17	37	5	32
TOTAL	1	12	32	65	115	225	45	180

Note: *BJSP*, *British Journal of Social Psychology*; *GPIR*, *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*; *PSPB*, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*; *JPSP*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*; *JESP*, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*; *SPQ*, *Social Psychology Quarterly*; *JASP*, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*; *JC&ASP*, *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*.

articles were published with senior scholars from elsewhere, including the United States. We do not believe that this detracts from the achievement, and might reflect a form of mentoring that should be recommended. We provide further data for the case of Italy in Table 1, giving the number of papers with Italian authors published in nine leading journals and grouped by decade from the 1970s to the 1990s, then for two 5-year periods, and then broken down into pre- and post-2000. Although the table shows that *EJSP* was and is the favoured international journal for Italian social psychologists, supporting Schrujijer's decision to focus on it, three other pertinent facts are evident from these data: (1) publication by Italians in *EJSP* has risen notably over the years (even taking into account an increase in the number of papers it publishes annually); (2) to focus on *EJSP* misrepresents the quantity and quality of Italian social psychology; indeed it accounts for only 64 of 225 articles by these scholars in this period; (3) notwithstanding the fact that Italians have published most of their articles in *EJSP* (64), they have published almost as many (60) in the top three US journals (*JPSP*, *PSPB*, *JESP*), including 28 in the leading journal in the field (*JPSP*). We think that if you had proposed this as a goal to the founders of EASP in 1967, they might have suggested you were being a trifle ambitious. At the same time we note, however, that scholars from other European countries are not, or very rarely, publishing in these US journals, so this is not meant to be a full explanation. Italy, in particular, seems to have come further, and faster, and we should analyse and learn from its success (e.g. its policy of sending PhD students abroad for an extended period of research experience could be adopted more widely).

(3) *Be careful in collapsing countries into regional groupings – there are sometimes substantial within-category differences.* Because of the difficulty of such an evaluation, Schrujijer's analysis might, unwittingly, underestimate the real progress that has been made in some countries by collapsing them with other 'weaker' countries. For example, she collapses four South Mediterranean countries – Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece – and yet, as we

have seen, they vary dramatically in their submission rates to *EJSP*. Moreover, as we have noted above, there have been impressive developments in Italy, especially, and several scholars have made notable contributions from Spain and Portugal, but the situations are not directly comparable in these countries. In Spain, for example, experimental social psychology (which, as Schruijer notes, tends to be represented in the leading journals) is a minority affair. At most 20% of social psychologists active in Spain work in the experimental tradition, and these include very few senior professors.

In Greece, the situation is different again. The first psychology (single-subject, honours) degree was awarded only as recently as 1991 (University of Crete), and the first PhD in social psychology in 1992 (Panteion University); there are few senior chairs occupied by social psychologists, and scarcely any research funds for the discipline; and some social psychologists are now more active in related fields (e.g. J. Georgas in cross-cultural psychology), where the contributions tend to be overlooked if one focuses exclusively on social psychology journals.

Likewise, we do not think it is good practice to collapse 'Former Eastern European countries' into one bloc. Polish social psychologists, as we have seen, have succeeded in gaining entry into the top journals in the field, while other countries have no similar success or tradition. The situation in the Ukraine, for example, is not the same as in Poland, and in fact the EASP helped to promote the discipline of social psychology in the Ukraine by funding and coorganizing two regional summer schools in Wroclaw and Przemysl, which included students not only from Poland and Ukraine, but also from Byelorussia.

Different countries are, then, at different points in their development of the discipline (e.g. in Hungary the first doctoral programme in social psychology was as late as 1995 in Budapest). Responses to questions posed by the authors of this article in their respective countries supported this view. For example, respondents from both the Czech Republic and Bulgaria indicated that much has still to be done in their countries. There are few active scholars in mainstream social psychology in the former; and the situation is judged as 'not very promising' in the latter, even though 'Bulgarian social psychologists have benefited so much from the activities of EASP'.

Finally, the case of Scandinavia is interesting. Even if Scandinavian social psychologists seem to publish in *EJSP* at a rate commensurate with their proportion of EASP membership (see Table 1 in Schruijer, this issue, p. 100), this is a region with few pockets of social psychology, and fewer senior figures (e.g. K. Helkama in Finland). For a variety of reasons, students' interests have been channelled elsewhere by professors whose interests did not include social psychology (despite the role of figures such as R. Rommetveit in the early days of EASP); in some cases social psychology is subsumed under sociology, rather than psychology; and there are too few social psychologists, who are also too scattered and isolated from each other to form coherent research groups. Furthermore some social-psychological research appears under other labels (e.g. health and organizational psychology).

Criteria other than articles published in leading journals by which to evaluate EASP

The respondents contacted by the authors of this article tended to emphasize that the EASP had played not simply a role, but a *crucial* role, in developing social psychology

in their country. This view was stronger in some countries (e.g. Poland) than others (e.g. Greece). In Poland, for example, EASP support made it possible for Polish social psychologists to have contacts with the academic community in western Europe. In Hungary, the many types of meetings sponsored by the EASP (see below) were cited as instrumental in the professionalization of social psychology, which started late in this country.

Meetings sponsored by the EASP include a wide range of events, but at all levels the association has taken steps to stage such events across the broad spread of Europe, from North to South, and East to West. General Meetings, held every three years, have included Budapest (1990), Lisbon (1993), San Sebastian, Spain (2002), Opatija, Croatia (2008), and Stockholm (2011). There have been countless small- and medium-size meetings (e.g. Espoo, Finland, 1989), several of which led to seminal publications in specific fields (e.g. Sardinia, Italy, 2001). East–West meetings (e.g. Hungary in 1974) were rare and cherished opportunities for social psychologists hidden behind the Iron Curtain to meet and exchange views with western counterparts. Summer schools have included Bologna (1986), Serock (north of Warsaw, 1994), and Aegina, Greece (2010). Many of today’s professors, all over Europe, were yesterday’s students at summer schools. As one respondent from the Czech Republic wrote in 2011, ‘the summer school in 2006, Padova [Padua] . . . was the most inspiring event throughout my whole PhD studies . . . I have learned so much in just two weeks . . . how experiments are designed and how the whole research process operates. So, I would never say EASP has failed in its disseminating role . . . for me, its contribution was invaluable.’

Positions of power, influence and responsibility throughout the EASP have also been widely dispersed, whether we look at editors of the *EJSP*, or members of the executive committee. The good work done by these members includes the establishment of ‘seed-corn’ research grants to young researchers to establish their own labs, and travel grants to support research trips to work with others in Europe.

To evaluate the full impact of EASP, however, we should broaden the analysis yet further to include the founding and strength of national organizations (e.g. the Polish Association of Social Psychology), the frequency and quality of national conferences (e.g. the annual Italian Social Psychology Conference), and the vigour and quality of national journals (e.g. *Psychologia Społeczna*, in Poland; or *Psicologia* and *Analise Psicológica* in Portugal) – all developments that exist primarily for internal, not external, consumption, or evaluation. In Italy, for example, the PhD programmes at the Universities of Bologna and Padua began in the 1980s and were heavily influenced by the involvement of senior professors in EASP activities (A. Palmonari and D. Capozza, respectively). They are, today, ‘factories’ that produce excellent researchers, places for visiting scholars to include in their itinerary, and centres of excellence for European social psychology.

Conclusions

Since the founding of the European Association of Social Psychology in 1967 scientific development in social psychology has changed from being a one-sided enterprise, with North American ideas being adopted in Europe, to a mutual development, in which

European ideas have also been taken up enthusiastically in the USA. Ever-increasing collaboration has led to scientific growth, and it is now accepted practice for leading North American journals (e.g. *JPSP*, *PSPB*) to have at least one European editor, and likewise for the *EJSP* to have non-European editors. We have indeed come a long way in a relatively short time, and we believe that the EASP has played a commanding role.

As we have tried to show in this reply to Schruijer, in order to evaluate the impact of the EASP one needs to use multiple criteria; looking at the national origin of authors of *EJSP* articles is just one measure, and is not sufficient. We have shown that in just under 50 years social psychology in Europe has come on in leaps and bounds, with European scholars not limiting their horizons to publishing in 'their' journal but, instead, 'taking the fight' to the editors of the leading journals in the field, which are North American. But we have also seen that there are subtle yet important differences in the evolution of social psychology in different countries, even within the same geographical region, and that these frustrate attempts to provide simple answers to such a complex question as whether EASP has been successful.

Broadly conceived, we contend that the impact of EASP has been truly impressive, achieved by building from the top down (via General Meetings and journals) and from the bottom up (via support for junior scholars, notably in its summer schools). Success has not, however, been uniform; there remain areas of Europe that the EASP should target for future developments; and in the future special workshops should be funded to help non-native speakers of English to prepare their work for publication in English. But overall we submit that the central aims of the founders of EASP, to establish European social psychology across the continent and to build a European discipline for which North Americans, especially, would have respect, *have* been fulfilled, and probably beyond their wildest dreams.³ In conclusion, for many social psychologists spread widely across Europe if the EASP had not existed, we would have had to invent it!

Notes

The first author was an anonymous reviewer of the original and revised versions of Schruijer's article; he did not share its contents with anyone else. He did, however, consult colleagues in several countries (who themselves consulted colleagues in their countries) to try to test his own hypotheses about what impact the European Association of Social Psychology had had, overall and in their specific countries. These colleagues, who provided invaluable assistance, are listed as co-authors; thanks too to Jorge Vala and Tony Manstead for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.

1. The association changed its name at its General Meeting in 2008, not without some controversy but after a vote of all its members, dropping the word 'Experimental'.
2. I am grateful to the current president of the European Association of Social Psychology, Fabrizio Butera, and the editors of the *EJSP* for permission to report these data (based on submissions 2008–11), and to Sibylle Classen, secretary of the association, for providing them.
3. In this article the analysis of the contributions of the EASP is restricted to its impact in Europe, because that was the focus of Schruijer's article. We note, however, that European social psychology has had a significant impact on global social psychology, not only in the USA, but also, in particular, in Australasia, South America, and in several Asian countries.

References

- Carlson, R. (1984) 'What's Social about Social Psychology? Where's the Person in Personality Research?', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47: 1304–9.
- Cook, T. D. and Campbell, D. T. (1979) *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Hewstone, M. and Stroebe, W. (2009) 'Social Psychology in Our Time: from "Fun and Games" to Grown-up Science', in P. Rabbitt, (ed.) *Inside Psychology: A Science over 50 Years*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 137–50.
- Lewicki, P. (1982) 'Social Psychology viewed by SESP', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 8: 409–16.
- Moscovici, S., Lage, E. and Naffrechoux, M. (1969) 'Influence of a Consistent Minority on the Responses of a Majority in a Color Perception Task', *Sociometry* 32: 365–80.
- Sears, D. O. (1986) 'College Sophomores in the Laboratory: Influences of a Narrow Data Base on Social Psychology's View of Human Nature', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51: 515–30.
- Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M. B., Bundy, R. P. and Flament, C. (1971) 'Social Categorization and Intergroup Behaviour', *European Journal of Social Psychology* 1: 149–78.
- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1973) 'Availability: a Heuristic for judging Frequency and Probability', *Cognitive Psychology* 5: 207–32.

Biographical note

Miles Hewstone is Professor of Social Psychology and Fellow of New College, Oxford University. His main research topic is the reduction of intergroup conflict. He received the Kurt Lewin Award, for Distinguished Research Achievement, from the European Association for Experimental Social Psychology in 2005, and is a Fellow of the British Academy.