



EFPA

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS**

Convenor : BJORN RISHOVD RUND

**REPORT to the
GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2005 in GRANADA**

Report to the General Assembly, EFPA, Granada July 9-10, 2005

From the Standing Committee on Scientific Affairs

Members of the committee are: Ivo Cermak (Czech Republic), Nigel Foreman (United Kingdom), Lars-Goran Nilsson (Sweden), José M. Prieto (Spain), Hannelore Weber (Germany), Paul Bartolo (Malta), Magda Kalmar (Hungary), Gretty Mirdal (Denmark), Bjorn Rishovd Rund (Norway) as convenor.

Rainer Silbereisen (Germany) is the EC Liaison.

The SA committee have had two meetings since the members were appointed during spring 2004. The first meeting was 12th June 2004, at the EFPPA headquarters in Brussels. Present at the first meeting were: Ivo Cermak, Nigel Foreman, Lars-Goran Nilsson, José M. Prieto, Hannelore Weber, Bjorn Rishovd Rund, and Rainer Silbereisen.

The second meeting was held in Oslo, 22nd January 2005. Present at the second meeting were: Gretty Mirdal, Hannelore Weber, José M. Prieto, Lars-Goran Nilsson, and Bjorn Rishovd Rund.

Five main topics have been discussed in these two meetings:

1. The 9th ECP in Granada, July 3-8, 2005.
2. How can we increase the funding of psychological research in Europe?
3. Minimal standards for Ph.D programmes in Europe.
4. European Psychologist: Evaluate the Editor's 2005 report.
5. What should be the tasks of the committee?

In addition to the five main issues mentioned above, the committee has nominated two members to serve on the next Aristotle Prize and WJ Prize committees, and nominated members to the scientific committee of the 10th ECP in Prague, 2007.

Ad point 1: *9th ECP in Granada, July 2005.*

The SA committee has wanted to increase the visibility of this committee in the scientific program of this conference as well as other EFPA conferences in the future. It was decided in the second meeting to organize a round table in the Granada conference on “what is meant by excellence in psychological research within the EU”. Prieto will act as convenor and Mirdal, Weber, Nilsson, and Rishovd Rund as participants. This may also be the right forum to start the distribution of the next draft of the document “Doctoral Degree in Psychology within the European Context” (see below) since there is a link between Excellence in Psychological Research and Doctoral Degrees in Psychology.

Ad. Point 2: *Funding of psychological research in Europe.*

Within the EU there is a preference for large projects requiring large amounts of money. This is not the case in psychology where some projects require rather small funding and rather few grants. It requires a change of strategy to initiate contacts at the top level, for instance members of the European parliament or policy makers in Brussels regarding FP6 and FP7. EFPA should introduce the scientific perspective in present lobbying approaches, paying attention to professional aims and tenets.

In FP6 there are areas where psychological research is welcome collaterally, but not explicitly. It means that National Associations of Psychology, researchers in higher education institutions as well as EFPA must try to maintain conversations with members of the European Parliament in the commission that is now elaborating drafts of FP7. They are open to suggestions and discussions, but also leading researchers in each EU country must be proactive in contacting them in this preliminary phase. The

submission of proposals is intricate enough to demand the implication of experts in the EU bureaucracy and lobbying procedures. Thus, it is suggested that EFPA and National Associations may also consider the possibility of identifying consultants specialized in dealing with EU affairs and used to lobby for a cause. Without adequate technical and bureaucratic advice psychological researchers may fail to generate and coordinate suitable Work Package across countries, at least three are required in submissions. FP7 is expected to be enacted by 2007.

The European Science Foundation (<http://www.esf.org/>) includes Psychology within Humanities and Social Sciences, but not in Health Sciences. This bias seems to be critical: important sections of psychological research are focused on social and cultural issues and dilemmas and other sections move apparently towards neuroscience.

Ad point 3: Minimal standards for Ph.D. programmes in Europe.

Prieto circulated the first draft of a document entitled “Doctoral Degree in Psychology within the European Context” in the Oslo meeting. The second version of the draft is enclosed. The SA convenor has asked the Executive Committee of EFPA for feedback as well as instruction for how to proceed with this work. (Email to Tuomo Tikkanen of March 1, 2005).

Ad point 4: European Psychologist: The SA committee has expressed its wish of enhanced involvement in the process of nomination of associate editors and consultants. The committee is expected to evaluate an annual report from the EP editor. The committee before the meeting in Oslo received an outstanding report, and a response to the report was mailed to the Editor in February 2005.

Ad point 5: Future work of the SA committee.

The generation of guidelines for PhD Programs in Europe, the involvement in European Congresses of Psychology as well as in European Psychologists have been pointed out as important tasks for the SA committee. These tasks are also supporting the continuity during the three years period of this committee.

However, although most members have emphasized that this committee serves important functions within the EFPA, several members have also expressed their dissatisfaction with the way the SA committee has been appointed and the indistinctness of the role of the committee. Clear statutes and tasks for the committee are wanted. The EFPA's EC is invited to work out clearer instructions for the SA committee. These instructions should be in place at the time a new committee is appointed (about 2 years from now), or preferably at an earlier point of time. Members of this CSA are willing to assist the EC in working out clear statutes and tasks for the committee.

It has also been discussed whether convenor or chair is the appropriate title of the head of a standing committee.

Enclosement:

Doctoral Degree in Psychology within the European context: towards a reference model.

Version 1.1. 09/02/05

1. Important changes have occurred within the European context during the last 25 years regarding policy making in psychology as a field of research expertise and professional action.
 - a. During the 1980s training of students and graduates in psychology was the consequence of idiosyncratic initiatives launched by departments of psychology in specific universities and coordination was rather absent at the regional or national level.
 - b. During the 1990s some initiatives launched by the European Network of Organizational Psychology (ENOP <http://www.ucm.es/info/Psyap/enop/>) and the European Federation of Psychological Associations (EFPA <http://www.efba.be/>) have generated a set of minimum standards or a reference model backed by national associations (<http://www.europsych.org/> and used by some psychology departments.
 - c. During the 2000s the idea of an European Diploma of Psychology has been under examination and a provisional set of procedures and standards seems to be ready to be backed in July 2005 by national associations in Granada during the 9 ECP (<http://www.ecp2005.com/>). The main aim is favouring free mobility of university graduates in Psychology among European countries and as a rule within EU State members. It seems to prevail the professional perspective.
 - d. The next step seems to be the free mobility of researchers and scholars across European countries and the legal tender seems to be the Ph.D. all around the world. This is an incoming challenge and often unresolved matter within the European context and this document is an initiative to step in. .
2. The journal *European Psychologist* (<http://www.hhpublish.com/journals/ep/>) devoted a monographic issue in 2003 to gather information about Doctoral Studies in Psychology held in countries such as France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden, UK and US (volume 8, number 1, 2003). Eight reports were co-authored by 22 scholars who summarized not only present requirements but also introduced critical comments and suggestions for future developments at least at the national level. It became evident that a reference model at the European level is conspicuously absent and it may be a goal to be reached sometime between 2005 (9ECP in Granada), 2006 (26ICAP in Athens), 2007 (10ECP in Prague), 2008 (28ICP in Berlin) and 2009 (11ECP somewhere in Europe). This is a benefit of five European or International Congresses to be held here and there in Europe in a consecutive manner. The Committee of Scientific Affairs of EFPA may act as a catalyst for generating rapprochements between stakeholders and produce a reference model before 2010. The *European Psychologist* may act again as a communication channel as well as the homepage of EFPA.

3. By 2005 Doctoral Programs in Psychology seem to be organized after one of the following scenarios:
- Scheme 1: A unique department of Psychology in a given university.
 - Scheme 2: Several departments of Psychology in a given university.
 - Scheme 3: Several departments from different disciplines and somehow related to Psychology in a given university.
 - Scheme 4: Several departments of Psychology among networked universities in the same country.
 - Scheme 5: Several departments of Psychology among networked universities in several countries sharing a given language or a cultural background.
 - Scheme 6: Several departments of Psychology among networked universities throughout the European Union under the umbrella of Network of Excellence. Official language is English.
 - Scheme 7: Several departments of Psychology among networked universities throughout the European Union under the umbrella of Doctoral Program of Excellence. Official language is English.

After the information gathered within the European Union Schemes 5 to 7 are preferred due to the fact that they allow cooperation and development across borders, favouring an European perspective.

4. Important changes came about within the European context as a direct consequence of Bologna Agreement backed in 1999 by Government Ministers of Education as well as Higher Education institutions. It entailed important consequences since Higher Education authorities favour new structures and organizational schemes regarding benchmarking, cooperation and communication among departments and research units across countries as well as normative issues such as duration of studies or homogeneous versus heterogeneous background. In a similar vein present challenges faced by doctoral students are under scrutiny. For instance commonality-specialty-specificity in programs and syllabus, financial aspects such as grants, funding and welfare, or career development plans and placement schedule. Psychology departments cannot remain on leave in this phase that requires an overview of scenarios, manoeuvre and enforcement within universities and across universities.
5. Within the European context the large majority are State universities supported by national or regional budgets, and so under direct or indirect supervision by policy making Councils or

Governmental Agencies. The sources of funding entail consequences for psychology departments and doctoral programs because the umbrella of Education, the umbrella of Employment, the umbrella of Health and the umbrella of Technology sponsor Research, Development and Innovation (RDI) Programs and, thus, often influence what is considered acceptable or adequate in a rather autonomous manner. City Councils or Regional Government also sponsor research and action programs within the umbrella of Community and Diversity issues. So, at least, these umbrellas enhance five distinctive frames of reference that request a multi-faceted profile or an interdisciplinary profile in psychology departments or RDI units and centres. The immediate sequel seems to be pressures to change non-tenure staff profiles that may affect the continuity of lecturers, associates, collaborators as well as doctoral students.

6. For decades, Psychology has been highlighted as a behavioural or cognitive science for instance by heads of departments or chairpersons but very rarely Applied Psychology has been understood and socialized within the university milieu as a behavioural and cognitive technology. This distinction, science versus technology as sound background for Psychology is not neutral and produce consequences in the way psychology graduates are perceived and their contribution is appraised, for instance, by RDI project managers, consultants and decision makers in public or private settings.
7. Psychology is an almost inconspicuous term rarely mentioned or identified as such in national and European scientific and technological programs backed by institutions, experts and politicians within EU State Members. This invisibility affects grants and stable incomes for young researchers among psychology graduates. Other university degrees are accepted in the first round and psychology graduates are included afterwards in the second round. This discrimination is critical for the continuity of doctoral programs because then psychology students are enrolled on the basis of voluntary work. It was often the case for decades during the 20th century as a direct consequence of being new comers in education, health, employment or technology-related issues. But it cannot continue as a standard in the 21st century: it results in an status of decline or weakness and not of strength and advancement.
8. Traditionally in Europe two traditions have coexisted regarding the doctoral degree, based upon the ability to perform scholarly research. The distinction differentiates between short-term and long-term research capability. For centuries it has prevailed the idea that a Doctor's degree was related to maturity and competence throughout adulthood and so the direct outcome of having experience, knowledge and good judgement. In a few words, a doctoral dissertation was the long-term expression of wisdom and rationality. However during the 20th it has prevailed the idea that a Doctor's degree was related to first-rate and specific skills or sound knowledge in a particular field. In a few words, a doctoral dissertation was the short-term expression of expertise and virtuosity throughout young adulthood. This distinction, long-term versus short-term doctoral dissertations, is not neutral because it changes the targeted audience: accomplished and professional university graduates versus neophytes and probationer university graduates. This distinction often entails strong differences regarding the pertinent "know how" and "know what" to be displayed and endorsed in a doctoral dissertation. During the last two or three decades of the 20th century short-term research projects are over-represented among doctoral students as compared to long-term research: these were over-represented during the first five or seven decades of the 20 century. There is room in psychology departments for short term and long term Doctoral degrees. Senior graduates often held posts different of occupational niches open to younger graduates.

9. Also the distinction between researches carried out in laboratories under rather experimental frameworks as compared to field studies and case studies is not neutral. It generates quite different profiles not only among psychology departments but also among doctoral students and the journals where their contribution may enter or not under the scrutiny of referees. Quotation indexes acceptable for promotion and tenure posts differ from health and neurosciences-related journals as compared to social or humanities-related journals. It is not the distinction between theoretical or applied areas, but between scientific or technological approaches to psychological explanation and action.
10. From an organizational perspective a set of criteria should be considered for discussion and the following list is just suggestions to generate an operational framework.
- Doctoral programs in Psychology shall be administratively housed at least in one higher education institutions, accredited as such in a given European country, preferably but not entirely in a university campus.
 - The doctoral program must be clearly identified and labelled as a psychology program and integrated within the mission of the psychology department or unit involved. .
 - The Psychology department or unit must specify in institutional catalogues or brochures that it has been devised to facilitate the advanced training of already graduates in psychology at the highest level.
 - The doctoral program in Psychology shall stand as a recognizable and coherent organizational unit and a leading scholar in psychology shall be identified as titular head of the program.
 - The program shall lead to an integrated, organized sequence of study covering both core and specialty areas.
 - There shall be an identifiable group of tenure scholars in psychology sufficient in size and breadth to lead the way and carry out its responsibilities.
 - The program shall have an identifiable group of students matriculated for the doctoral degree in psychology.
 - The program shall include field or laboratory training, supervised practicum or internship appropriate to psychological research or action.
 - The curriculum must encompass a minimum of XXX European credit units.
 - An accreditation system shall be developed at the national level (focused mainly on schemes 1 to 4) under the National Association or at European level (focused on schemes 5 to 7) and under the EFPA.
11. From a political perspective a set of criteria should be considered for discussion and the following list is just suggestions to generate a political framework
1. The Ph.D. training must be based on the existent and evolving body of knowledge, skills and competencies coherent within the broad scientific and technological foundations of psychology as a field of research and action expertise.
 2. The Ph.D. program involved should make explicit the educational and training background supported by the psychological unit as well as preferred models, objectives and methods acceptable within the broad umbrella of psychology.
 3. Psychological research and action are based on the science and technology of psychology that also is influenced by psychology as a profession.
 4. The primary training method is experiential and it includes socialization within the profession of psychology.
 5. Diagnose and problem solving through psychological assessment and measurements as well as the management of groups and organizations are skills to be favoured in the training of Ph.D. students. Other relevant skills are related to dissertation and research

projects, effective essays and report writing, listening and interviewing, critical thinking, presenting psychological information, citations, references and online/offline resources, oral presentations and discussion, effective reading and construction of arguments, reviewing articles and books, analysis of rival hypotheses, ethics and standards.

This is the first draft of a document backed by the Committee of Scientific Affairs of EFPA. The main purposes are

- Initiating a dialogue between members of the committee of scientific affairs and representatives of national associations of psychology as well as BOD of EFPA,
- Bringing out a climate of dialogue on the subject by psychology leaders present in European or International Congresses of Psychology,
- Looking for synergies and signs of agreement,
- Producing a set of minimum standards or a reference model to be backed by the General Assembly of EFPA before 2010.

These purposes require the proactive involvement of National Associations of Psychology in Europe, the natural setting where Ph.D. graduates in Psychology are welcome as one in the profession.

These are the steps to follow:

- Spreading around among members of this Committee of Scientific Affairs the present document as a first draft to be submitted to the Executive Committee of EFPA. The purpose is obtaining an initial endorsement as a basic framework for future actions and developments as well as an initial funding.
- Bringing to public attention of attendees to the 9ECP this draft document that will be made available during the Round Table scheduled and focused on what entails excellence in psychological research. The main goal is obtaining an initial feedback specially from head of Psychology departments as well as Ph. D. graduates present in the congress.
- Reporting to the members of the General Assembly of EFPA about aims and strategies regarding the suitability of a reference model for doctoral degrees in Psychology within the European context. The main goal is obtaining feedback from national delegates and the appointment of adequate liaison persons in each country. These persons will be contacted at least via email through a moderate discussion list on the subject.
- Opening a special section of EFPA's homepage that will make available an electronic form in Adobe Acrobat for the submission of URL addresses as input and the availability of a catalogue of Ph.D. programs in Psychology classified throughout each one of the seven scenarios outlined. The main goal is identifying homepages and email addresses across European countries.
- Contacting presidents of European Psychological Associations or Societies specialized in the specific fields of expertise to obtain their feedback regarding a reference model for doctoral degrees in Psychology within the European context. The aim is generating a climate of convergence across associations and societies pivoting on research outcomes made public in scientific programs and journals.
- Submitting a proposal to FP6 or FP7 asking for funding of a network of excellence focused on a reference model for doctoral degrees in Psychology within the European context and as continuity to past Leonardo da Vinci support on the minimal standards in Psychology and the European Diploma on Psychology. The main purpose is assisting the emergence and maintenance of such a network across European countries at least in the initial phase.

- Obtaining the OK from Congress Organizers of 26 ICAP (Athens, 2006), 10 ECP (Prague, 2007), 29 ICP (Berlin 2008), 11 ECP (?, 2009) to organize a symposium or a round table on the subject and sponsored by the CSA of EFPA. The main goal is gathering information and generating successive revised version of a reference model for doctoral degrees in Psychology within the European context.
- Submitting an advance version of this document to EFPA delegates in Prague 2007 and obtain an institutional support as it was the case in London 2001 and Vienna 2003 regarding the pre-doctoral degree and the European diploma on Psychology respectively. The aim is enhancing the distinction between a European diploma as standard favouring the professional mobility and a Doctoral degree as standard among researchers and scholars.
- Making available the reference model to stakeholders of Ph.D. programs in Psychology's through the homepage of EFPA as well as the European Psychologist. Printed or electronic copies will be forwarded to heads of Psychology departments within the European Context. The main purpose is visibility and a common language favouring progression in this realm.
- Contacting the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Board (<http://www.asppb.org/>) as institutional interlocutors and formal referees in the process of identifying doctoral programs as psychology programs in the US and Canada since 1977. This association organizes every two years an international convention devoted to exchange reliable information and where leading figures of Psychology in Scandinavian countries as well as UK, and Australia maintain proactive contributions. The main goal is stressing that a doctoral degree in psychology is the standard for the free mobility of researchers and scholars around the world.

Bjorn Rishovd Rund (Norway) as convenor