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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00-16:00</td>
<td><strong>REGISTRATION</strong>&lt;br&gt;On the first day, the registration desk can be found in the central hall of the Academy building&lt;br&gt;For the remainder of the conference the registration and information desk will be moved to the Munting building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td><strong>OPENING</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>Maarten Derksen &amp; Jannes Eshuis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15-17:15</td>
<td><strong>KEYNOTE</strong>&lt;br&gt;Values and (e)valuations in the social sciences and humanities&lt;br&gt;<em>Sarah de Rijcke (CWTS), Leiden University</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15-18:15</td>
<td><strong>WELCOME RECEPTION</strong>&lt;br&gt;<em>drs. Jan de Jeu, Vice President of the Board of the University of Groningen</em>&lt;br&gt;This reception is offered to you by the University of Groningen, the Municipality of Groningen and the Province of Groningen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Room 061</th>
<th>Room 074</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>KEYNOTE</td>
<td>“Multiple issues”: History of the human sciences &amp; Wikipedia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 061</td>
<td>Alice White, Wellcome Collection, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>COFFEE</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the</td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orangerie</td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td>Trends in</td>
<td>Trends in publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publication</td>
<td>Chair: Ian Lubek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Jeremy Burman: Trust in databases: On what’s missing in “What is history of psychology?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vassiliki Giakoumatou: Public discourse on psychology in contemporary Greece: An archaeological investigation of newspaper archives, 1975-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td>LUNCH BREAK: Free time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td>Development of methodology</td>
<td>Panel: Between Narrative and Science: Historicizing Narrative Knowledge in the Modern Discipline of Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Stefan Grujters</td>
<td>Chair: Csaba Pleh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• John Arkenbout: The end of great stories and the advance of ever-smaller questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lisa Wijsen: What’s on the mind of the psychometrician? Interviews with Psychometric Society Presidents</td>
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<td>• Christopher Green et al.: Which Statistical Tests Have Which Psychological Subdisciplines Been Using for How Long?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>COFFEE</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:30</td>
<td>Psychology in crisis (Room 061)</td>
<td>Psychology in crisis (Room 061)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Ruud Abma</td>
<td>Chair: Ruud Abma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Henderikus Stam: Once more with feeling: The eternal recurrence of the reproducibility crisis in psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annette Mülberger: When and why did psychologists start to worry about replication?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jill Morawski: The Psychologies of Psychologists in Times of Crises: A Comparative Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-22:00</td>
<td>CONFERENCE</td>
<td>CONFERENCE DINNER at De Rietschans, Haren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td>17:45 bus arrives at the Munting building; 18:00 bus leaves for De Rietschans; 18:15 arrival at De Rietschans; 22:00 return to Groningen, Grote Markt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:30</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Reflection on pioneers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Arthur Arruda Leal Ferreira</td>
<td>Chair: Jannes Eshuis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Renato Foschi &amp; Andrea Romano: The</td>
<td>• Liesbet de Kock: From rhythm to sense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foundation of the degree in psychology in</td>
<td>The relation between Wundt’s metronome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy during the Cold War</td>
<td>experiments and his psychological analysis of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Csaba Pleh: The psychology degree programs</td>
<td>meaningful speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Hungary: 1960s-1990s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Miki Takasuna: History of certifying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychologists in Japan compared with that of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>psychotherapists in Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:00</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Reflecting on pioneers</td>
<td>The context of psychiatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Jannes Eshuis</td>
<td>Chair: Maarten Derksen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Liesbet de Kock: From rhythm to sense.</td>
<td>• Jimena Carrasco: Cinderella’s shoe: A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relation between Wundt’s metronome</td>
<td>critical look at hegemonic history of Psychiatry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiments and his psychological analysis of</td>
<td>in Chile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meaningful speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• João Moreira: José H. Ferreira Marques and</td>
<td>• Annette Mülberger: Testing the mind in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the History of Psychology in Portugal</td>
<td>Spanish juridical psychology (c. 1900-1936)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Luiz Eduardo Prado da Fonseca &amp; Hugo</td>
<td>• Oscar Montero-Pich: Orthodontics and Mental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonardo Rocha Silva da Rosa, Arthur Arruda</td>
<td>prophylaxis: a particular intersection between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leal Ferreira: A peculiar historical operation:</td>
<td>moral and palatal fissures within the framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The fabrication of Wacław Radecki as a pioneer</td>
<td>of the Second Spanish Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Brazilian history of psychology. Or the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pioneer who was, without ever having been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>CLOSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:30</td>
<td>BOAT TOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:00 we meet at “Rondvaartbedrijf Kool” for</td>
<td>17:00 we meet at “Rondvaartbedrijf Kool” for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an optional boat tour of the city; 17:15 the</td>
<td>an optional boat tour of the city; 17:15 the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boat leaves the dock; 18:30 the boat returns</td>
<td>boat leaves the dock; 18:30 the boat returns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This boat tour is sponsored by the Reflecting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Psychology graduate programme of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Groningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuesday July 17: Registration & Opening
Street map including Broerstraat and the Academy building

Notice the yellow arrow indicating the main entrance of the Academy building.

Wednesday July 18 - Friday July 20: Scientific Program
Street map including Grote Kruisstraat and the Munting building

Notice the yellow arrow indicating the side entrance to the courtyard (Oude Hortus), which gives access to the locations where sessions (upper red arrow) and coffee breaks (lower red arrow) take place.
Tuesday July 17

Academy building, Broerstraat 5, Groningen
**Tuesday July 17**

*Academy building, Broerstraat 5, Groningen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00-16:00</td>
<td>REGISTRATION</td>
<td>On the first day, the registration desk can be found in the central hall of the Academy building. For the remainder of the conference the registration and information desk will be moved to the Munting building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td>OPENING</td>
<td>Maarten Derksen &amp; Jannes Eshuis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15-17:15</td>
<td>KEYNOTE</td>
<td>Values and (e)valuations in the social sciences and humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah de Rijcke (CWTS), Leiden University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15-18:15</td>
<td>WELCOME RECEPTION</td>
<td>drs. Jan de Jeu, Vice President of the Board of the University of Groningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This reception is offered to you by the University of Groningen, the Municipality of Groningen and the Province of Groningen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Values and (e)valuations in the social sciences and humanities

Sarah de Rijcke (CWTS, Leiden University, the Netherlands)

New forms of evaluation are reconfiguring science and social life in ways we are only beginning to understand. The growing use of evaluations and their ‘constitutive effects’ (Dahler-Larsen, 2014) are subject of considerable debate. While some analysts welcome the possibility of increasing transparency through performance data, recent years have also seen high-profile initiatives drawing attention to perceived damaging effects of an increasing metric-orientation in research assessment (e.g. the Leiden Manifesto, DORA).

In this talk I will share results from recent projects in the social sciences and humanities in which we analyzed interactions between evaluation and knowledge production on the ‘shop-floor’ of academic research. Does what is evaluated also coincide with what is valued highly? The work contributes to a better understanding and conceptualization of the intricate ways in which evaluation, valuation and knowledge production interact.
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# Wednesday July 18
Munting building, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, Groningen

| Session 1 | 09:00-10:30 | Pedagogy & parenting  
Chair: René van Hezewijk  
- Wendy Sims-Schouten: Child Protection and the Deserving/Undeserving Paradigm through History  
- Marion de Ras: Lea Dasberg: Judaism and Jewish pedagogy  
- Dennis Bryson: Shifts in Parenting Expertise: From a Focus on Children's Fundamental Needs to Developing Children's Brains | Politics & identity  
Chair: Ben Harris  
- Martin Wieser: Psychology in the “Ostmark”: Applied Psychology in times of war  
- Sandra Schruijer: Social psychology during the Cold War: The case of the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology  
- Anna Borgos: Gender concepts in pre-war Hungarian psy-sciences |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Session 2 | 11:00-12:30 | Piagetian pedagogy  
Chair: Jeremy Burman  
- Rita Hofstetter & Bernard Schneuwly: An expansionist educational internationalism. The International Bureau of Education under Piaget as an alternative to US hegemony and to the confusion between science and militancy?  
- Clariçe Moukachar Batista Loureiro: Piagetian Theories on International Education: Texts and Contexts  
- Marc Ratcliff: Jean Piaget, the Rousseau Institute and Jewish refugees from 1933 to 1945 | Epistemological issues  
Chair: Martin Wieser  
- René van Hezewijk: Collingwood, re-enactment and psychology  
- Ruud Abma: Louis Althusser and the Human Sciences  
- Horst-Peter Brauns: Paradigms revisited |
| 12:30-14:00 | LUNCH BREAK in the Orangerie |
| Session 3 | 14:00-15:30 | Studying development & disability  
Chair: Douwe Draaisma  
- Elizabeth Valentine & Mura Ghosh: Mabel Jane Reaney: Red Cross heroine and pioneer researcher on play  
- Mura Ghosh & Elizabeth Valentine: “A lady of unusual ability and force of character”: Lucy G. Fildes (1884-1968)  
- Marion Schmidt: The psychology of deafness – educational psychology, mental testing, and the sciences of humanizing and difference | Panel: Same, same, but different? Lessons learned while writing about the “histories of health psychology”  
Chair: Annette Mühlberger  
- Ian Lubek et al.: Adventures in publishing a critical look at the development of health psychology and behavioral medicine in the United States.  
- Monica Ghabrial et al.: A bibliometric enquiry into the publications of English-speaking health psychology articles (1962-2012): Topics, theories and populations addressed or under-represented  
- Henderikus Stam: A critical Canadian Perspective on Health Psychology’s history |
| 15:30-16:00 | COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie |
| Session 4 | 16:00-17:30 | ESHHS BUSINESS MEETING (Room 061) |
Child Protection and the Deserving/Undeserving Paradigm through History

Wendy Sims-Schouten (University of Portsmouth, UK)

Contemporary child protection systems in the UK need to be seen in light of beliefs and practices inherited from the 19th century child rescue movement. First introduced by the Poor Law of 1834, discourse around ‘deservedness’ and perceived support entitlement, often acts as a locus for the manifestations of stigma, perceptions of lifestyle choices and social-economic background (Sohasky, 2015). This can for example be seen in the initial response to the sexual exploitation scandals in different cities in the UK (e.g. Rotherham) where girls as young as 13 years old were abused and described by professionals as ‘out of control’ and ‘streetwise’ (Delap, 2015). This strongly resembles Stead’s exposure in the Pall Mall Gazette in 1885 of child prostitution in London. Current procedures regarding child safeguarding dismiss historical and structural mechanisms in unequal practices, locating problems in families and parenting instead. The current research challenges the prevailing viewpoint and turns towards uneven safeguarding practices and related subjective distinctions between those who are ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ (e.g. in relation to perceived behaviour and lifestyle choices). In an attempt to provide services where there are ever increasing thresholds for access and cuts to resources, I argue that a resurgence of the ‘deserving/undeserving’ paradigm reflects a contemporary justification regarding who is ‘entitled’ to help and who is not.

This research aims to investigate causal factors (individual, material, institutional) and social structures that impact on the continued legacy of the ‘deserving/undeserving’ paradigm, i.e. the notion that interventions and approaches towards child protection are variable and obtuse, favouring some and not others. There is evidence that at present and in the past, certain children and families miss out on support and interventions due to complex needs, financial cuts, and ever changing thresholds (Skinner & Thomas, 2017). Yet, underlying causal factors (material, institutional and personal) are all too often ignored here in favour of a focus on ‘deservedness’. It is the group of children referred to by Mike Stein (2006) as ‘victims’, a term used for the most disadvantaged children who have spent time in care, have complex needs and have had the most damaging pre-care family experiences, who are the focus of this study.

Drawing on historic data from archives (between 1880-1920) from the Children’s Society, a national children’s charity in the UK, and contemporary data from interviews with practitioners and young care leavers, this research provides insight into past and current causal factors that contribute to uneven interventions. In my analysis I draw on the critical realist stance as proposed by Bhaskar (1989) on the interface between the material, personal world, and causal constraints. Firstly, I analyse language/narratives around child protection, safeguarding and wellbeing in historic case files (1880-1920) (N=150, mixed gender/age) and contextualise this within the historiography, societal mechanisms and social policy of the time. Secondly, I compare this with current developments and data from 36 interviews with practitioners and young care leavers. Findings show how both in the Victorian/Edwardian times and now, their personal history of being in the care system, as well as their material context, combined with complex mental health needs, behavioural issues places some children and young people (‘victims’) on the margins of society with no privileges at all. Taking account of historic structures and mechanisms is crucial in identifying good/bad practice and instigating change.
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Lea Dasberg: Judaism and Jewish pedagogy

Marion E.P. de Ras (independent scholar)

From 1970 to 1985 Lea Dasberg (1930-2018) was the most celebrated educator in the Netherlands. However, in the years after her emigration to Israel in 1985, she came to be forgotten. Now, both after her death and after the 2016 publication of a biography about her, the interest in her life and work is beginning to make a comeback.

In this lecture I will provide a brief outline of Dasberg’s life and then delve further into her Jewish identity and to what extent it was connected to her Jewish pedagogy.

Lea Dasberg was born in the ‘Jewish quarter’ of Amsterdam, the middle daughter of Ies Dasberg, a family doctor, and his wife Bertha Nijstad. They were married on 18 August 1927. At the age of three Lea contracted a serious illness. She suffered from juvenile rheumatism for which no medication existed at the time. In 1938, when she was almost eight years old, she was taken to Switzerland for treatment. From time to time her parents would visit her but in late 1939 they had to rush back to the Netherlands because the war was about to break out and her father had to enter the military service. Lea stayed in Switzerland by herself. An orthopedist who was treating her, kept her in plaster of Paris for a year. It helped to put an end to the pain and the rheumatism, but it caused Lea to be seriously handicapped for the rest of her life. She was a growing girl and should have never been locked up inside plaster. Dasberg was to remain handicapped for life and be dependent on assistants who needed to help her with everything: lying, sitting, walking.

She was alone in Switzerland for eight years without any contact with her family and had no idea that her parents and two sisters were in hiding. She carried on, supported by her faith and Jewish rituals. Back in the Netherlands, with the help of Jaap Meijer (father of Ischa Meijer), she managed to obtain her gymnasium diploma (in a wheelchair at all times). She studied Medieval History and found a position as a teacher at the Maimonides Secondary School. She got her Ph.D. in eleventh-century Jewish History and subsequently became senior lecturer in Historical Pedagogy at the University of Utrecht, and ultimately—in 1980—Professor of Historical Pedagogy at the Pedagogical Institute of the University of Amsterdam.

Lea Dasberg gained fame with her book Grootbrengen door kleinhouden als historisch verschijnsel (Raising Children by Keeping Them Small as an Historic Phenomenon), which had a resounding success. In addition, she gained notoriety with her dissertation, where one of her theses claimed that children ought to focus on Jewish history and not on the Holocaust as providing the definitive significance of Judaism.

In 2009 I decided to interview Dasberg for a biography. Among others, I also visited Marion Kaplan, Professor of Hebrew and Judaic Studies and Skirball Professor of Modern Jewish History at New York University. I asked her how she would characterize Jewish identity. She answered that she always told her students the following: there are three letters ‘B’: Believe, Belonging, and Behavior. What became clear to me in the conversations with Lea Dasberg was that these three words were of great importance to her, but their exact meaning was extremely complex. Even more so because for her their meaning tended to vary.

In my lecture I will go more deeply into the complex relationship that Lea Dasberg had with the three ‘B’s’ and will describe to what extent they influenced her Jewish pedagogy.
Shifts in Parenting Expertise: From a Focus on Children’s Fundamental Needs to Developing Children’s Brains

Dennis Bryson (Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey)

A basic shift in expertise on parenting and child development occurred in the late twentieth century. While during much of the twentieth century, experts such as Lawrence K. Frank advised parents and educators to focus on the fundamental needs of the child, by the end of the century, experts were exhorting these groups to focus on the developing brain of the child. I will examine this shift in my paper by comparing the two approaches and their implications for human engineering.

In 1938, Frank indicated that in order to raise and educate children so that they would grow up to be “wholesome, sane, cooperative and mature personalities” (378), their basic needs would have to be understood and catered to. Moreover, frustrating these needs would have to be minimized—or at least counteracted by providing the children with love and reassurance. Influenced by psychoanalysis, Frank envisioned human beings as bundles of emerging drives and needs; these drives and needs posed various problems to the development of personality at different phases of life. By dealing with these problems in a healthy manner—and especially by avoiding the festering of such emotions as rage, resentment, anxiety, and guilt within the individual—the individual would develop a normal, mature, and cooperative personality and, as a result, a peaceful and relatively harmonious society would be fostered. The human engineering orientation of such an approach was aptly expressed by Frank’s friend Margaret Mead, who wrote of her support for “the conscious, intelligent directing of human institutions in response to observed human needs” (Mead, 156).

As brain science developed in the late twentieth century, the emphasis of the child development experts shifted from envisioning the infant and child as being a bundle of emerging needs to being a bundle of emerging cognitive capacities and skills. To be sure, neuroscientists and developmental psychologists understood that the brain developed in interaction with the environment; thus the early experiences of infants and children within specific socioeconomic environments would be extremely important to understand. In large part as the result of the new findings in brain science, experts such as Robert D. Putnam (Professor of Public Policy at Harvard) came to endorse “intensive parenting”—which would involve the “concerted cultivation” of the child’s development by the parents by means of intense, loving interaction with the child and by their providing it with a variety of social and educational experiences. Such parenting would enhance the development of the brain and the cognitive capacities of the child, thus leading to the child’s “success in life.”

In many respects, the new mode of intensive parenting based on recent findings in brain science is consistent with the earlier methods of parenting recommended by experts in parenting and child development. In the middle decades of the twentieth century, as in recent decades, an intensive style of parenting, based on loving parental care vis-à-vis the child with the ultimate goal of making the child capable of self-control.
and independence, was recommended by the experts. Moreover, both styles have been associated with agendas of human engineering. The current style differs from the earlier style, however, in its stress on the development of the brain and the cognitive capacities of the child and on the manner in which such development is conceived as resulting in the educational, career, and life success of the individual. Instructively, the rhetoric of investment in the child recurs in the writings of the more recent experts; indeed, their rhetoric tends to be strikingly similar to that deployed by neoliberal Chicago economist Gary Becker.

A major theme that I will explore in my paper will be the affinity of the recent style of intensive parenting based on brain science to neoliberal perspectives geared toward the fostering of the entrepreneurial self, that is, the self as “human capital,” a “bundle of skills,” engaged in enhancing its value. In addressing this theme, I will be concerned with Robert Putnam’s recent book Our Kids as well as with the publications and internet sites connected with the Harvard Center on the Developing Child.
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Psychology in the “Ostmark”: Applied Psychology in times of war

Martin Wieser (Sigmund Freud Private University, Berlin, Germany)

Until the 1980s, very little has been written about the fate of German psychology from the rise of National Socialism in 1933 until the end of World War II in 1945. Only when the last psychologists who served under the Hitler-regime vanished from the academic sphere, a serious interest in the use and function of psychological knowledge and practices was coming to life within the German-speaking psychological community. The most renowned publication from this first phase of historiography of psychological during National Socialism is Ulfried Geuter’s major publication “The professionalization of German psychology in Nazi Germany” (1988), who argued that the rise of psychology within the academic system as well as its success in becoming a distinct profession in Nazi Germany was intimately tied to the successful integration of aptitude tests for soldiers, specialists and officers in the Wehrmacht, an integration which helped to establish the first nationwide diploma program for psychologists in 1941, which was widely celebrated by leading psychologists at that time. Although several important works concerning the development of psychological practices outside of the military during National Socialism were published in the meantime (e.g., Benetka, 1992; Ash, 2002), Geuter’s narrative of the rise of the psychological profession within the military still remains the central reference point in this historiographical context.

This presentation will focus on a different and smaller context by highlighting the development of applied psychology in the “Ostmark” (as Austria was renamed after its occupation). While there were only very few psychologists who worked in the military in the “Ostmark” before the “Anschluss” in 1938, several psychologists had found an occupation in different state-funded organizations and institutions, such as employment offices, state-owned enterprises (e.g., the Austrian Federal Railway), prisons, reformatories, schools, clinics and welfare facilities in the interwar era. While German applied psychology had grown within big industrial companies and the military before the war, the small country that was left from the big Austro-Hungarian Empire after World War I could not offer any of these breeding grounds for psychological practitioners. Consequently, Austrian psychologists tried to connect their practices with the needs and demands of the public welfare system, especially in Vienna, which was governed by Social Democrats who showed a strong interest in raising the efficiency of public welfare by scientific means.

After the annexation of Austria in March 1938, many of those psychologists who did not fall victim to political and racist persecution adapted their practices and methods to prove that their expertise was still valuable within the new political context. Methods of “Psychotechnik” which were originally developed for helping people to find new jobs were now applied to forced labourers from occupied countries to put them to use in the arms industry. Methods of clinical and developmental diagnostics were used to identify children and grown-ups which were supposedly “not worthy of support” and subsequently sterilized or killed. Psychologists who worked at the court helped to identify juvenile delinquents which were suspected of subverting the political system.

After giving an overview of the development of applied psychology before and during World War II in the “Ostmark”, a comparison between Austria and Germany is put forth to address the question to what extent Geuter’s narrative of the professionalization of psychology in Nazi Germany does also apply to the context of the “Ostmark” or if a different narrative might be necessary in this case. Overall, it is argued that integrating an integration of the local political and economic contexts is necessary to adequately analyse the development of applied psychology.
Social psychology during the Cold War: The case of the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology

Sandra G.L. Schrujer (Utrecht University, the Netherlands)

The subject of this paper is how social psychology in the western world was influenced by the Cold War context in the period until 1965. During this period US funding of university research and diplomacy were closely tied together, against the backdrop of East-West relations. Especially psychology was considered as an important Cold War instrument. Further, the Cold War context shaped the themes for research and the type of research. In this paper I will zoom in into social psychology by studying how the Cold War context impacted its research as reflected by the articles published in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology up till 1964. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology was a leading journal in the domain of social psychology. In 1965 this journal made a disciplinary split and the outlet for social psychological research became the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (JPSP). I will focus on the different types of funding of the published articles in JASP. I will also make an inventory of the themes, type of research, research material, and conclusions drawn that were represented during this period, and where possible, relate these to the funding source.
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Gender concepts in pre-war Hungarian psy-sciences

Anna Borgos (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary)

The relationship of psychology and gender issues is rather controversial. The knowledge on psychosexual development, ‘gender differences’, gender roles, gender identity and sexual orientation is part of the studies in developmental psychology, social psychology, personality psychology, cognitive psychology, as well as psychoanalytic theories. However, it does not necessarily involve a gender-sensitive psychology with reflection on social constructions or the relationship of society and science. Therefore, psychological studies have often been gender-blind and heteronormative. My paper aims to explore the research questions, concepts, explicit and implicit theories related to gender and sexual orientation in the special context of Hungarian psychology, focusing on the pre-war period. I seek answers to the following questions: Where and how did scholars indicate the boundary between biological sex and gender before the term came to exist? What kind of social and cultural ideals, ideologies, or preconceptions were represented in the different conceptions of sex and gender, ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’, gender traits and roles, gender identities and sexual orientations? How did the ways of their ‘measuring’ develop and what do they represent? How influential was the dimension of gender considered within human personality? Through what rhetoric did these conceptions assign or question social norms and non-normative genders and sexualities? How did scholars conceptualize the role of biology vs. society, ‘nature vs. nurture’? What kind of changes and trends can be perceived in raising the issue along the changing social and political circumstances and different professional/theoretical contexts? How did women’s participation influence the thinking and viewpoints about gender issues in Hungarian psychology? The resources of the investigation are textbooks, handbooks, journals, scholarly and ‘semi-scholarly’ articles and reviews published in Hungary (by Hungarian authors or in translation) between the 1910s and 1930s within psychology and psychoanalysis on the subject of gender and psychology.

Bibliography
Session 2, Room 061: Piagetian pedagogy

Chair: Jeremy Burman

An expansionist educational internationalism. The International Bureau of Education under Piaget as an alternative to US hegemony and to the confusion between science and militancy?

Rita Hofstetter & Bernard Schneuwly (Université de Genève, Switzerland)

To remove the world from war through science and education: this was the aim of the leaders of the Institut Rousseau (established in Geneva in 1912) when they founded the International Bureau of Education (IBE) in 1925. Scientific objectivity and neutrality were the spearheads of the agency to conquer its legitimacy on a global scale; and to make Geneva in reality THE platform of educational internationalism in universalizing the “pedagogical truths” experienced within the Rousseau Institute, thus intimately mixing science and militancy. We will show that the challenge will be far from easy, many other agencies in Europe already (International Moral Education Congress; Institute of Intellectual Coopération of the LoN; New Education Fellowship; Fédération internationale des associations d’instituteurs) claiming their primacy. Based on the IBE’s voluminous archives (manuscript and printed), we analyze, in this paper, the crucial turning point of the years 1929-1930. We will highlight more particularly the bitter negotiations between the World Federation Education Association (WFEA) whose networks cover above all the USA and some English-speaking countries, and the IBE, confined to other regions. This will allow us to question the expansionist logics of educational internationalism, under the heading, among others, of educational science, at a time when the IBE is grappling with its “US mirage”. Having learned the lessons of the “failure” of the 1929 Congress the IBE organized together with the WFEA, it was on an intergovernmental scale that the agency positioned itself thereafter, under the aegis of Jean Piaget, accrediting its scientificity. We will demonstrate that Piaget experimented, in the international conferences of public education, and thus on an intergovernmental scale, the methods of cooperation and self-government that he theorized. With the support of the IBE staff and its Deputy Director Pedro Rossello, Piaget called for scientific research into the conditions of possibility for rational pacifism (a “method of understanding”), the necessity of which he demonstrated at a time when nationalism was being exacerbated (1934). Through comparative education - as an emerging scientific discipline in the realm of educational science, and as an approach to work between governments - the IBE aroused as a global relay for educational progressivism endorsed by Piagetian psychology. Science, a means for elaborating knowledge on education, became also a means and a model for regulating relationships between nations: another way of articulating science and political action.
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Piagetian Theories on International Education: Texts and Contexts

Clarice Moukachar Batista Loureiro (Université de Genève, Switzerland)

In 1929, Jean Piaget became the head chief of the International Bureau of Education (IBE), institution created in 1925 by a group of intellectuals who had founded the Jean-Jacques Rousseau Institute, both institutions located in Geneva/Switzerland. (Hofstetter; Ratcliff & Schneuwly, 2012) (Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2013). One of the most important aspirations of the IBE, sought by his protagonists, Edouard Claparède, Pierre Bovet and others, was the development of the spirit of international collaboration through schools. Authors like Magnin (2002), Campos (2010) and now the researches of the ERHISE (Équipe de recherche en histoire sociale de l’éducation), under the direction of professors Rita Hofstetter and Joëlle Droux, bring into light this IBE’s belief concerning the development of world peace through science and education.

The present study aims to bring some contribution to this purpose by disclosing how Piaget attached his knowledge on child psychology to the target of world peace, yielding theories about international education. Having in mind an analytic-descriptive approach, we aim to present a few of his texts written between the years 1931 and 1934 approaching issues such as war, education and the relationship between peoples, showing how he built, at that time, the notions of solidarity and justice. Considering the fact that these intellectual productions came from a specific context, which is the creation of an international organism in the field of education on the interwar period, we have meant to point out the linkages between the socio-political and economic atmosphere of the IBE with the psychologist’s thinking. Our main purpose was to draw Piaget’s concept of international education in a context of neutrality and scientism in which the IBE was immersed.

We have come to a conclusion that, the main target of international education, according to Piaget, is to create in each individual a method of understanding and reciprocity, taking advantage of the tendencies towards internal solidarity and towards the practice of cooperation rules and self-government methods.
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Jean Piaget, the Rousseau Institute and Jewish refugees from 1933 to 1945

Marc J. Ratcliff (Archives Jean Piaget & Université de Genève, Switzerland)

This paper examines the ways in which Jewish refugees were regarded by Jean Piaget – and, more generally, by the members of the Rousseau Institute for the Sciences of Education in Geneva (IJJR) – from the 1930s through Second World War period. The IJJR had welcomed progressive students since its creation in 1912, and increased its recruitment in 1933 to accommodate Jewish refugees. The archives also show that Jean Piaget was active in his support, especially of Jewish psychologists from Germany, Austria and the East countries. He helped them not only to study at the Institute but also to immigrate to other host countries. This support was manifested in various ways, including but not limited to, letters of recommendation, tuition waivers and subsidies for school fees, and exchanges through international aid organizations. Particularly he used his networks and influence through both official and informal channels getting in touch with academic, administrative, and governmental authorities at the Swiss cantonal and federal levels, and dealt with embassies of some countries. Through it all, cultivating an unwavering discretion, Piaget also followed a political strategy that consisted in preserving the Institute to serve as a rallying point for psychological research in the post-war period.

My demonstrations will take place in three steps. Firstly I’ll show that the Institut Rousseau was a safe haven for refugees and progressive students; Secondly, archival research on the students of the IJJR between 1928 and 1945 showed that Piaget practiced inclusion of all students in his research agenda. And thirdly, I will examine the different types of support Piaget gave to Jewish students between 1937 and 1945 to help them.
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Collingwood, re-enactment and psychology

René van Hezewijk (Open University of the Netherlands)

In my presentation I will discuss aspects of work of R. G. Collingwood (1989-1943), historian, archeologist, and philosopher. I will concentrate on his principles for historical investigation: re-enactment, and the logic of question-and-answer which he suggested to replace propositional logic, in relation to psychology. Collingwood was critical of the psychology of his days, as well as of any future psychology. He accepted that psychology could scientifically explain “feeling”, but rejected the idea that psychologists could explain “thought”. Collingwood strongly opposed to a psychology that pretended to be able to explain rational choice, especially in moral issues. He opposed to realism as well as idealism, but spent most of his career to avoid relativism as well. So the questions are why, and how, did he do this, questions which are important for psychology, in the past as well as today.

In my discussion I will refer to a number of works by Collingwood (1939, 1940, 1946, 1994) in which he developed his theory of re-enactment and his “logic of question-and-answer”. I will also briefly mention, if not discuss critical studies and comments by other authors: Van der Dussen (2012, 2016), Ernest Gellner (1974) Connelly and Costall (2000), Connelly (1994), and Guido Vanheeswijck (1994, no relation).

Collingwood's ideas will be confronted with John Watkins' analysis of the collision between HMS Camperdown and HMS Victoria (22 June 1893) which resulted in 356 men drowning near Tripoli. I also (plan to) confront his approach with work by Harold Pinter (2005, 2013), and with learning a new language (like Spanish).
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Louis Althusser and the Human Sciences

Ruud Abma (Utrecht University, the Netherlands)

Louis Althusser (1918-1990) was a Marxist philosopher who rose to prominence in France in the 1960’s and subsequently in Western Europe and South America. In his book Pour Marx (1965), he argued that in Marx’ work an ‘epistemological break’ had occurred that gave the study of history a scientific foundation (‘historical materialism’). According to Althusser, Marx in his later work had freed himself from earlier ‘idealistic’ philosophy, that nevertheless remained powerful in the developing disciplines of sociology and psychology. In Althusser’s view, these new human sciences oscillated between various poles of idealism, be it ‘empiricism’ or ‘subjectivism’.

Apart from an elaborated concept of what constituted ‘real science’, Althusser also developed a specific notion of ideology. In 1970 he published a paper called Idéologie et appareils idéologiques d’Etat (Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses). Here Althusser abandoned the earlier Marxist notion of ideology as ‘false consciousness’ and, inspired by Spinoza and Gramsci, introduced an alternative, ‘positive’ theory of ideology. In his view, ideology materializes in a series of processes and institutions – the so-called ideological state apparatuses such as the family, the media, the churches and the educational system – in which class struggle is equally prominent as in the ‘repressive’ state apparatuses, such as the army and the police. A general feature of ideology is that it is a representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. Also, it includes a mechanism that transforms individuals into subjects.

An interesting feat of Althusser’s theory of ideology is his incorporation of Freudian thinking, most notably Freud’s book Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse (Mass Psychology and Analysis of the Ego). In Freud et Lacan (1964), Althusser placed Freud’s psychoanalysis on equal footing with Marx’ historical materialism: like Marx, Freud had opened up a new continent, that of the unconscious. Like historical processes, psychological processes are analyzed as conflicts, contradictions and struggles. For both domains, Althusser rejected the notion of a ‘subject’ as the central notion (‘theoretical anti-humanism’), for instance the working class or the Ego.

In this paper, I seek to answer the question why Althusser felt the need to defend the scientific status of psychoanalysis, but also why he incorporated Freud’s ideas in his own theory of ideology. More broadly, I would like to reassess the relevance of Althusser’s demarcation between ‘real sciences’ (historical materialism, psychoanalysis) and the human sciences (sociology and psychology).
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Paradigms revisited

Horst-Peter Brauns (Free University Berlin, Germany)

The history of the term paradigm does not seem to be blessed with success until the last century. It is Diogenes Laertius in the late 3rd century who reports in his “account of the doc-trines of the chief Greek philosophers” that Plato uses this word to denote ideas (D. Laertius, 1967, p. 178). Aristotle already dismisses this concept from here to rhetoric where a para-digmatic inference from one single case to another similar one could be allowed at most. Later on, stressing a similarity relation as an essential facet of its meaning, paradigm obvious-ly became marginalized in traditional philosophical contexts, while keeping a place in fields like grammar and rhetoric.

Today, the term paradigm and derivatives of it like paradigm change are broadly used. We find both in dif-ferent variants in politics, literature, sciences and particularly in history and philosophy of science. In that recent part of philosophy probably, a revival began instigated by Kuhn’s (1962) numerous applications in his “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”.

In the following, we will shortly bring out some more details of paradigms ancient use. Secondly, we focus the term in its Kuhnian context as a part of a general theory of scientific development and as a tool for histo-riographical analyses. To this end, we will reconstruct Kuhn’s (1974) twofold approach: one way consists of meaning attribution by means of con-cepts of different degrees of generality. The other delivers a guideline for identification.

Certainly, one can declare our term on a higher abstract level to “standard, criterion, method, law, rule of game, prejudice, preconception, intuition and metaphysical conviction” and re-duce it afterwards to features like consensual “attractive example of achievement” and appli-cability “on a great number of further problems” (Hecht & Desnizza, 2012, p. 78). Kuhn (1974) however, after “Structure”, introduces the four paradigmatic components of symbolic generalization, value, exemplary problem solution and mo-del. Summarizing this ensemble with the term “disciplinary matrix” their specific meanings are attributed further by ostensively presenting examples of empirical referents. Additionally, Kuhn announces a guideline for the application of his conceptualizations on historical sources. For that reason so called external criteria are introduced, determined ostensively by empirical referents as well. Having reconstructed this twofold approach, we will demonstrate its transfer from the natural sciences to an application on the early history of experimental psychology in the 19th century.
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Mabel Jane Reaney: Red Cross heroine and pioneer researcher on play

Elizabeth Valentine (Royal Holloway, University of London, UK) & Mura Ghosh (Senate House Library, University of London UK)

Family background and education
This paper will trace the life and career of Mabel Jane Reaney (1874-1936), an early member of the British Psychological Society. She was the eldest child of George Reaney, a Congregationalist and later Anglican minister, and Isabel Reaney, a well-known author of Christian, feminist tales, social activist and temperance campaigner. Reaney undertook teacher training and studied psychology at University College London and natural sciences at King's College London, obtaining a BSc in 1903.

Research on play
Reaney was a passionate supporter of the importance of play in physical and social development. She began researching this under the guidance of Dr William Brown at King's College London about 1910. A large-scale empirical study (Reaney, 1914) investigated the relation between play ability in organized group games and general ability. There were 600 participants, mainly girls, from three London and four country schools. Play ability was assessed by teachers and games captains according to specified criteria; general ability was estimated by teachers and from position in class. A variety of psychological tests was also administered and an impressive number of correlations carried out amongst the various measures. Reaney concluded that there was a definite correlation between play ability as shown in group games and general ability; and that the results supported specific factors rather than a general factor, as there was no evidence of a hierarchical structure.

In her doctoral dissertation (Reaney, 1916), she critically discussed theories of play, suggesting that each accounts for a different type of play. She outlined four stages in children's play: 0-7 years, in which play is experimental and imitative; 7-9 years, when it is individual; 9-12, competitive; and 12+, in which play encourages the development of team spirit and cultivates citizenship. Her main thesis was that co-operative games provide an outlet, or social sublimation, for primitive instincts repressed in civilized life. These ideas on the theory of play and its practical applications were further developed in a book (Reaney, 1927), which included 74 games for the four age groups.

Reaney was one of the members of the Provisional Committee of the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) before it came into being at the Albert Hall meeting in 1925. She frequently gave lectures on the topic of play and the activities of the NPFA were the main interest of the closing years of her life.

Service with the Scottish Women's Hospitals
Reaney was launched on her psychological career in the opening years of WWI. However, she felt impelled to contribute to the war effort. For five years before the war she had belonged to the Women's Sick and Wounded Convoy Corps started by Mrs St. Clair Stobart, in which the women were trained by Royal Army Medical Corps doctors in first aid, ambulance work, camp sanitation and field hospital work. When war broke out she was a member of the London 104 VAD attached to the Artists’ Rifles, and volunteered with other members of her detachment for foreign service under the Red Cross. In August 1916, she went out to Roumania with the London Unit of the Scottish Women's Hospitals, a suffragist-inspired movement, as an ambulance driver, under Dr. Elsie Inglis. Owing to her previous work she was made Head Orderly of the Motor Transport Section, and was responsible for the sanitation of the Transport Camp. This unit was attached to the Serbian division of the Russian Army, and went all through the retreat of Dobruja. We will present abstracts from her “Letters from the Roumanian front” in our presentation; and will conclude by suggesting possible causal factors in her life and career.
**Bibliography**

Anon. *Heroes of the Red Cross: Dr M. Jane Reaney*. *Bromley District Times*, 4 October 1918. (London School of Economics. Women's Library. Scrapbook of press cuttings.)

Census records for 1881, 1891, 1901 and 1911.

Furzedown Training College Magazine. (London Metropolitan Archives)

Staff register, Furzedown Training College. (London Metropolitan Archives)


The directory of women teachers and other women engaged in higher and secondary education. London: Year Book Press. 1925.

The Times Digital Archive.

“A lady of unusual ability and force of character”: Lucy G. Fildes (1884-1968)

*Mura Ghosh (Senate House Library, University of London, UK) & Elizabeth Valentine (Royal Holloway, University of London, UK)*

Lucy G Fildes was born in Worcester, England, in 1884, the youngest of the four children of a cabinet-maker. She originally trained as a teacher, obtaining a BA degree by private study at the same time, and lectured at a training college for nine years. But in 1913 she entered Bedford College London to study psychology under Beatrice Edgell, thereby laying the foundation for the next stage of her career, in psychological research. Her “general ability and maturity marked her out from the beginning as a first class student”, and she did indeed graduate with a first class honours degree two years later.

In 1918, C.S. Myers invited her to undertake research in Cambridge on the causes of mental deficiency, funded by the Medical Research Council. Frederic Bartlett, who succeeded Myers as director of the laboratory, considered her “without exception the most capable research worker in her subject” that he had ever met. Sir Henry Head invited her to submit an article on so-called ‘word-blindness’ (dyslexia in current terminology) to the journal *Brain*, of which he was editor. This paper (Fildes, 1921), which became a classic, aimed to provide a psychological analysis of dyslexia. It reported ten experiments comparing readers and non-readers on visual and auditory discrimination and retention. Fildes demonstrated that dyslexia was not associated with intellectual ability, nor was the difficulty confined to words, and concluded that it was a defect in visual and/or auditory regions. Critchley (1964), writing over twenty years later, describes her early research as “an important contribution”, and notes that she was the first to draw attention to auditory factors in dyslexia. Even more remarkable is that fact that this research is featured in a recent commentary in *Brain* (Compston, 2016), in the same issue as a study reporting a neurological basis for the condition (Skeide et al. 2016). From 1925 to 1928 Fildes worked with adult defectives at state institutions for dangerous and violent offenders, and completed a doctoral thesis on word deafness.

In 1929 she was appointed Chief Psychologist at the newly opened London Child Guidance Clinic, becoming its Administrator from 1939-44. This involved not only clinical case-work, but also staff training and the administration of setting up a new service. Fildes had a profound influence on policy, serving in an advisory capacity to a wide range of organisations concerned with mental disabilities. In 1943, she initiated and chaired what was known as the Fildes Committee, which became the Committee of Professional Psychologists (Mental Health). This was the prime vehicle within the British Psychological Society for engagement with the National Health Service to achieve elements of professionalisation (Hall, 2007); and led to the formation of Divisions within the Society, Fildes being the senior founding member of the Division of Educational and Child Psychology. She served on the Curtis Committee, which reported in 1946, to inquire into the provision made for children deprived of a normal home life. This formed the basis of the 1948 Children’s Act, which re-
volutionised provision for child care. Her work was recognised nationally with the award of an OBE in 1951. For the last four decades of her life she lived in Tunbridge Wells, caring for an invalid friend, and set up a Child Guidance Clinic there, where she worked part-time until she was 80. She died four years later in 1968.
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The psychology of deafness – educational psychology, mental testing, and the sciences of humanizing and difference.

Marion Andrea Schmidt (University College Freiburg)

The mind and psyches of deaf people have long fascinated educators, scientists and lay people. Their sign languages have brought up questions about the relationships between thought, language and speech, imagination and abstraction. Often, they have served as a kind of model population for proving or disproving philosophical, psychological or linguistic theories, including the question of what distinguishes man from animal. These never were just abstract questions, but also very much matters of applied psychology and pedagogy. By studying the minds of deaf children, psychologists and teachers hoped to make their teaching more effective, to improve educational outcomes, and to better integrate deaf children into society by making them appear almost-hearing. These theories and practices often marginalized deaf people and oppressed sign languages as “uncivilized”. Yet the psychology of deafness also had the potential to unsettle social norms and expectations. Observing deaf people’s traits and behaviors, psychologists grappled with questions of normalcy and pathology. Was something considered pathological in hearing people necessarily so in the deaf? Weren’t they, in fact, living in a different psychosocial reality? Looking at the history of psychology from roughly 1900 to the 1970s, I will provide a new lens for looking at the intersection of the history of education and psychology, child and disability studies. Far from being an isolated outlier, the psychology of deafness drew the interest of important figures and contributed to the history of, for example, intelligence testing, Gestalt theory, or social psychology.
Moreover, it provides insight to the history of interdisciplinary exchange and the emigration of psychologists from Europe to the US during the 1920s and 30s. The early psychology of deafness is closely tied to research into the efficiency of education and standardization of mental traits in the first decades of the 20th century. It is little known that schools for the deaf were among the first institutions in the US to make use of intelligence testing for educational placement, as early as 1889. Psychologists such as Columbia professor Rudolph Pintner grappled with the question of how to apply standardized intelligence testing to populations with different skills sets and sociolinguistic backgrounds – an issue that still occupies psychologists today.

Gestalt psychology is another example for how closely the psychology of deafness is tied to prominent figure in the history of psychology. In fact, deaf children were the first to which Gestalt psychology was applied in the US, in the late 1920s at the Clarke School for the Deaf in Northampton, Massachusetts. Here, Kurt Koffka, one of the three foundational figures of Gestalt psychology, was appointed head of the school's psychological research division, an appointment he held next to his professorship at Northampton’s Smith College. Soon, Koffka handed this position over to another European immigrant, Austrian Gestalt and social psychologist Fritz Heider. During the 1930s and ‘40s, Heider and his American wife, Grace Moore Heider – one of Koffka’s first American students and an accomplished child psychologist herself – studied the sensory perception and social reality of deaf people, coming to conclusion which were at odds with both dominant methods of education and perceptions of disability. However, defining the deaf as a social and phenomenological minority, the Heider’s work was an important impulse for research in the 1950s and 60s into bias, preconception and the relationship between minority and majority. Relating the psychology of deafness to larger currents in the history of the human sciences, I show their potential to confirm or unsettle social norms, and point to the importance of studying different types of relationship between researchers and researched populations.
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Panel introduction: Same, same, but different? Lessons learned while writing about the “histor(y/ies) of health psychology(y/ies).

Ian Lubek (University of Guelph), Monica A. Ghabrial (University of Toronto) & Henderikus J. Stam (University of Calgary)

This round-table is a reflection on some of the contributions to a collective look at health psychology’s development as a sub-discipline (Lubek and Murray, 2018a), and the contrasts and overlaps among the histories from Australia (Kippax, 2018), Brazil (Spink, 2018), Ghana (de-Graft Aikens, 2018), France (Herzlich, 2018; Santiago-Delefosse and del Rio Caral, 2018), New Zealand (Chamberlain, Lyons and Stephens, 2018), South Africa (Yen and Vaccarino, 2018), U.K. (Murray, 2018), Canada (Stam, Murray and Lubek, 2018) and the U.S. (Lubek, Ghabrial, Ennis et al, 2018). As the special issue editors noted, there was a wide variety of, and some contradictions among, the particularities, specificities, and also overlap, of separate “country” histories, recounted using separate historiographies (Lubek and Murray, 2018b). In our presentations here, we focus on the additional critical untold stories...some removed in response to editorial suggestion, reviewers’ viewpoints, and/or lack of space. In the original histories we focused on the socio-cultural-historical contexts within each country, and the persistent boundary crossing among sociology, psychology, anthropology, health sciences, medicine, clinical and community psychology. As well, attention was paid to the broader worldwide contextual challenges, including the impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and we also discussed the arrival of the critical branch of health psychology. Perhaps this round-table will spark further historiographical contributions to critically challenge mainstream histories or to fill in missing voices from under-represented or omitted countries, cultures, and diverse groups or existing ones. A Special Collection of the journal Health Psychology Open will also continue in the next few years to continue these discussions as well.

The first paper by Lubek et al discusses some of the ideas gathered through archival, collective biographical means to describe the precursors of health psychology in the U.S., focussing on one productive centre from 1967 onwards. Ghabrial et al. use bibliometric health journal article counts to trace how English language journals accepted health articles between 1962 and 2012 to comment on history in the U.S. Stam points to different roots towards critical health psychology in Canada, which like many European countries, has a national health system.

Adventures in publishing a critical look at the development of health psychology and behavioral medicine in the United States.

Ian Lubek (University of Guelph, Canada), Monica Ghabrial (University of Toronto, Canada), Naomi Ennis (Ryerson University, Canada), Sara Crann (University of Guelph, Canada), Amanda Jenkins (University of Guelph, Canada), Michelle Green (University of Toronto, Canada), Joel Badali (McGill University, Canada), William Salmon (Ross University School of Medicine, Dominica), Janice Moodley (University of South Africa, South Africa), Elizabeth Sulima (University of Toronto, Canada), Jeffery Yen (University of Guelph, Canada), Kieran O’Doherty (University of Guelph, Canada) & Paula Barata (University of Guelph, Canada)

The paper eventually published as Lubek et al 2018 started as a triangulation of methodologies to tell the story, but after going through 4 health psychology reviewers, the paper was considerably shortened by more than half. The third methodology, a bibliometric study of the literature, had to be dropped at the unanimous request of all reviewers. Ghabrial et al, below, outline the results of that part of the study. Criticisms of the social biographical study eliminated much historical detail.
A bibliometric enquiry into the publications of English-speaking health psychology articles (1962-2012): Topics, theories and populations addressed or under-represented.

Monica Ghabrial (University of Toronto, Canada), Naomi Ennis (Ryerson University, Canada), Sara Crann (University of Guelph, Canada), Amanda Jenkins (University of Guelph, Canada), Michelle Green (University of Toronto, Canada), Joel Badali (McGill University, Canada), William Salmon (Ross University School of Medicine, Dominica), Janice Moodley (University of South Africa, South Africa), Elizabeth Sulima (University of Toronto, Canada), Jeffery Yen (University of Guelph, Canada), Kieran O’Doherty (University of Guelph, Canada) & Ian Lubek (University of Guelph, Canada)

The study sampled 2305 articles from 17 journals, across five neighboring disciplines including health psychology and behavioral medicine, where health-related articles appeared between 1962 and 2012. Stam (2000) argued there was not much theory being used in Health Psychology. Our counts showed that Social psychology journal articles used theory most frequently (71%), with health psychology following with 69 percent; however, behavioral medicine (42%), community psychology (21%), and public health journals (16%) did not often start out with a theory to apply. Overall, 12 theories constituted 45 percent of all occurrences. Some populations/groups were found to be under-represented.

A critical Canadian Perspective on Health Psychology’s history.

Henderikus J. Stam (University of Calgary, Canada)

Canadian health psychology developed along different lines than the US version just across the border. Heavily dependent on US models and employing American scholars at consistent rates, Canada nonetheless was slow to develop a full-fledged health psychology. This is due in part to Canada’s socialized health care, its wide geographically distributed population and its public institutions of higher education. Nonetheless in recent years there has been little to distinguish Canadian and American approaches to health psychology as each side of the border has become preoccupied with publishing in the same journals and attracting similar research funds. Canadian health psychology developed along different lines than the US variety just across the border. Some critical thoughts are offered.
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**Session 4, Room 061: ESHHS Business Meeting**

*Chair: Annette Mülberger*
Thursday July 19
Munting building, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, Groningen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 09:30-10:30  | **KEYNOTE (Room 061)**  
“Multiple issues”: History of the human sciences & Wikipedia  
*Alice White, Wellcome Collection, London* | **Trends in publication**  
Chair: Ian Lubek  
- *Jeremy Burman*: Trust in databases: On what’s missing in “What is history of psychology?”  
Chair: Stefan Gruijters  
- *John Arkenbout*: The end of great stories and the advance of ever-smaller questions  
- *Lisa Wijsen*: What’s on the mind of the psychometrician? Interviews with Psychometric Society Presidents  
- *Christopher Green et al.*: Which Statistical Tests Have Which Psychological Subdisciplines Been Using for How Long? | **Psychology in crisis (Room 061)**  
Chair: Ruud Abma  
- *Henderikus Stam*: Once more with feeling: The eternal recurrence of the reproducibility crisis in psychology  
- *Annette Mülberger*: When and why did psychologists start to worry about replication?  
- *Jill Morawski*: The Psychologies of Psychologists in Times of Crises: A Comparative Analysis |
| 10:30-11:00  | **COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie**                                        |                                                                           |                                                                           | **Conference Dinner at De Rietschans, Haren**  
17:45 bus arrives at the Munting building; 18:00 bus leaves for De Rietschans; 18:15 arrival at De Rietschans; 22:00 return to Groningen, Grote Markt |
Session 1, Room 061: Keynote

Chair: Jeremy Burman

“Multiple issues”: History of the human sciences & Wikipedia

Alice White (Wellcome Collection, London, UK)

Every day, more than 1,750 people visit Wikipedia to read about the history of the human sciences. What are they finding? How is the history of human sciences represented on the 5th most-viewed website in the world? The answer is complicated, and some subjects are better covered than others. Some pages even include a banner at the top that warns readers about “multiple issues” affecting the content that follows. (The page devoted to the “History of economic thought” has had such a banner since 2014.) Wikipedia’s ability to influence the public understanding of academic fields is significant, but in the past, academics have been reluctant to engage with the online encyclopaedia and many articles today could benefit significantly from expert engagement.

In this talk, I will share insights from my time as Wikimedian-in-Residence at the Wellcome Trust, survey the information available on the history of the human sciences, and then discuss why—and how—historians can be involved in shaping the way that history is told online.
Trust in databases: On what’s missing in “What is history of psychology?”

Jeremy Trevelyan Burman (University of Groningen, the Netherlands)

A recent examination of the journal-to-journal citations from articles published in the three “primary journals” of the History of Psychology provided a series of insights about the specialty, including the suggestion that it perhaps ought to be considered an inter-discipline (Burman, 2018). However, the analyses relied on the data behind the Journal Impact Factor (JIF) system. This then brought strengths (which were used to inform an examination of disciplinary interests). And it also imported weaknesses. Some of these relate to the method by which impact factors are determined. Others reflect commercial interests. And still others reflect the present bias toward journal publishing. This presentation engages in depth with the first weakness, although I also intend to mention the other two.

The method used in the earlier article was social network analysis, operationalized using journal-to-journal citations reported in the Journal Citation Reports (JCR) and interpreted through a variation on Granovetter’s (1973, 1983) “strength of weak ties.” By relying on the JCR, the analyses took advantage of the vetting done initially by Thomson Reuters and now continued by Clarivate Analytics. As a result, the citations could be counted on to reflect substantive scholarly engagements. But this is a conservative measure. The system can’t be trusted to provide a perfect reflection of the publishing reality.

The main weakness of relying on the JCR data is to accept errors of omission: journal-to-journal citations get dismissed in such an examination. Undertaking studies using these data then produces misleading conclusions. For example: in the earlier analysis, the Review of General Psychology was considered as only a “weak friend” to History of Psychology. But experience and trained judgment suggest this is incorrect. To delve into this as a representative example of what I will call the “trust in databases” problem, each citation reported by the database was then checked by hand (cf. Porter, 1995; also Burman, in press).

Between 2009 and 2015, according to Google Scholar, HoP published 7 articles citing the Review of General Psychology. The JCR says 8, published in 2014 (3), 2012 (3), and 2010 (2). An examination of the publication records in PsycINFO then suggests a possible reason for the discrepancy: to control for unduly-long publication delays inflating citation counts, the JCR may be calculating impact using the “acceptance date” of articles rather than the “print date” (and Pettit, 2016, was accepted on 9 December 2015 but is labelled as having been published the following May).

The JCR reports that HHS has never published an article citing the Review of General Psychology, either within the study window or outside of it. Google Scholar agrees. The reverse, however, is not true: the JCR lists 3 inbound ties to HHS, and Google Scholar reports 5. The previous date problem does not occur, but two of the extra articles—on the unification of psychology—could perhaps be dismissible as commentaries on material that appeared earlier: “editorial material” (see González & Campanario, 2007). Although they are both substantive contributions in their own right, the automated systems governing the JCR’s intake may well dismiss such articles as potentially inflationary: both cite large amounts of material published in an earlier special issue of the journal and both discuss the same topic as the earlier material. And these are the sorts of things that an overly-conservative AI gatekeeper might twist-to, then reject as false positives. JHBS, however, has a similar problem. But it’s more serious. The JCR lists 17 inbound ties from the Review of General Psychology (Google Scholar gives 11), and zero outbound ties. The JCR’s extra six can easily be explained as multiple citations in individual articles. That’s even to be expected from the system behind JIFs. But this is largely irrelevant. It’s the zero that’s damning. It’s also damaging, in terms of the analyses reported in the previous article, because it eliminated a mutual citation.
So why the omission? Google Scholar finds 3 articles published in JHBS that cite the Review of General Psychology. All three are substantive (Benjafield, 2010; Devonis, 2012; Gillaspy, Brinegar, & Bailey, 2014). One possible explanation for the omission is that none of them include DOIs in their references. This could plausibly be a problem for an AI, but I looked: none of the PDFs from the journal list DOIs. Indeed, that seems to be the house style. In the online versions of articles, DOIs included in manuscripts then instead become links directly to CrossRef, and the AI could easily be reading these. That’s not the problem. Nor are the three articles potentially inflationary in the same way as the HHS articles. It’s something else.

My present suspicion is that the JCR’s AI is over-generalizing the “editorial material” category. But I can’t see how that would occur in application to these three articles. I’m hoping the audience has ideas, so we can either fix the JIF AI or we can avoid doing whatever it is that is causing these articles to be ignored. In either case, however, this error of omission stands as a further example of why we cannot simply trust the numbers produced even by trusted systems.
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Public discourse on psychology in contemporary Greece: An archaeological investigation of newspaper archives, 1975-2009

Vassiliki Giakoumatou (University of Groningen, the Netherlands)

When you think of psychology in relation to Greece, the names that come to mind are most likely those of philosophers; especially Aristotle and Plato. Indeed, the Ancients speculated on a wide range of psychological topics, planting the seed for psychology within philosophical subfields (Boundless, 2016; Georgas, 1995; Danziger, 2008). Yet the establishment of modern psychology as a scientific discipline didn’t get underway until the 19th century, when the term “psychology” began to replace “mental philosophy” (Boundless, 2016). That story, however, can be located in a place as well as a time: especially in Germany and America, as well as in England and France. In Greece, the story of psychology is altogether different. And we can use one to reflect upon the other.

Greek psychology remained a sub-field of philosophy until relatively recently (Kazolea-Tavoulari, 2001; Dafermos, Marvakis, & Triliva, 2006). Indeed, the demarcation of psychology from philosophy in contempo-
Erevan Greece took place very recently, compared to the rest of the Western World: starting in the 1970s, rather than in the 1870s (Georgas, 1995). This recency then affords several benefits for a psychologist seeking to reflect on the more distant past. One of these is the fuller documentation of the public discourse. And that, in short, is the aim of the current study: to trace the psychologization of Greek society using methods drawn from the combination of a Foucaultian archaeology and the digital humanities, and then use them to elaborate on some possible reasons for the change. In other words, the recent history of psychology in Greece is used here as a microhistory to examine a larger and more fundamental issue.

I investigated the popular psychological discourse in contemporary Greece, focusing on the recent most prosperous period of the country’s modern history. I also looked at potential underlying reasons for fluctuations, and elaborated on the effects of the founding of dedicated University Departments and Psychological Associations. In addition, and most important, I sought to place the rise of psychology in context. I did this by recognizing that religion has an important role in Greek culture, and proposed that this could be characterized as a “confessional” culture. Thus, I looked at whether the discourse reflected the replacement of a confession to a priest with confession to a psychologist. My hypotheses were that there would be an increase in the number of publicized articles on psychology, especially around the times when the establishment of these important institutions took place, and also that the number of publicized articles about religion would decrease.

Both hypotheses were confirmed quantitatively: I examined coverage of psychological and religious topics in the national newspaper of record, Kathimerini, from just after the fall of the military junta in 1975, until 2009. However, the fluctuation in the number of published articles also led me to turn reflexive; I began to question the quality of my data, and of my methodology. I therefore conducted a third study in order to ensure the trustworthiness of my conclusions. The insights arising led to an exposition of the pitfalls of this form of research: one can’t blindly trust in these numbers (Porter, 1995; cf. Burman, in press). Nevertheless, the findings of the third study did ultimately serve to confirm the findings of the two initial studies: after the establishment of Greek institutions of scientific psychology, the Greek confessional discourse began to turn away from priests and toward psychologists.

The standard histories of the rise of American psychology focus on the science. This project shows that the story may be more complex: yes there was a rise in psychological discourse, but so too was there a decrease in religious talk. Thus we are led to new questions: is this decline in religion also part of the pattern of the rise of American and German (as well as French and English) scientific psychology? Or are there fundamental national differences in the psychologization of society?
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Valentina Rizzoli & Arjuna Tuzzi (University of Padova, Italy)

In many areas of knowledge, a history of ideas and a narrative of what has been the evolution of the disciplines have been developed from a theoretical, epistemological and methodological point of view. What often happens is that this history becomes, over time, a history told in the light of what is known ex-post. This is only one, albeit important, way of doing history. Also, it can imply the risk of creating ceremonial or presentist histories (cf. Hilgard, Leary, & McGuire, 1991). If we consider the history of a discipline as a social construction, we are aware that each history is constructed from a particular point of view and produced around a community (cf. Danziger, 1995). At least for the major contributions of contemporary scientific and intellectual panorama, there is an alternative starting point of reading the history of a discipline, that is through the journals publications. Scientific journals can be considered the new Agora for the exchange of ideas and for the dissemination of research results, and because they represent a written and documented legacy, it is possible to read the timings of scientific debate across the temporal sequence of the publications.

The present contribution proposes ways of analyses ascribable in a distant reading approach (Moretti, 2013) to digital history (cf. Trevisani & Tuzzi, 2015; Pettit, 2016; Benjafeld, 2017) and aims to portray an history of social psychology starting from the study of a pivotal North American mainstream journal (the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology - JPSP) by highlighting the debated topics contained in it and their trends over time. All the abstracts (from the first publication in 1965 to the last one in 2016) of the journal papers were collected. Abstracts are an effective vehicle of the main papers contents since they should be written to summarize all relevant information (objects, methods, results, and field of applications). Moreover, they represent a text genre that shows linguistic features (standardization, compactness, conciseness) that prove suitable to perform an analysis based on word frequencies in a bag-of-words framework. By means of a (lexical) correspondence analysis (SPAD software), the existence of a latent temporal pattern in keywords’ occurrences has been explored. An overview of the methods, theories and fields of application debated and covered by the journals along years was thus provided by displaying words that mainly characterized every year. Furthermore, in order to detect and retrieve the main topics the journal dealt with over time, an analysis implemented by means of Reinert’s method (1986) was conducted (IRaMuTeQ software) and the presence of the topics along years was then showed (R software). Main results permitted to observe the evolution of journal contents over time, e.g., an initial interest on attitude change, aggression, and decision making, then the cognitive turn with the spread of study on memory, categorization and stereotype, and a more recent interest in well-being and close relationship. Publications trends will be described reflecting on the contribution of these methods for the study of the history/ies of scientific disciplines.
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A Forgotten Name in the History of Psychological Studies of Volitional Phenomena: Mikhail Vladislavlev (1840-1890)

Irina A. Mironenko (St. Petersburg State University, Russia)

At the turn of the 19th century a new stage in the development of psychological science began, usually labeled as the “modern history of psychology”. The main shift occurred in relation to the methodology of science: experimental method was introduced and introspection was dislodged. The work of those who continued research in line with the old paradigm in the last decades of the 19th c was not popular among the supporters of the new one, and many of those have been forgotten by the new generations, fell into the blind spot of history. This tendency was very clearly expressed in Russia, where during the Soviet period psychological science, partly forcibly, was kept within the frame of a mono-methodological trend, oriented towards the principles of natural-science methodology, including, first and foremost, the privilege of the experimental method.

One of the introspectionists of the late 19th c was Mikhail Vladislavlev. Son of a village priest, he graduated from the seminary and was enrolled in the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. However, he did not graduate from the academy, but took part in the competition at the St.Petersburg University for a grant for education in Germany and received this grant. He studied at the University of Jena, where he attended lectures by Kuno Fischer, Rudolf Hermann Lotze and other prominent German philosophers of the time. He highly appreciated German philosophy, especially Immanuel Kant and Jakob Friedrich Fries, who developed and systematized Kant’s psychological ideas. On his return to St.Petersburg Vladislavlev started lecturing at St.Petersburg University, first as a docent and eventually as a professor and finally the University Rector. Vladislavlev made comprehensive psychological investigations and left several bulky volumes [Vladislavlev, 1866; 1881], in which he highlighted the history of psychology from antiquity to his time and outlined his conception of psychology as a science, presenting a detailed assessment of the structure of mental processes. He developed an original method of introspection, elaborated questioning methods and language analysis methods. Vladislavlev’s psychological conception, which he outlined in two large volumes (more than 1000 pages altogether) of “Psychology: An Investigation of the Basic Phenomena of Psychic Life” [Vladislavlev, 1881], focused on volitional phenomena, rarely addressed by psychologists. Vladislavlev regards the will as the source of all the activities of the individual, which determines the structure and functioning of all psychic processes. He proposes a multilevel classification of volitional phenomena and comprehensive analyses of each level and kind. Of special interest is the way he addresses the problem of the freedom of will basing on an original philosophical anthropology, close to the ideas of Russian Orthodox philosophers.

Due to the radical ”experimental” shift in psychology, Vladislavlev’s name is hardly known to contemporary psychologists, even in the University where he worked. His books were never reprinted, they exist in single copies in the halls of the old book of central libraries in Russia and do not attract any attention of readers. I managed to find only one article about him [Bolshakova, 1997], published in 500 copies in a provincial university twenty years ago and also difficult to find now.

Nowadays psychological science is changing in the context of the global new modernity, which presupposes both general renovation of the domain of psychology, new objects of research, as well as changes in methodology and its general diversification. Psychological science turns to investigating subjectivity phenomena once again, and the work of the introspectionists of the late 19th c can find its place in the history of psychology and contribute to the contemporary development of our science.
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Isolation of science and openness of scientific society: An analysis of reviews of Russian psychologists in the first half of the 20th century

Olga A. Artemeva (Irkutsk State University, Russia)

In order to explore the critical history of Russian psychology during the first half of the 20th century, an analysis of scholarly reviews was undertaken. Among 2342 publications by 41 leading Russian psychologists, 83 reviews by 19 authors were found.

Approximately one-fourth of these reviews were published before the Russian Revolution of 1917; they focused on original and translated publications by foreign philosophers and psychologists, including textbooks. These reviews presented basic overviews and theoretical frameworks of the foreign books and rarely offered criticism. Russian authors in this period tended to criticize foreign publications to the same extent that they criticized the approaches of their fellow countrymen. Most of these reviews were written by psychologists who had studied in European universities – G. G. Shpet, M. M. Rubinstein, A. F. Lazursky. Thus, Russian research before the Revolution was typically compared to that of foreign scientists and thinkers. On one side, this allowed Russian psychology to be a part of global science; on the other side, the standards were set by the achievements of foreign research and philosophy rather than by national science. The abrupt change of the social order affected the contents of the reviews in psychology. After the Revolution of 1917 the characteristics of the reviewed books also changed: foreign publications were soon replaced by more Russian textbooks and monographs. Reviews of foreign publications were mostly limited to A. R. Luria's reports on Austrian and German psychologists: S. Freud, K. Lewin, and their colleagues. In 1928 and 1930 he also prepared reviews of the publications of F. Koffka, Vm. A. White, and E. Jaensch, offering both criticism and positive assessment. In the 1920s Russian psychologists apparently were following the prompting of Vladimir Lenin (1922) to make use of foreign achievements to construct distinctly Soviet science.

After 1930 no leading Soviet psychologist published a review of any foreign publication. During the following years reviews of publications by Russian psychologists took the form of critical reviews, and foreign authors could be mentioned only in the context of criticism of so-called bourgeois psychology. Contradictions between Soviet and bourgeois science caused the isolation of Soviet science. At the same time, the designated vector of the development of Soviet science contributed to the purposeful collective work of researchers; through mutual criticism of the proposed approaches, they formed common criteria for assessing the content of scientific and educational work on psychology. In the 1930s several textbooks on psychology were published, the content of which was always subject to discussion in reviews by the Soviet psychologists.

Thus, over the first half of the 20th century there were changes in publication frequency, subject matter, and assessment criteria in the reviews that were studied. After the Revolution the leading psychologists rarely published reviews: centralization of publication starting in 1931 closed the psychological journals that had been controlled by scholarly societies. Reviews of foreign-authored publications ceased altogether. Instead, the Soviet publications simply criticized the ideas of foreign researchers, without detailed reviews. Under conditions of isolation externally imposed on science, the authors of reviews were required to focus on the content of Soviet textbooks on psychology.
The reviews by Russian psychologists during the first half of the 20th century demonstrate both the essential openness of scientific society and the increasing pressure from the side of isolationist Soviet scientific policy.

This research is supported by a Grant of the President of Russian Federation (Project No. MD-1443.2017.6).
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Vladimir Bekhterev’s Scientific Heritage in Russian Psychology

Natalia Loginova (St. Petersburg State University, Russia)

In 2017 Russian psychologists celebrated 160th anniversary of V.M. Bekhterev. It is now believed that he was not only the outstanding psychiatrist and researcher of the brain, but also a great Russian psychologist. He had published his objective psychology concept at the very beginning of the 1900’s and eventually created a theory which is known as reflexology. This theory was claimed to be a new type of psychology based on: the objective method, the ideas of the reflex, the universal energy and neuropsyche. His ideas and organizational activity strongly influenced Russian psychology, especially in St. Petersburg. Under his influence, the St. Petersburg psychological school was founded on the principles which were close to those of the natural science. In psychology his name stands next to but still in the shadow of Ivan Pavlov. Pavlov was a Nobel Prize laureate. Bekhterev was presented to the Nobel Prize committee but was not awarded the prize. It is believed that the reason for the absence of the Prize was he worked in a cross-discipline way and did not focus on one specific is Myasishchev sue.

His ideas were ahead of his time and therefore, have not found true appreciation during the first half of the 20th century. His theory was severely criticized in the 1920s and 1930s as non-Marxist. His followers were forced to publicly condemn their tutor. Nevertheless, Bekhterev was not forgotten and his scientific direction was developed into the comprehensive human research approach. The Bekhterev Institute of Brain (1918-1948) became the center for such development. Even during the period of the Great Terror of the 1930s the Institute organized scientific conferences in Leningrad (now St. Petersburg) to honor Vladimir Bekhterev.

However, for the majority of Soviet psychologists Bekhterev remained persona non grata until almost the 1960s. The renaissance of Bekhterev as a psychologist started after 1957 when Bekhterev’s 100th anniversary was festively celebrated in the USSR, particularly in Leningrad.

We distinguish three branches of Bekhterev’s School in the Soviet psychology:
1. Anthropological psychology of Boris Ananiev (1907-1972)
2. Personality attitude theory of Vladimir Myasischev (1893-1973)

Each of those researchers undertook and developed the main ideas of Bekhterev.

Boris Ananiev developed the idea of the personality as the individuality which is an integral wholeness of human being. He organized a big comprehensive multi-measured and multi-level research in St. Petersburg University (1966-1972). Ananiev represented individuality as a closed system with a multi-level heteroge-
neous structure and inner subjective world (now some psychologists call it “a soul”). Ananiev stated that an inner subjective world could only be comprehended through the open systems of an individual as the personality and subject.

Vladimir Myasishchev created the Attitude Theory which incorporated not only Bekhterev’s ideas but the ones of Bekhterev’s collaborator’s A. Lazursky, as well of Marxism. According to Myasishchev, personality is a three dimensional system of the attitudes to the world and the self. He was a psychologist, psychiatrist and psychotherapist and his theory became popular in the clinical practice.

Boris Lomov, initially an Ananiev’s student, later became the first director of the Institute of Psychology at the Academy of Science in Moscow. Under his leadership, the Institute conducted cross-disciplinary research of the human being. B. F. Lomov had always referred to Bekhterev as an eminent scientist who established the modern Russian psychology.

The paper is sponsored by The Russian Fund of Fundamental Research, project #17-06-00484
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Session 3, Room 061: Development of methodology

Chair: Stefan Gruijters

The end of great stories and the advance of ever-smaller questions

John Arkenbout (Open University of the Netherlands)

One of the most salient features in current human sciences is that there are so many ever smaller questions and so many statistics, to paraphrase philosopher Harry Frankfurt (2004).

Science historians know: sciences once started small, but have grown with great stories to answer great questions. Until about a century ago, science was still fairly clear. It was mainly practiced by the smartest men in the elite of society, who had time and resources to study a wide array of different fields and sometimes develop into homo universalis. And they told great stories, developed great theories that are still being built on by current science. Some of these great stories even have kept (and still keep) scientists hostage.

Now we live in a time when the sciences have been democratized, and are no longer only practiced by men from higher circles. The amount of scientific knowledge has multiplied, science has been further refined, the number of scientists has increased enormously. Sciences have grown into complex knowledge systems, with more and more universities as ‘science factories’ in which countless people carry out research in many fields, report their results in an inscrutable multitude of scientific journals and devise and develop things that are supposed to be useful to society. In addition, students are trained in the broad outlines of that knowledge and the required methodology to acquire knowledge, so that it can be transferred and expanded.

This has a price. The homo universalis seems to be a thing of the past, and specialization is the norm. Great stories do not seem to exist anymore, small questions about small problems have replaced them. Words are more and more replaced by numbers as main instruments of science. In 1979 the French postmodernist Lyotard already announced the end of the great stories, at least of the great stories in science. According to him, science needs rationality and evidence, preferably (repeatedly) measurable, because usefulness and achievement become more important than narratives, which we should leave to the ‘unscientific’ part of the world and to the study of literature.

However, the end of big stories and the emphasis on specialization seems to lead to an ever-increasing fragmentation within the human sciences, to the promotion of (statistical) research methods from the mean to the end of science, and to the putting in parenthesis of large theories, philosophy and history of science. In my presentation I will try to outline what this means from a philosophical point of view, especially for the theory, the philosophy and the history of the human sciences.
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What’s on the mind of the psychometrician? Interviews with Psychometric Society Presidents

Lisa D. Wijsen (University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands)

Psychometrics is the scientific field devoted to measurement and prediction of psychological phenomena. Psychometric models (e.g. the common factor model, the Rasch model) are often used for measurement or prediction of psychological attributes, such as intelligence or personality dimensions. This tradition started in 1904, when Spearman constructed the common factor model, which measured what he called ‘general intelligence’ in an objective fashion. Since then, psychometric models have been used to measure a wide variety of psychological attributes, such as cognitive abilities (Thurstone, 1935), attitudes (Thurstone, 1928) or personality (Cattell, 1945), and form the theoretical basis of the cognitive or mental test. Testing has taken up a prominent place in our society: not only do most people encounter at least one of them in their lives, important decisions are based on their results (e.g. are you accepted into a school, or will you get the job?). Psychometrics has thus become an influential research domain, both in science and in society at large. However, psychometricians are strongly divided on topics such as the relation with psychology, and the actual goal of psychometrics. For example, the psychometrician can be considered to be the methodological advisor to the psychologist that is interested in using psychometric techniques, but psychometrics has also gained enough credentials to be considered a field of its own, with its own research traditions. And speaking of the relation with psychology, is psychometrics supposed to contribute to the construction of psychological theories, or should it focus more on data analytic techniques for prediction? To map the ideas of psychometricians about their own research area, I interviewed 20 presidents of the Psychometric Society, in which I asked them questions on three themes: their career, the relations between psychometrics and other disciplines -such as psychology and statistics - and the history and future of psychometrics. In this talk, I will elaborate on some of the findings. Besides a wealth of historical information and anecdotes, the interviews provide a nuanced and diverse image of psychometrics. One of the interesting findings is that the interviewees differ greatly on what they see is the role of psychometrics in relation to other fields. Some consider psychometrics as a science of consultation, helping the psychologist out with their complicated data analysis; others are convinced psychometrics itself should be strongly influenced by psychology and vice versa. Many of them stress the fact that they are not familiar enough with psychology to say anything intelligent about it, implying the field of psychometrics can be carried out without in depth knowledge of psychology. Whereas the interviewees stress the importance of psychometrics’ achievements – often mentioned are ‘the mental test’ or ‘objective measurement’ - they also emphasize their frustration with the lack of psychometrics in psychological science and testing agencies. Furthermore, they highly vary on their ideas of the future of psychometrics: some argue psychometrics should open up to new developments such as neuroscience or data mining, whereas others find it important to protect the unique skills and knowledge psychometricians have. Besides preserving the testimonies of frontrunners of psychometrics, the interviews provide an interesting peek into the mind of the psychometrician.
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Which Statistical Tests Have Which Psychological Subdisciplines Been Using for How Long?

Christopher D. Green, Mark C. Adkins, Eric Austerberry, Ian J. Davidson, Julian DiGiovanni, Natalia Lysenko, & Laura Villani (York University, Toronto, Canada)

For decades now, the statistical procedures that have become more or less “standard” in psychological research – various forms of the null hypothesis significance tests (NHST) – have been called into question. It is important to note that these criticisms come not just from those who dispute the appropriateness of taking a quantitative approach to psychology, but also from many who are advocates of the quantitative approach and who also believe that it is ill-served by NHST. Some of these oppose NHST in principle, but most draw attention to the ways in which NHST has been poorly practiced by many research psychologists, and its results poorly handled by many journal editors. Many powerful critiques of these practices were published back in the 1960s (e.g., Bakan, 1967; Cohen, 1965; Lykken, 1968; Meehl, 1967; Nunnally, 1960; Rosenthal & Galto, 1963; Rozeboom, 1960). There was more criticism through the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s (e.g., Abelson, 1995; Cohen, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994; Rosenthal, 1979; Wilkinson, 1999). Finally, in the early 21st century, matters came to a head and we now appear to be in a period of rapid transformation of the ways in which statistical analysis is used and interpreted (e.g., Cumming, 2014; Cumming & Finch, 2005; Ioannidis, 2005, 2008; John, Loewenstein, & Prelec, 2012; Lehrer, 2010; Masicampo & Lalande, 2012; Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn, 2011; Wagenmakers, 2007; Wagenmakers, Wetzels, Borsboom, & van der Maas, 2011; Ziliak & McCloskey, 2008).

Despite these older critiques and the burgeoning new reform movement, we actually know fairly little about the process by which inferential statistical tests like NHST came to dominate psychological research in the first place. We all know the general outlines of the development of statistical thinking in the sciences (Gigerenzer, 2004; Gigerenzer et al., 1990; Hacking, 1975, 1990; Rucci & Tweney, 1980; Stigler, 1986), but there is very little detail about the exact “shape” of psychology’s adoption of inferential statistics. For instance, which areas of psychology were first to embrace z, t, χ2, F, and r? When did they do so? What proportion of research articles in each area of psychology used each of these statistics in the 1940s, the 1950s, the 1960s, and so on? Which statistical tests became popular in which subdisciplines at which times? Did tests that were once popular in one or another area later decline and come to be replaced by new tests? Remarkably, fundamental baseline information of this sort has not, to date, been compiled and interpreted by historians. To address this significant gap in our historical knowledge, we are conducting an extensive survey of seven prominent psychological journals: Developmental Psychology, Journal of Abnormal (and Social) Psychology, Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Experimental Psychology (General), Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. We are surveying the full text of every fifth year in each of these journals from 1945 (or the journal’s first appearance, where later) up to 2015. This represents more than 10,000 individual articles. Our ultimate aim is to find every instance of the use of the five statistics listed above. Once the basic database is complete, we will be able to query it on a variety of issues. In addition to the questions suggested above, we might see whether higher-status universities (e.g., the Ivies, Michigan, Chicago, Iowa, Berkeley, Stanford) began extensive use of inferential statistical tests earlier than the lower-status universities and colleges. Also, were there regional differences in the use of statistics?

Eventually, we will investigate pertinent questions such as how early we find evidence of p-hacking (Simmons et al., 2011), HARKing (Kerr, 1998), and other questionable research practices that are so much the focus of the critiques of psychology’s statistical analysis today, whether and how such practices changed over time, and how they have been historically distributed across the various topic areas of psychology. Subordinate issues might include questions of the growth of the literature itself – i.e., is it proportional to the growth in the number of psychologists or has there been a per-capita expansion in psychological publishing?
The outcome of this research will be the foundation of an area of historical study with respect to psychology the surface of which has only been scratched, as yet – the development of the discipline's statistical and methodological practices. It is an area where the new style of digital investigation will combine productively with traditional qualitative historiographic methods to produce knowledge that was virtually impossible to acquire before the widespread availability of computer databases.

Notes
1 r, of course, is not inferential, but it was a commonly used statistic in the early discipline, so we have included it here.
2 Some journals changed their names during the period under investigation. The parentheticals indicate how we are going to handle this matter.
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Session 3, Room 074: Panel session on narrative knowledge in science

Chair: Csaba Pleh

Panel introduction: Between Narrative and Science: Historicizing Narrative Knowledge in the Modern Discipline of Psychology

Kim M. Hajek (Narrative Science Project, London School of Economics, London, UK)

What epistemic roles does narrative play in the modern scientific discipline of psychology and how might narrative intersect productively with persistent anxiety about the reliability of psychological methods and findings? If we review the discipline from its emergence in the second half of the nineteenth century, we can find many instances of narrative in the monographs, case histories, and pedagogical texts generated by researchers in the field. It is notorious that Freud likened his case histories to short stories; reciprocally, and several decades earlier, Zola proposed the “experimental novel” as the means to extend scientific methods from physiology into psychology. But was and is it possible for psychology as a science to reconcile writing “all the style of a novel” and generating “scrupulously true and scientifically analysed fact”? Joseph Grasset claimed both these attributes for his 1890 pedagogical case history of an hysteric, and in this session, we explore ways that narrative has served an important epistemological function in psychology beyond simply that of “spinning stories.”

In this, our session contributes to a growing strand in the history of science which examines narrative as a form of knowing within the modern sciences. Articles in a recent issue of *SHPS* considered narrative for its role in creating coherence or helping resolve complex scientific problems. We extend this approach to the discipline of scientific psychology across contexts from the subject-focused observations and experiments of late nineteenth-century France and Italy, to the internationalised discipline promoted by twentieth-century American textbooks. For if narrative is readily identified in psychological texts—much more so than in some natural sciences, for instance—its presence often sits uneasily with psychologists’ conceptions and defence of their work as science. Hence the surprising effect of Grasset’s play on novelistic style in his case history.

Uneasiness with narrative is particularly evident in late twentieth-century psychology, which tends to dismiss narrative as mere storytelling, a shortcut leading scientists away from best practice. The first paper in our session introduces and historicizes these concerns. By reconstructing intersections between storytelling—in data production and analysis—and textbook depictions of psychology as a discipline, Ivan Flis demonstrates the crucial pedagogical role played by narrative and argues for its fundamental function in advancing the always “unfinished” work of contemporary psychologists. Subsequent presentations take up the epistemological questions raised by contemporary narrative knowing and explore how they might be contrasted productively with practices and writings from the beginnings of psychology. David Horn and Kim Hajek notably interrogate how narrative contributed to making scientific knowledge out of observations and experiments on exceptional subjects. Horn focuses on two women subjects who circulated across national and disciplinary boundaries, Léonie Leboulanger and Eusapia Palladino, while Hajek tracks the multiple retellings of the case of a third: Féïda X… and her double personality. Each paper explores the ways in which the stories produced by human scientists worked to channel the extraordinary phenomena displayed by these women—by explaining, by re-explaining, and by explaining away. Ultimately, our presentations begin to map out the ways in which narrative has been deployed in the modern science of psychology and why “narrative knowing” might matter to the discipline.
Storytelling in an Unfinished Science: Replication Crisis and Textbooks as Disciplinary Overviews (1950–2018)

Ivan Flis (Utrecht University, the Netherlands)

In 2012, the famous academic blogger Neuroskeptic published a paper in Perspectives on Psychological Science with the tongue-in-cheek title The Nine Circles of Scientific Hell. In it, “[i]n the spirit of Dante Alighieri’s Inferno” the blogger lists scientists’ “sins against best practice.” The third circle of Neuroskeptic’s scientific hell is reserved for the post-hoc storytellers – the psychologists who spin stories based on loose interpretation and guesswork after the data has been collected. A historian or a philosopher might ask: what is data-driven storytelling, and has it always been a “questionable research practice,” which itself is a new epistemologically and morally loaded term? In this paper, I will use the contemporary controversy about storytelling and data-production as a showcase of how psychologists’ genres of writing, style of argumentation, and methodological questions are bundled together. I will connect it to a particular textbook description of psychology that portrays the discipline as an unfinished science. The description of psychology as a discipline I will reconstruct comes from Hilgard’s Introduction to Psychology, an extremely successful undergraduate psychology textbook that has been republished and translated from the 1950s to today. Looking at it from the level of introductory textbooks, storytelling fulfilled a crucial epistemological function for scientific psychologists in the post-WWII world that students were inculcated with from the earliest courses in their bachelor’s degree. A stable core of disciplinary sanctioned methods of data production and analysis coupled with a specific mode of arguing about that data produced an unfinished science, but in the view of its producers, one that was progressing.
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Narrating the Extraordinary: Léonie Leboulanger, Eusapia Palladino, and the Agency of the Experimental Subject

David Horn (The Ohio State University, Columbus OH, USA)

This paper focuses on two extraordinary women, Léonie Leboulanger and Eusapia Palladino, to explore the agency of experimental research subjects at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Both women worked as professional mediums, and both were frequently studied by human scientists—the first in relation to the doubling of the personality, clairvoyance, and “hypnotism at a distance” (by Pierre Janet, Charles Richet, Frederick Myers, and Julian Ochorowicz), and the second in relation to “physical” mediumship (by Cesare Lombroso, Richet, Myers, William James, Hugo Münsterberg, and many others). Each woman
circulated across national and disciplinary boundaries, appearing in the laboratories and homes of psychologists, philosophers, and others; and each also moved through the pages of scholarly journals and the popular press, in which stories were told about their remarkable abilities—to communicate at a distance, to become multiple selves, to move objects, or (especially in the case of Palladino) to deceive onlookers. Alongside the elaboration of new protocols—for conducting and reproducing experiments, for verifying or exposing the accomplishments of mediums—human scientists developed new modes of narration, of writing experimental subjects into (or out of) the accounts they produced. In neither case was the experimental subject frequently authorized to speak, or at least not directly. Rather, scientists worked through the stories they told to manage the extraordinary—sometimes to make a new kind of sense, sometimes to explain away, sometimes to debunk. The varied ways experimental subjects were imagined and their stories were narrated were tied, I want to suggest, to negotiations of the status of emergent forms of knowledge, to the policing of boundaries between science and pseudo-science, and to changing perceptions of the promise and dangers of certain kinds of extraordinary ability.
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“Je vais raconter l’histoire d’une jeune femme”: Retelling the Story of Félida X… in Emerging French Psychology.

Kim M. Hajek (Narrative Science Project, London School of Economics, London, UK)

In May 1876, psychologically inclined readers could first study in detail “the story of a young woman whose existence [was] tormented by an alteration of memory which presents no analogy in science.” The young woman in question was Félida X… and her “doubled life” would go on to become one of the cases most often retold in the nascent psychological science of late nineteenth-century France. Following Eugène Azam’s twenty-four reiterations and updates to his observation of Félida, and references, re-uses, and critiques by savants from Alfred Binet to Jules Liégeois, Pierre Janet could jest that Félida was the real founder of the Chair of Experimental and Comparative Psychology at the Collège de France. If together, the multiple (re-)deployments of Félida’s story worked to advance the discipline of scientific psychology, individually, they supported distinct theoretical and methodological perspectives. In the process, it was not only the epistemic import of Félida’s case which varied, but also the very substance of the story itself—its structure, style, and even content.

In this paper, I combine close analysis of Azam’s work on Félida with readings of its re-use by other researchers, and begin to trace the influence of this exemplary case on the emerging body of psychological knowledge. By investigating how researchers’ epistemic exigencies articulated with the ways they configured Félida’s story, the paper moreover provides a case study into how narrative knowing operated in the early days of French psychology. Azam’s communication bears notable narrative features, such as intertwining
the stories of Félida’s “doubled lives” and Azam’s journey of discovery, and incorporating Félida’s own reports of certain episodes. When did other researchers retain these elements and reapply the story in its “original” form, as a pre-digested segment of narrative? What changed when they reworked Azam’s account for their own purposes, and how did Azam’s incredibly frequent updates and reiterations of the case complicate the process of generalising from Félida’s condition? At stake is to elucidate when and how narrative knowing or narrative style was fundamental to making psychological knowledge out of Félida’s story—and concomitantly, to identify instances when narrative did not come into play. Finally, we can speculate as to whether such use of narrative is characteristic of an emerging science, of psychology as a particular kind of science, or just idiosyncratic to what is, after all, an exceptional case.
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Once more with feeling: The eternal recurrence of the reproducibility crisis in psychology

Henderikus J. Stam (University of Calgary, Canada)

The reproducibility crisis that has plagued psychology (and related fields) in the recent past is neither new nor particularly original. Many of the issues raised have been quietly or not-so-quietly discussed for the better part of five decades, albeit without much effect. To name but a few: In 1959 Theodore Sterling referred to a general problem of “publication bias” or the bias that occurs when successful research is more likely to be published than unsuccessful research. Martin Orne created a stir in social psychology with his notion of “demand characteristics” in 1962. Robert Rosenthal published a major paper on “covert communication” in psychological experiments in 1967, following his widely discussed work on the “Pygmalion effect.” In 1976 Theodore Barber was able to summarize “ten pitfalls” in human research that included a host of issues that we now commonly associate with the reproducibility crisis. These included such common issues as the “investigator data analysis effect” and the “experimenter unintentional expectancy effect.” In writing his book Barber was able to draw on several decades worth of commentary and research that had already laid bare fundamental problems associated with reproducibility, accuracy and experimenter effects. Furthermore, the so-called “crisis in social psychology” had also opened - albeit for a brief period - a discussion about the applicability and meaningfulness of social psychological laboratory research in the late 1960s and 1970s. Without resolving this crisis, social psychologists quietly went back to work after abandoning the tradition of high-impact experiments such as Milgram’s obedience research. What remained most vexing about these ongoing issues were the epistemological problems that were routinely shoved under the carpet in favor of discussions of methodological fixes. By focusing on methods, psychologists neither had to face nor to attempt a serious alteration of their favored technological tools. They could recommend instead a greater attention to detail and a more fastidious following of the rules of methodology. What remained unexamined in both this previous literature on the “pitfalls” of research and today’s crisis were the loose theoretical foundations that made the problems of reproducibility so regnant. Psychology had long ago settled for a flexible functionalism (what I have referred to as an indeterminate functionalism). Functional theoretical categories are highly flexible, which makes their use ubiquitous in psychological research. One can modify, adjust, shift, or otherwise add new functional entities with relative ease. It allows the neophyte rapid access to psychological ‘theory’ and enables new graduate students, never mind researchers, to create their own ‘theories’ effortlessly. It also allows for the indefinite multiplication of such theories. As a consequence, the relationship among the constructs of such theories is very loose and their connection to a world of human action is dependent on the creativity of the researcher. The failure to replicate findings across studies should not then surprise anyone.
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When and why did psychologists start to worry about replication?

Annette Mülberger (CEHIC, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain)

My talk starts with some general definition of the term “replication” and remarks on the historiography about experimentation, recalling the discussion about this feature of scientific practice in the works of Collins, 1985, Galison, 1987, and others. Then I’ll deal with the history of experimentation and how scientists became concerned with repetition and replication of experiments. Schickore (2011), for example, stated that re-doing other investigators’ experiments became an issue around 1670. Moreover, she examined the case of an Italian microscopist and physiologist (Felice Fontana), who in the late eighteenth-century stressed the importance of repetition of his own experiments in which he proved the origin and effects of viper’s venom. The review of historical cases seems helpful to get to know what these scientists understood by “repetition”, “re-doing an experiment” or “replication” and why they thought that this should be part of the process of knowledge construction.

When did psychologists get concerned about replication? Kant who examined the possibility of psychology becoming a real science mentioned as one obstacle the non-replicability of psychological introspection (Sturm, 2009). Thus, in the 19th century, for Fechner, Wundt, Titchener and their disciples the demonstration of psychological experiments being replicated was crucial. When Calkins and her student Nevers replicated in the 1890ies Jastrow’s association experiments, she found slightly different results (Nevers, 1895; Calkins, 1896). Jastrow (1896a, 1896b) reacted furiously, arguing that their experiments were no real replications of his. With historical cases like this, my research contradicts Makel, Plucker and Hegarty’s (2012) finding and shows that replication played a role early on in psychological experimentation, due to psychology’s aspiration to discover universal laws. The historical analysis of a selection of experimental reports evidences also how the technical aspects and epistemological approaches to replication changed over time.
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The Psychologies of Psychologists in Times of Crises: A Comparative Analysis

Jill Morawski (Wesleyan University, Middletown CT, USA)

Following a period of nearly unbridled scientific success, much of psychology faces what is termed a re-producibility "crisis," producing a cascade of critiques and recommendations for reform of scientific practices. Psychology also confronted what was understood as a crisis 50 years ago, similarly prompting critical analyses and proposed reforms. That earlier crisis passed, and save several methodological changes, many researchers retrospectively regarded it as a “minor perturbation” (Jones, 1985, p. 49). As Bill McGuire diagnosed, the anxieties about the science’s wellbeing were principally psychological: he used stage theory to
explain the crisis as a “suspiciousness problem” that progressed from denial, to coping, and ultimately to an “exploitation phase” wherein the suspiciousness problem was reduced to an “interesting experimental variable in its own right” (1969, p. 14). McGuire’s hypothesis is one of the psychologies of the psychologist proffered during the previous crisis and although going largely without comment, the current situation, too, has generated psychologies of the psychologist, claims ranging from bullying to unconscious cognitive biases. This paper examines the kinds of psychologizing of the psychologist advanced during these two crises. The examination heeds Peter Galison’s advice “to take the experimenter’s anxiety seriously” and explore how that anxiety is productive for scientists (1997, p. 233-234). The current crisis gives greater attention to replication yet the two crises have much in common, including proclaimed apprehensions about a various scientific practices (Sharpe & Whelton, 2016), a shared epistemology, and appreciation of replication as entangled not only with methods but also with validity, reliability, honesty, philosophical ‘truth,’ writing styles, ‘situations,’ ethics, career advancement, unobserved yet believed in (moderator) variables, and the very nature of the investigative objects (Morawski & Derksen, 2017). Despite commonalities, the psychologizing of these two episodes of disquietude differ. Recent appraisals of psychologists are distinctive in several respects: their high frequency, embeddedness in articles ostensibly discussing scientific matters, admixture of the psychological and the moral, and use of findings from experimental psychology to explain psychologists’ actions. The current appraisals also mark a notable shift from attending to the knower in the laboratory, to the knower in her post-experimental engagement with laboratory data. The previous heightened concern about researchers’ subjective psychological states focused primarily on her presence (both her actions and psychological status) in the experimental setting. By contrast, the current worries give little attention to the experimenter in situ. Additionally, the two periods generated distinctive ethical qualms. Consistent with attentiveness to the investigative situation, the earlier discontent targeted the ethics of experimentation and the moral (and political) bases of psychology’s models when they were extended to technologies of social control. By contrast, whenever ethics enter the current conversations over replication and best scientific practice, they center on post-experimental activities, primarily on truthful data analysis and reporting.

The different psychologies that were offered to explain psychologists’ psychologies illuminate scientist’s anxieties during these two periods. Close analysis finds that the earlier crisis, focused primarily on laboratory life, seriously contemplated the psychology of subjects and experimenters and, importantly to their social interactions. Here the work of Martin Orne and Robert Rosenthal exemplify the psychological explanations of psychologists though, to note, some researchers drew upon political theory to explain psychologists’ psychology. By contrast, the recent crisis, with pronounced interest in post-experiment practices, attends largely to the cognitive biases that influence data analysis; these accounts rely on explanatory models in cognitive psychology and behavior economics. These two borrowings of contemporary psychology of the period demonstrate the “circuity” of psychology described by Graham Richards (2002).

The psychologies of psychologists generated during the two crisis periods thus can be appreciated as reflexive acts, yet they also need to regarded in cultural context. The paper concludes by considering the socio-political environments in which these crises transpired: the first emerging in an atmosphere of human/civil rights and a liberal ethos of change, and the second in a moment of global financial unrest, deregulation, and a neoliberal ethos regarding human life.
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Conference dinner at De Rietschans in Haren

17:45 – Bus arrives at the Munting building
18:00 – Bus leaves for De Rietschans;
18:15 – Arrival at De Rietschans;
22:00 – Return to Groningen, Grote Markt
Friday July 20

Munting building, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, Groningen
## Friday July 20

**Munting building, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, Groningen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Session 1 10:00-11:30</th>
<th>Session 2 12:00-13:30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 061</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curriculum development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Arthur Arruda Leal Ferreira</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reflecting on pioneers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Renato Foschi &amp; Andrea Romano:</strong> The</td>
<td><strong>Chair: Jannes Eshuis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>foundation of the degree in psychology in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy during the Cold War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Csaba Pleh:</strong> The psychology degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>programs in Hungary: 1960s-1990s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Miki Takasuna:</strong> History of certifying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>psychologists in Japan compared with that of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>psychotherapists in Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 074</strong></td>
<td><strong>Psychoanalysis, religion &amp; the occult</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Anna Borgos</strong></td>
<td><strong>The context of psychiatry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Marco Innamorati &amp; Ruggero Taradel:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Maarten Derksen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jung and the Catholic Church: The turning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>point of 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Júlia Gyimesi:</strong> From Occultism to Symbol-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation: Herbert Silberer the Outsider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• David Clark:</strong> Witch-hunts: The intersection of the Psychoanalytic Interpretation of History and Group Psychology applied to Colonial America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:30-12:00</strong></td>
<td><strong>COFFEE BREAK in the Orangerie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 061</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reflecting on pioneers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Jannes Eshuis</strong></td>
<td><strong>The context of psychiatry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Liesbet de Kock:</strong> From rhythm to sense.</td>
<td><strong>Chair: Maarten Derksen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The relation between Wundt’s metronome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experiments and his psychological analysis of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meaningful speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• João Moreira:</strong> José H. Ferreira Marques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the History of Psychology in Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**• Luiz Eduardo Prado da Fonseca &amp; Hugo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonardo Rocha Silva da Rosa, Arthur Arruda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leal Ferreira: A peculiar historical operation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The fabrication of Waclaw Radecki as a pioneer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Brazilian history of psychology. Or the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pioneer who was, without ever having been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 074</strong></td>
<td><strong>The context of psychiatry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chair: Maarten Derksen</strong></td>
<td><strong>The context of psychiatry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Jimena Carrasco:</strong> Cinderella’s shoe: A</td>
<td><strong>Chair: Maarten Derksen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical look at hegemonic history of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychiatry in Chile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Annette Mülberger:</strong> Testing the mind in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish juridical psychology (c. 1900-1936)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Oscar Montero-Pich:</strong> Orthodontics and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mental prophylaxis: a particular intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between moral and palatal fissures within the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>framework of the Second Spanish Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13:30</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLOSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BOAT TOUR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17:00-18:30</strong></td>
<td><strong>BOAT TOUR</strong></td>
<td><strong>17:00 we meet at “Rondvaartbedrijf Kool” for</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an optional boat tour of the city;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**17:15 the boat leaves the dock; 18:30 the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boat returns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This boat tour is sponsored by the Reflecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on Psychology graduate programme of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Groningen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The foundation of the degree in psychology in Italy during the Cold War

Renato Foschi & Andrea Romano (Sapienza Università di Roma, Italy)

Until 1971, there was no degree program in psychology in Italian universities. After World War II, there were only two chairs of psychology in Italy. However, in the Post WWII period the demand for psychological skills increased, so students began to manifest some interest both towards psychological issues and psychoanalysis.

When the academic world was in flux due to an imminent reform law within the Faculties of Magistero (Faculty for the training of school teachers), the need to establish a degree program in psychology emerged. So, in 1964, the Faculty of Magistero of the University of Rome endorsed a transformation project in the Faculty of Human Sciences, resulting in three different degree programs: in pedagogy, sociology and in psychology.

In this context, the figure of Ernesto Valentini (1907–1987) emerges. He was a Jesuit priest who, after graduating in Philosophy, began his academic career as assistant professor to Mario Ponzo. From 1953, Valentini was psychology professor in the Faculty of Magistero in the University of Rome. He wrote a document in which he promoted a range of innovations in the field of social sciences in the university area (Valentini, 1964). The goal was to adapt the training of new professionals able to respond to the needs of a country in the middle of a rapid social transformation. In fact, during the Cold War the need for psychological intervention and models increased exponentially (Cimino & Foschi, 2017).

A few years later, thanks to his contacts with Fabio Metelli (1907–1987), a pupil of Cesare Musatti (1897–1989), Valentini was able to involve the University of Padua which contributed to the proposal regarding the degree course in psychology. After some attempts, in 1971, the Ministry of Public Education approved the institution of the degree course in psychology.

But the figure of Father Valentini assumes an even more interesting role. From 1943, he wrote some important papers in the Jesuits journal “La Civiltà Cattolica” (Catholic Civilization), dealing with philosophical, psychological and social-pedagogical topics (e.g. Valentini, 1946, 1948).

Based on his writings, it can be hypothesized that Valentini’s interest in promoting the degree course in psychology was also an attempt to disciplinize the contents and subjects of the degree course, contrasting a progressive secularization of Italian society.

This program of disciplinization of Italian society was in particular promoted in a moment of collaboration between different cultural positions. In fact, in Italy, Catholics, “Euro-communists,” democratic socialists and liberal-republicans collaborated first as forces of resistance to Fascism and subsequently as cultures that founded the Italian Republic during the Cold War.
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The psychology degree programs in Hungary: 1960s-1990s

Csaba Pléh (Central European University, Budapest, Hungary)

Modern psychology training in Hungary started from the 1960s. The talk shall describe the formation of the three basic training systems before the present valid one.

• 1963: 5-year program, with an integration of applied fields into the 5 years.
• 1970s: a more academic 5 year comprehensive training, with postgraduate system of applied training.
• 1990s: reintroduction of specialization from 3rd year (Pléh, 2017).

These were the years of modernization and Westernization. The talk shall use three types of data to analyze the extent of Westernization and the professional outlook: archival materials about the establishment of programs, curricula, and the content of mimeographed readers used by the students.

Regarding the organizational factors the data indicate interesting interactions of the three levels of decision making in early state socialism: the professional initiatives, the university and ministerial leadership, and the party central organs. It is very telling to see how this changed for the 1990s into a two level, professional, and higher education management system.

The changes between 1963 and 1973 were mainly related to two factors. The increasing role and diversification of academic psychology, and parallel to this the expressed need of the applied fields for postgraduate training under their own control.

In the system of the 1970s-1980s the buildup started from more theoretical fields of general and comparative psychology, and developmental, social, personality followed in the later years. Regarding the 1990s, there were two interesting factors, that continue towards the Bologna system. The different fields appear in parallel during the first years, there is no clear “progression” from abstract towards more concrete. And during the last years there was a reintroduction of student specialization, including academic specialties like cognitive or social psychology, and more applied ones like guidance.

Regarding the curricula and reading materials, new data will be presented about the sensitive issue of Westernization (see Erős, 2017. Kovai, 2017, Szokolszky, 2016). The reading materials support a fast Western outlook especially in experimental and social psychology, with a more Soviet orientation in developmental fields.
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History of certifying psychologists in Japan compared with that of psychotherapists in Germany

Miki Takasuna (Tokyo International University, Japan)

The dawn of the Meiji-Era in Japan 150 years ago (1868) brought with it a new era of modern society. This included the founding of universities with new offerings, such as lectures in psychology, the field having been imported mainly from Germany and the US. Although the field of psychology in Japan mostly began expanding after WWII, it has been only much more recently that psychologists have been recognized as professionals in schools and clinics.

Certified psychologists or professional psychologists were first qualified to practice the profession in 1941 in Germany (Lück, 2002). But Diplom-Psychologe (Diploma of Psychologist) was too broad to specify how it would be applied in clinical fields so, from the 1960s until the 1990s, a new more specialized qualification was pursued. Finally, after a long “history of sufferings (Leidensgeschichte)” (Zier, 2002), the Law of Psychotherapists was passed in Germany in 1998 and enacted on January 1, 1999. This nationally approved law would regulate the independent profession of German psychotherapists to include “psychological psychotherapists” and “psychotherapists for children and youth.”

The Japanese movement to nationally qualify psychologists also began in the 1960s. In 1966, a foundation of accreditation authority for psychologists (originally shinri-gijutsusha, literally translated as psycho-technician) was announced in the Japanese Journal of Psychology, but as soon as the student movement heated up across Japan in the late 1960s, a campaign against qualification became so large that, by the end of 1969, the foundation of accreditation authority collapsed (Watanabe, 1988).

During the 1970s, psychologists and psychotherapists working in clinics waited to be certified but were thwarted by an anti-qualification campaign fueled by members of the Japanese Association of Clinical Psychology (founded in 1964). In due course, another group of clinical psychologists eager to be qualified founded a new society in 1982, the Association of Japanese Clinical Psychology (AJCP). And in 1988, AJCP set up a new organization of accreditation and introduced a new qualification, Clinical Psychologist, which required that applicants: a) graduate from master courses in clinical psychology accredited by the organization, and b) pass written (first phase) then oral (second phase) examinations (to be conducted annually).

As membership in AJCP swelled in the 1990s, along with the number of clinical psychologists, the need for nationally accredited psychologists reappeared. In 2005, the Japanese Psychological Association, the oldest society of psychologists founded in 1927, along with a broad union of psychological societies, moved to legislate nationally accredited psychologists (named Medical Psychologists) under the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare. AJCP reacted immediately with the help of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology to legislate for Clinical Psychologists. Unfortunately, this new attempt at legislation was described as “1 act for 2 qualifications,” with both entities failing to introduce any bill to the National Diet.

Consequently, in 2009, most of the psychological societies agreed to have one national qualification, and the new bill for Certified Psychologists (Konin-Shinrishi) was presented to the Diet. In September 2015, the new law for Certified Psychologists was enacted. It requires that, at a minimum, psychologists possess a BA in psychology. And by April 2018, any university in Japan can offer a specifically designed program that will graduate Certified Psychologists.

Germany, which has had similar growing pains, has established more specialized psychologists with the help of evidence-based medicine (Rief et al., 2007), while Japan has been establishing more general, broad-based psychologists. Here I discuss in detail the contrast in requirements for qualification to psychologist between the two countries.
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Jung and the Catholic Church: The turning point of 1953

Marco Innamorati (University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy) & Ruggero Taradel (University of Washington, Seattle, USA)

The attitude of the Catholic Church towards the thought of Carl Gustav Jung has been, on the whole, less positive than towards that of Sigmund Freud. After Pope Paul VI recognized, in one of his Wednesday public audiences, the acceptability of depth psychology, Catholics preferred Freudian psychoanalysis rather than Jungian analytic psychology. Eugen Drewermann, who was the Catholic theologian more inclined, recently, to investigate psychodynamic aspects of the human soul, relied on Freud rather than on Jung as a theoretic reference (Foschi, Taradel & Innamorati, 2018). It seems that even Pope Francis, when he decided to ask for psychotherapeutic help, preferred a Freudian Jew female analyst, even if there was a Jungian professor in his Jesuit University in Buenos Aires.

This may seem surprising. Freud was very proud of his “atheist Jewish” identity. He also tried to employ psychoanalysis as a tool to demonstrate that religion is the result of unconscious conflicts and, should consequently be considered an illusion (Freud, 1927; 1929). Jung, on the contrary, considered religion as an authentic human need, and dedicated several works to themes that can be described as theological. It is also well known that he considered of paramount importance the dialogue with theologians. He even collected in a specific file the most important letters he exchanged with Catholic and Protestant priests and pastors, hypothesizing their publication in a book (Lammers & Cunningham, 2007).

The preference towards Freud could be better understood, analysing a fundamental point of reference, which conditioned the attitude of catholic theologians (especially during the XX Century) towards scientific theories and philosophical ideas: id est its compatibility with Neo-Scholastic philosophy. This philosophy was born in the XIX Century with the purpose of a restoration of medieval Catholic philosophy and theology, based on St. Thomas (Gemelli, 1934). Incompatibility with Neo-Scholastic philosophy (especially Neo-Thomism) explains, for instance, why many books of a “spiritualist” philosophy as Italian idealism was listed in the Index of the forbidden books in the 1930’s (Verucci, 2006).

On the other hand, the possible compatibility with Neo-Thomism was the explicit reason why Father Victor White had a series of exchanges with Jung (Lammers & Cunningham, 2007), whose theory White thought could be useful for Catholicism. Jung even wrote a preface for White’s book God and the Unconscious (Jung, 1952). White understood that his opinion about Jung was wrong, when Answers to Hiob was published (Jung, 1953). That book eventually revealed that Jungian theology was divergent from Neo-Thomism for many important reasons, especially the conception of Evil. For St. Thomas Evbìl is essentially a privatio boni (absence of good) whereas for Jung it is an integral part of the world and even of God.

In the same year of the publication of Answer to Hiob, at the Congress of Catholic psychotherapists in Rome, a speech given by Pope Pius XII (1953) seemed to close the gates of the Vatican to analytic psychology. This was the interpretation of the words of the Holy Father given by Agostino Gemelli (1953) that would deeply affect the Catholic consideration of Jung. Catholics seem to prefer Freud because they think that his thought could be purified from atheism, explaining it with his possible ignorance of theology. Jung, on the other hand, who knew theology almost too well, developed a doctrine that could lead to heresy.
From Occultism to Symbol-Formation: Herbert Silberer the Outsider

Júlia Gyimesi (Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary, Budapest, Hungary & University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary)

The aim of the paper is to explore the reasons why the theory of symbol-formation turned out to be an important scene of the process of demarcation in psychoanalysis. The debate on the theory of symbol-formation is illuminated by the examination of the work of the Viennese psychoanalyst, Herbert Silberer. Herbert Silberer (1882–1923) was the son of a well-known, wealthy self-made man, Victor Silberer (1846–1924). Victor was a successful representative of Austrian public life as the founder of Austrian airship travel and owner of a sports newspaper and a publishing house. Herbert, his son, was also a sportsman and one of the pioneers of Austro-Hungarian aeronautics (see Silberer, 1903). Furthermore, he was a journalist and a self-taught psychoanalyst; however, he was never able to become financially independent from his father (Nitzschke, 1988). He entered the Viennese Psychoanalytic Society in 1910, and he continued to participate in it irregularly until the end of his life. Despite the initial acknowledgment of Freud and others (e.g. Jung, 1968), he was not able to achieve much acclaim over the course of his career. Silberer was always a kind of outsider in Viennese psychoanalytic life.

Beyond his unique professional background, another root of Silberer’s unorthodoxy was his interest and involvement in mysticism and occultism. Silberer’s life-work is an outstanding example of the encounter of psychoanalysis and the so-called occult. He studied yoga and astrology, investigated the long-lasting influence of stars on the individual, and even conducted sexual-magic experiments (Stekel, 1924).

Silberer neither belonged to the group of scholars whose purpose was to prove the genuineness of occult phenomena by using psychoanalysis, nor to skeptical psychoanalysts who aimed at demonstrating the illusionary nature of mystical experiences. Rather, he considered mystical experience a valid segment of psychological life, a psychological content worth integrating into the manifold subjects of psychoanalysis. His primary objective was to introduce the reader to the little-known features of alchemy, freemasonry and other fields of occultism, and to prove that the practices, images and theories of these domains represented nothing other than another form of psychological knowledge. According to Silberer, they were alternative languages of the soul, expressions of fundamental developmental tasks, and symbols in which human existence, struggles, anxieties and fulfilments were reflected (e.g. Silberer, 1915, 1917).

In 1909 Silberer introduced a radically new and different concept: the functional category of symbols. The functional category of symbols turned out to be a comprehensive concept in Silberer’s thinking. Although he never denied the significance of Freud’s thoughts on symbol-formation, he insisted on broadening the theory of symbolism. Today, functional symbolism is what experts refer to most often when discussing the investigations of Silberer. In fact, his theory on functional symbolism was developed in connection with his...
experiences in the field of occultism, mysticism, alchemy, etc., and inevitably led to tension between his viewpoint and the basic principles of psychoanalysis. The conflicts that emerged due to the integration of the occult by Silberer did not lie between materialistic and spiritualistic worldviews. Rather, they originated in theoretical oppositions. Silberer’s oeuvre shows that considering occultism and mysticism a valid psychological language could lead to a radically new form of psychology.
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Witch-hunts: The intersection of the Psychoanalytic Interpretation of History and Group Psychology applied to Colonial America.

David O. Clark (independent scholar)

In his book, “Freud for Historians,” Peter Gay praised John Demos's history, “Entertaining Satan: Witchcraft and the Culture of Early New England;” Gay declared it “The most systematic, most intensely cultivated attempt to make psychoanalytic persuasion work for history.” Psychoanalytic theories are contested; with reservation, I asked did Demos contribute to a psychological understanding of history? For a psychoanalytic interpretation, an overwhelming proportion of “Entertaining Satan” was devoted to the English-Puritan culture, the economic conditions, the geographical environment, and to the witch-hunt trials. Gay endorsed an environmentally strong history with a parsimonious psychological interpretation.

According to Demos, the New England colonies were microcosms of pre-enlightenment English culture rife with superstition, ideal subjects for a psychoanalytic interpretation. Demos described the inhabitants of these communities as isolated and vulnerable people who lived under threatening conditions. The witch-hunts were formal proceedings that archived evidence, and the court records described in dramatic detail the persecution of people accused of the crime of using supernatural powers for the purpose of harming their neighbors. Evidence could be attained by torture, and conviction often meant death. In our natural science paradigm, if the supernatural was an illusion and witches never existed, then the witch-hunt must have been a psychological state, but psychology in what sense? Demo’s praiseworthy interpretation was predominately well-understood manifestations of psychopathology exhibited by individuals.

In my presentation, I argue that an alternative psychodynamic interpretation might include not only individual anxieties in face of a hostile environment but also an analysis of group psychology. Freud’s “Group Psychology and the Analysis of Ego” suggests a starting point. I explore this thesis. By means of analogy, a group mind is meant to evoke a contrast and comparison to individual psychology. The function of mind is understood to interpret the environment and organize appropriate behavior. The group mind conditions behavior in individuals that otherwise would not have occurred.
In writing “Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego,” Freud was not the first to attribute unconscious motivation to crowds. He was indebted to Le Bon’s famous book, “The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind.” Although eclipsed in mainstream psychology today, Le Bon postulated unconscious crowd behavior decades before Freud’s publication. In 1921, Freud responded to Le Bon’s 1895 theory by presenting an alternative explanation for the emergence of group unconscious motivation. In one sense, Freud took Le Bon’s theory of the group mind, and he flushed out some of the nebulous concepts. I argue efforts to establish causal links can benefit from theories of the group mind. This presentation begins with a brief presentation of witch-hunts and Demo’s psychoanalytic interpretation. The introduction is followed with Le Bon’s theory of a group mind and Freud’s criticism. The presentation will conclude by applying a few concepts from the theory of a group mind to witch-hunts and comparing the results to Demo’s interpretation.
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From rhythm to sense. The relation between Wundt’s metronome experiments and his psychological analysis of meaningful speech.

Liesbet De Kock (Free University of Brussels, Belgium)

In the wake of the critical reorientation in the historiography of psychology, a number of scholars have challenged the one-sided structuralist and positivist interpretation of Wilhelm Wundt’s work. In this respect, authors such as Danziger (e.g. 1979), Blumenthal (e.g. 1975), Leary (1980), and more recently Araujo (2016), should be credited with presenting a more sophisticated, fine-grained analysis of his psychological voluntarism. This paper aims at contributing to these efforts, by providing an analysis of Wundt’s apperceptionist account of the psychological processes underlying the ability to produce meaning through speech. In a related vein, Wundt’s take on the aetiology of disorganized thought and speech – and on the so-called flight of ideas in particular – will be discussed.

In doing so, Wundt’s metronome-experiments will serve as a point of departure, not so much for the sake of their methodological or technical purport, but rather for their theoretical relevance with regard to the question at stake, i.e., their alleged ability to “demonstrate […] the psychology of consciousness” (Wundt, 1912, p. 3). As will be explained, Wundt argued that the analysis of rhythmical hearing by means of the metronome-experiments afforded a basic explanatory model for the meaningful organization of thought and experience. By extrapolation, Wundt thus used his model of rhythmical hearing to account for the ability for meaningful speech. As such, he assumed a degree of isomorphism between the psychological processes underlying the rhythmical hearing and the verbal expression of complex ideas (most notably, see Wundt 1897 and Wundt 1912).

To be more precise, Wundt maintained that the investigation of the processes underlying the combination of separate beats into a meaningful whole, clearly demonstrates (a) the synthetic, purposive nature of psychological processes of combination, and in the same vein, (b) the explanatory poverty of mere associationalist accounts. As will be explained, in both his analysis of rhythmical hearing and meaningful speech, Wundt assigned a pivotal role to processes of apperception, and more particularly, to the purposive arrangement of the elements of consciousness around what he called a unitary idea [Gesammtvorstellung]. Correlatively, he pointed to the disastrous consequences of disturbances in the function of apperception and the related inability to structure verbal utterances around a unitary idea with regard to the general ability to make sense through speech.

As Danziger (2001, p. 96) pointed out, there seems to be a general lack of insight into “the relationship between Wundt’s program of experimental work and his broader theories about the nature of psychological processes”. Most generally, this gap in the historiography of psychology led to an insufficient appreciation of the theoretical framework within which Wundt constructed and interpreted his experiments. The discussion of the general theoretical purport of Wundt’s metronome-experiments can be considered at least in part as an attempt to overcome this issue. Furthermore, while Wundt’s pivotal role in the development of the psychology of language is relatively well-known, discussions on this part of his theorizing tend to focus exclusively on his gestural or motor account of language. This obliterates the complex theoretical background of Wundt’s theory of language and speech, as well as its systematic place within his psychological system. Finally, Wundt’s analysis of disorganized thought and speech has not received the attention it deserves. Notwithstanding the renewed interest in Wundt’s psychological program, the way in which this program amounted to a particular perspective on the aetiology of psychopathology remains underappreciated and ill understood.
José H. Ferreira Marques and the History of Psychology in Portugal

João Manuel Moreira (University of Lisbon, Portugal)

Very little has been written about the history of psychology in Portugal, and even less in English (for perhaps the only exception, see Gonçalves & Almeida, 1995). The goal of this presentation will be that of, while discussing the career of José Ferreira Marques (Moreira, in press), one of the most influential and internationally known Portuguese psychologists of the second half of the 20th century, give a broad overview of the path of implantation of modern psychology in Portugal.

As a very peripheral country in Europe, Portugal has been hindered in its development by being far from where a critical mass of economic and cultural activity took place in Central Europe. Therefore, in comparative terms, Portuguese psychology has suffered from the lack of resources and the high costs of keeping up and contributing to the scientific work that was being developed elsewhere.

With only one university formally instituted until the early 20th century, one may securely characterize the situation as one of little scholarship and scientific productivity until the democratic revolution of 1974, although a few brilliant minds could break these barriers and achieve remarkable contributions and international recognition (Ferreira Marques, 2000). Among these, I will briefly mention, among others, Pedro Hispano (Pope John XXI) in the 12th century, Francisco Sanches in the 16th century, the Abbott Faria in the 18th century, and Alves dos Santos, Sílvio Lima and Edmundo Curvelo in the 20th century.

A different period may be considered from the late 19th century to the 1920s, in which higher education had a major development, including the creation of the University of Lisbon, and one may say that in that period Portugal came closer to other European countries regarding the development of psychology. It all turned back, however, with the establishment of the authoritarian regime in 1926, that would last until 1974, most of the time under the leadership of Salazar.

It was during this period that Prof. José Ferreira Marques was born, in 1936, and took his studies in philosophy at the University of Lisbon, obtaining his doctorate with the Portuguese adaptation of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children in 1969. Meanwhile, in spite of several attempts from universities, only one higher education program in psychology existed, from a small, private, religiously affiliated institution, and which did not get full recognition from the government (Bairrão, 1968; Borges, 1986).

It all changed with the democratic revolution in 1974, and the creation of psychology programs in three universities (Lisbon, Coimbra and Oporto). In this context, Prof. Ferreira Marques found himself in a position
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of leadership, as he was the only person in Portugal with a doctorate in psychology that was not expelled from the university because of connections with the former regime. He would play a major role in securing the creation of the psychology programs and of school psychology services that would ensure the employability of many psychologists in these early years. Related to this purpose, he was also highly regarded for the creation of innovative career education programs, in which he started working in the late 1960s, following Donald Super's career development model. Although based at the University of Lisbon for the whole of his career, he was very active and took several leadership roles in international institutions. The interaction between his personal qualities and the historical context he found himself in will be highlighted (see also Moreira, in press), together with the relevance of further comparative historical studies in different European countries (e.g., Georgas, 2000).
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A peculiar historical operation: The fabrication of Waclaw Radecki as a pioneer in Brazilian history of psychology. Or the pioneer who was, without ever having been.

Luiz Eduardo Prado da Fonseca (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Hugo Leonardo Rocha Silva da Rosa (Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) Arthur Arruda Leal Ferreira (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

This paper aims to establish a discussion about the production of pioneers in the narratives of the history of psychology as a historical operation (Certeau, 1988). For this historiographical discussion we will present a case from the history of psychology in Brazil: the Polish psychologist Waclaw Radecki (1887-1953). The historical narratives related to this author don’t agree in a great number of details. But it is possible to present some common points: Radecki arrived in Brazil around 1920, after an intense political and academic career in Poland and Switzerland. In Rio de Janeiro he organized a laboratory around 1924 that in seven years was converted into an Institute of Psychology. After the interruption of the activities of this Institute in 1932, Radecki dedicated himself to the two new Institutes of Psychology that he created in Montevideo and Buenos Aires. But our interest is to present some controversies and radical changes in the historiography related to this character. After a long time being briefly referred to (and without much acclaim) in any Brazilian texts of the history of psychology (see Olinto, 1944/2004; Cabral, 1950/2004; and Lourenço Filho, 1955/2004), Radecki was suddenly reinvented in the 1980’s as a pioneer of psychological science in Brazil, initially by the article of Centofanti (1982/2004). After this article, Radecki had his historical position and function changed to a more central and crucial one (see Antunes, 2004 and Massimi, 2010) and especially the modes of discourse (using a concept from Latour, 1988) changed to a more regular and positive reference towards him. This is the central issue of our work: to analyze the changes in the historical modes of discourse related to Radecki’s legacy. For instance, although most of his concepts and his theoretical system (the Affective Discrimination) were misunderstood or ignored, in these new articles he received a lot of titles related to this heroic role: the first psychologist in Latin America (Stubbe, 1988) and the main
articulator of experimental psychology in Brazil (Shiraev, 2015). We then analyze this historical operation of Radecki`s invention as a pioneer in comparison to the establishment of Wilhelm Wundt as the “father” of experimental psychology by classical historiography (as an example, Boring, 1929/1950). Here we propose that Radecki undergone a comparable process (although in a different scale and degree of stabilization), occupying suddenly a prominent place in Brazilian narratives of its national history of psychology. Similar to Wundt, Radecki created a laboratory, an Institute and a journal for publications of his research group. Like Wundt, his heroic role as a pioneer didn’t guarantee a good comprehension of his work (see Araujo 2010). The importance of this comparison is to highlight the historical operation generated by the need of creating a respectable ancestor (validated by the creation of a laboratory) as a way to legitimize our present science as a trustworthy one. In both cases this operation had some delays, roundabouts and hesitations. In Wundt`s case it is possible to say that Boring wasn’t the first to promote Wundt as a heroic experimental father, although he promoted the strongest and most lasting historical operation. It is interesting to see, though, how Boring opened other possibilities of pioneerism when mentioning Fechner’s psychophysics (see Rosenszweig, 1987). We finish this paper questioning this kind of historical operation that produces and paves the histories of psychology, constructing heroes, fathers and pioneers, presenting a historical path from a glorious past towards a supposedly autonomous and scientific progress of psychology. Shouldn’t we create other stories and versions that escape from this epic narrative? This is the political and ethical position and question of this work.
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Cinderella’s shoe: A critical look at the hegemonic history of Psychiatry in Chile

Jimena Carrasco M. (Universidad Austral de Chile, Valdivia, Chile)

We will use a critical analytic approach inspired by Foucault’s conceptual tools in order to develop a critical history of the Casa de Orates in Santiago and the inception of Chilean psychiatry, between the second half of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. We will review the historical background of the asylum, the prison and the rise of the medical viewpoint in colonial society, and in the beginnings of the republic (Neira, 1998; Franulic, 2007). Following this, assuming the exercise carried out by Foucault in the History of Madness, we will analyse texts which narrate the history of the Casa de Orates in Santiago. The focus is placed on this institution because it is the first one destined to the confinement of the mentally ill, which later will be configured by some narratives as the place where Chilean psychiatry begins (Garafulic, 1957). Our methodological approach is to contrast Foucault’s proposals in History of Madness with Chilean process. In this aspect we will compare the process of the establishment of the psychiatry as a new area and its new practices of observation and classification of the mental diseases (Foucault 1976; 1979: 1991).

The results show that the hegemonic history of psychiatry in Chile, which tends to highlight the figure of psychiatrists, only arises in the 1930s, after the establishment of the physicians (doctors) as the new intellectual elite. It shows how the process of ascension of the medical category was made possible through the discourse of European modernity and the exaltation of the modern subject. In this context, the psychiatry, until then called the Cinderella of Chilean medicine (Vivado, Larson & Arrollo, 1939), sought (through its main doctors) a connection with Augusto Orrego Luco (Ahumada, 2002; Garaulic, 1957; Medina, 1990; Rojas Troncoso, 2002). This doctor was a very important character in the Chilean social scene of the 1930, and, despite not having a greater relationship with the Casa de Orates, had studied in France with Dr. Charcot and embodied the enlightened European subject as a cultural ideal.

As the main conclusion we propose that the development of psychiatry in Chile cannot be understood only through the practices of confining the supposed mentally ill. We conclude that we should consider processes that go beyond the history of the Casa de Orates, such as the birth of the biopolitical project (Foucault, 2006) and the rise of medical discourse, which in turn should be understood as bearing the mark of Colonialism/Modernity as was presented in the works of Aníbal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein. In this sense, we want to propose that the rise and the establishment of the psychiatry in Chile must be analyzed through a more complex process than a simple effect of an inner and necessary medical development. We propose that this complex analysis must situate the establishment of psychiatry as a part of a wider modernization process of the Latin-American nations. In this process the West European nations was considered the model and the colonial matrix that oriented a great number of reforms (in heath issues, education, urbanism and so on). In the most part of these reforms the Enlighten European Subject was considered the model and the ideal between all forms of Human Beings.
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Testing the mind in Spanish juridical psychology (c. 1900-1936)

Annette Mülberger (CEHIC, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain)

Historically, juridical psychology and criminology are two fields which emerged at the crossroad between juridical, medical, anthropological, and psychological expertise. Such confluence was highly problematic, leading to professional conflicts and rivalries. At the same time, it also enhanced a wider cross-disciplinary circulation of psychological techniques aimed at examining the human mind.

My talk will focus on the psychological methods developed and employed in juridical psychology between the first decades of the 20th century in Spain. Thereby, I will deal with the question about what kinds of intellectual and material resources were used within the area of juridical regulation and intervention, to generate knowledge about people’s state of mind, feelings, and the veracity of their statements. My examples and materials are mainly drawn from historical sources related to two initiatives. First, the psychological techniques promoted and introduced, at the beginnings of the 20th century in Spain, by historical figures such as the jurist Eugenio Cuello Calón, the psychiatrist Gonzalo Rodríguez Lafora and the pedologist Domingo Barnés in their attempt to identify and select the “abnormal mind”. The infantile ‘abnormal’ mind was viewed as pre-stage of delinquency and other asocial behavior in the adult. In this setting, (juridical, psychological, medical) science was called to intervene by examining and selecting the ‘dangerous’ mind, and thereby prevent such ‘social threat’. Second, I will deal more broadly with the juridical psychology and its techniques as was promoted by Emilio Mira y López, a psychologist and psychiatrist who published in 1932 the first textbook on this topic in Spain. His techniques are based on readings of a wide range of literature dealing with psychology, psychiatry and criminology, as well as on his own professional experience. The techniques proposed and used by these Spanish progressive scholars are linked to their respective intellectual (as well as social and political) agenda’s which sometimes include psychological classifications, bio-typologies, and eugenics. The research has been undertaken by a research team working at the CEHIC and has received support from the Spanish Ministry (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, HAR2014-58699P) and the Generalitat de Catalunya (AGAUR, 2017 SGR 1138).
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Orthodontics and Mental prophylaxis: a particular intersection between moral and palatal fissures within the framework of the Second Spanish Republic

Oscar Montero-Pich (CEHIC, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain)

Archivos de Odontología, a journal edited by the Official Association of Dentists of Catalonia, consists of twenty issues published between March 1933 and May / June 1936. Among the various sections, we have published the Bulletin of the same College of Dentists that collects all extraordinary meetings and meetings of this college. The articles mainly show operational techniques, material novelties and information about diseases related to dentistry.

One of these articles, co-authored by Drs. Sylvain Dreyfus and M. Guillery, entitled “Orthodontics and Mental Prophylaxis”, argues how an orthodontic treatment can help in the moral development and even “to cure or improve certain mental disorders” (Ortodoncia I Profilaxis Mental, 1933, p.111).

Supporting Adler (1968) and Kretschmer (1961), orthodontists try to establish a relationship between psychiatry and orthodontics by linking various oral disorders (cleft palate, biprotusion, dental dysmorphosis ...) with functional disorders of psychic origin. And although they believe that there is still a long way to go, they try to show themselves as experts who can “explore” this path in patients, especially teenagers.

In this research I try to highlight the importance of an original and peculiar text through two lines (relation-ship between orthodontics and mental illness and the struggle of the new expert in moral and psychological hygiene). Another of my goals is to relate the article with the social-political context of Catalonia in the 30s. We must bear in mind that this article was presented at the French Society of Dental Orthopedics in 1932, but it is published quickly in Spain. This may be due to the framework of struggle during the II Spanish Republic between various medical disciplines for appearing as an expert in a specific area (2014). Through its pages, The Arxius d’Odontologia tries to enter into the expert sphere of psychology and psychiatry.
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Boat tour (optional)
This boat tour is sponsored by the “Reflecting on Psychology” graduate programme of the University of Groningen.

17:00 – We meet at “Rondvaartbedrijf Kool”, Stationsweg 1012, Groningen
17:15 – Boat leaves the dock
18:30 – Boat returns
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