

DIPARTIMENTO DI PSICOLOGIA

Stefania Paolini Ph.D e Mark Rubin, Ph.D,

Professori di Psicologia Sociale

presso la University of Newcastle, Australia,

terrano due seminari giovedì 28 giugno 2018 presso l'Aula 6 del Dipartimento di Psicologia con il seguente programma:

09.30-10.30

Stefania Paolini : "Valence Asymmetries in Intergroup Contact: Bringing Negative Intergroup Contact to the Foreground for a Fuller and More Realistic Outlook of Intergroup Dynamics"

10.30-11.00 Discussion

11.00-11.30 Break

11.30-12.30

Mark Rubin "Hypothesising After the Results are Known (HARKing): Are all Types of HARKing Bad for Science Under all Conditions?"

12.30-13.00 Discussion

I seminari sono organizzati nell'ambito del Dottorato di Ricerca in Psychology

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM – UNIVERSITA' DI BOLOGNA Viale Berti Pichat 5 – 40127 Bologna – Tel. 051 2091330 – Fax 051 203086/2091844

STEFANIA PAOLINI

TITLE: Valence asymmetries in intergroup contact: Bringing negative intergroup contact to the foreground for a fuller and more realistic outlook of intergroup dynamics

ABSTRACT: There is an extensive body of evidence of negative biases in many areas of psychology: Hence, in many life domains, negative stimuli, negative information, negative experiences often have greater impact on cognitions, affect, and behaviour than positive stimuli, positive information, and positive experiences. This paper presents a program of research on valence asymmetries in interactions between members of opposing groups—or 'intergroup contact'. Due to a focus on corrective prejudice reduction, social psychological analyses of intergroup contact have traditionally shied away from investigating negative intergroup contact and from comparing the impact of negative and positive intergroup contact. As a result, these traditional analyses often provide a more optimistic report for intergroup contact than related disciplines; one that disagrees with global trends of troubled intergroup relations. My research redresses this research disconnects by bringing negative intergroup contact to the foreground of social psychological analyses. I will present a program of research testing valence asymmetries in intergroup contact in a variety of intergroup settings and using a variety of research paradigms. I will contrast alternative motivational explanations and mechanisms and discuss a series of theorydriven moderators capable of exacerbating, mitigating, and even reversing negative valence asymmetries in intergroup contact. I will conclude discussing the implications of these findings for theory, social interventions, and future research.

BIO: Stefania Paolini trained in social psychology at the University di Padova, Italy, and completed her doctoral work in intergroup psychology with Miles Hewstone at Cardiff University in the UK. In her PhD, she investigated 'individual-to-group generalization', exploring 'when' and 'why' experiences with individual members of a social group affect judgements of the group as a whole. Since, she has researched, published, and earned competitive research funds to investigate the antecedents, the consequences, and the mechanics of intergroup contact, intergroup friendship, and intergroup emotions in peaceful and post-conflict contexts. Stefania is currently Associate Professor in social psychology and intercultural relations at the University of Newcastle, Australia. She has driven the establishment of the Newcastle-Oxford Research Centre for Conflict and Cohesion, and the Psychology-led Aboriginal, Equity and Diversity working party at UON. She cochaired SPSSI internationalization committee and in that capacity established a regular SPSSI-SASP small group conference series to link experts from the two professional societies across the Pacific. She is currently section editor for Wiley Social Psychology and Personality Compass' Group Processes and Intergroup Relations section.

For more information on Stefania's research, visit: https://www.newcastle.edu.au/profile/stefania-paolini#career,

https://scholar.google.com.au/citations?hl=en&user=cPq4X4EAAAAJ&view_op=list_works&sortby=pubdate, and https://sites.google.com/site/uonsocialpsychlab/, https://www.norccc.org/researchers

ALMA MATER STUDIORUM – UNIVERSITA' DI BOLOGNA

MARK RUBIN

TITLE of the SEMINAR Hypothesising After the Results are Known (HARKing): Are all Types of HARKing Bad for Science Under all Conditions?

ABSTRACT Hypothesizing after the results are known, or HARKing, occurs when researchers check their research results and then add or remove hypotheses on the basis of those results without acknowledging thisprocess in their research report (Kerr, 1998). HARKing has been proposed as one of the causes of the replication crisis in science. In this presentation, I consider whether all types of HARKing are bad for science under all conditions. In particular, I consider three forms of HARKing: (a) using current results to construct post hoc hypotheses that are then reported as if they were a priori hypotheses; (b) retrieving hypotheses from a post hoc literature search and reporting them as a priori hypotheses; and (c) failing to report a priori hypotheses that are unsupported by the current results. I consider the conditions under which each of these three types of HARKing is most and least likely to be bad for science. I conclude with a brief discussion about the ethics of each type of HARKing.

BIOGRAPHY Mark Rubin is an associate professor in social psychology at the University of Newcastle, Australia. He received a Master's degree from the London School of Economics and a PhD from Cardiff University, UK. He is best known for his work on social identity and intergroup relations, including research on prejudice and stereotyping. His recent work has considered the causes of the replication crisis in psychology and beyond, including hypothesising after the results are known, the use of significance testing in exploratory research situations, and the problem of sample-contingent data analyses.