

Dilemmas of social influence for science

ANNE COOKE reports on the M.B. Shapiro Lecture given by Mary Boyle (University of East London).

MARY Boyle's lecture, which was the subject of much discussion in the bars and foyers of Winchester's Guildhall, concerned the relationship between research and social policy. The Society is currently increasingly concerned to establish good links with policy makers; the Division of Clinical Psychology in particular now has an explicit stance that we should become more proactive in communicating our research and ideas to policy makers as well as via the media to the public.

Drawing on the work of Carol Weiss, Boyle described two possible models of the relationship between research and social policy.

The first is a linear one. Research findings are seen as objective, and as having direct policy implications that can either be accepted or ignored by policy makers. The model sees research as value-free, and policy as partisan and value-laden. This is the model that many of us hold, or would perhaps like to be true.

However, Professor Boyle suggested several problems with it. Firstly, today's 'truth' is often tomorrow's discarded or superseded theory. Secondly, the model overlooks the evidence for the role of values in psychological theory and research. Thirdly, it can be seen as a counsel of despair. It often leaves

researchers feeling either slighted, with their data overlooked or misrepresented, or inadequate, when they suspect that their data are not really robust enough to inform policy decisions.

The second model is the 'reconceptualisation' model. Here research



Mary Boyle

is seen as gradually changing the way people think about an issue, challenging received wisdom and converting practices that were once seen as benign into social problems. An example would be the segregation of people with learning disabilities.

Professor Boyle suggested that this second model represents a more hopeful and constructive way of thinking about the relationship between research and policy, and that it highlights a number of important issues.

The first issue is that the timescale for influence is very long term: we need not be deterred if policy makers appear to ignore our ideas and data. They will have gradual and long-term influence, provided that they are in some way brought to public attention.

Secondly, research is always potentially influential. Whether we intend it or not, through our work particular psychological ideas become part of the construction of reality that is drawn on by policy makers to frame both social problems and perceived solutions. A current example would be the

idea that we all have personalities, and that these personalities can become disordered.

This model also acknowledges that theory and research involve implicit assumptions and values; it sees them, like policy and law making, as processes of conceptualisation rather than discovery. Both researchers and policy makers occupy what might be called an 'epistemological space' where certain aspects of the world are simply taken for granted. These form the basis of research questions, methods and the interpretation of results as well as of definitions of social problems and proposals for solutions. Every policy proposal contains an implicit conceptualisation of the problem it seeks to address.

Policy makers and legislators will only hear what we say to the extent that we occupy the same 'epistemological space', adopting broadly similar frames of reference. This does not mean that we can never offer them any data or ideas that challenge what they believe. At issue are more fundamental assumptions that are thought of as simply 'what is'.

The final issue highlighted by the reconceptualisation model is that both psychologists and policy makers implicitly construct particular versions of the human subject. For example, in doing research on 'non-compliance with medication' we may be constructing people as potentially deviant, perhaps disobedient and unruly, in the face of a benign intervention. But if we say that we are doing research into reluctance to take strong psychotropic drugs, we may construct an entirely different subject: thoughtful, appropriately cautious in the face of interventions with mixed effects. It is not that one construction is right and another wrong, but that different constructions can make different policies and laws seem reasonable or necessary.

Professor Boyle illustrated these points in detail with two examples, from abortion legislation and psychosis, and suggested that we are at the beginning of a long-term process of influence which will inevitably encounter difficulties.

Continuing from last month, FIONA JONES, Associate Editor for Conference reports presents more from the Society's Annual Conference in Winchester.

She suggested that we ask ourselves the awkward question: What is clinical psychology's epistemological space, our frame of reference? Our current one, she suggested, is largely borrowed from psychiatry, and in turn from medicine, and is now showing considerable signs of strain and fragmentation. For example, the Society's response to the recent government proposals about 'severe personality disorder' contained a sort of 'disclaimer' stating that some psychologists consider the concept of personality disorder to be so seriously flawed that it cannot be used as a basis for decision making. This assertion challenges the entire basis of government thinking on this issue. Whilst alerting policy makers in this brief way to fundamental disagreements is entirely appropriate at this stage, it may not be possible to do it repeatedly and plausibly over the next 10 or 20 years.

Boyle stressed the need to foster public awareness and debate. Policy makers will never ask about what is taken for granted, so we need somehow to challenge taken-

for-granted ideas without making ourselves incomprehensible — for example by being open about our debates.

We also need to be aware of the kinds of identities that we are constructing for people in our theories and research. They have policy and practice implications because they make certain courses of action seem reasonable, and others unreasonable or even unthinkable. Boyle suggested that we might consider working backwards, starting with policies or practices that we consider desirable and then asking whether these are compatible with the kinds of persons or identities that we construct through our theories.

Theory and research are always potentially influential. Whether we approve it, intend it or are even aware of it, our theories will have influence in that they become part of the taken-for-granted reality of the public and policy makers. Becoming more aware of, and actively shaping, these fundamental processes of influence is one of the most exciting challenges that we face.

Executive impairment in autism

SIMON BIGNELL *reports on the Neil O'Connor Award for Developmental Disability Lecture.*

THIS year's conference welcomed the inception of the Neil O'Connor Award. Attending the packed prize-giving was Professor Neil O'Connor's widow Peggy, who founded the award to provide an annual accolade for outstanding published research in the area of developmental disabilities. The first recipient of the award was Michelle Turner (Durham University) for her research in autism. Clearly delighted to present her with the award was Professor John Sloboda (Chair, Division for Teachers and Researchers in Psychology).

In her address, Michelle Turner spoke about the approaches that she and her colleagues have adopted in looking at the cognitive deficits affecting individuals with autism. Her talk focused on impaired executive function (the skills that are necessary for the generation, planning and regulation of intended behaviour) in individuals with autism.

Turner explained that while there have been surprisingly few studies investigating executive dysfunction in autism, it is widely asserted that these deficits do underlie the disorder. 'However,' she argued, 'it is equally plausible that these deficits may be

the result of growing up with autism.' She suggested that if executive function impairment is responsible for many features of autism then certain predictions should be able to be made — specifically that executive impairments should be universal in all individuals with autism, that the nature and severity of executive impairment should be associated with those of the symptoms present, and that these deficits should be present from early in life.

Turner presented the results of a series of her studies designed to test these predictions. Whilst all individuals with autism in her studies showed deficits on some measures of executive function, the scope of this impairment differed widely between individuals. Although there was some evidence that the nature and severity of this impairment may be associated with that of certain symptoms there was little evidence that executive impairment is present in pre-school years. This provides some support for the suggestion that executive function deficits may be the consequence, rather than the cause, of autism.

The significance of this research was discussed in relation to clinical intervention.

For example, changes in the environment to reduce executive demands on those with autism may lead to improvements in some symptoms. In addition, she spoke of improving the quality of life for individuals with autism and called for research to take a developmental perspective. One of the ways in which this can happen is by looking at the development of very young children to ascertain when and how executive impairment emerges. Consequently, Turner and her colleagues at Durham University are currently investigating the executive functioning of pre-school children.

Turner's research effectively characterises the nature of executive impairment in individuals with autism and provides a major contribution to our understanding of this lifelong developmental disorder.

WEBLINKS

National Autistic Society:
www.oneworld.org/autism_uk
Autism Research Centre:
www.psychiatry.cam.ac.uk/arc

Demystification and the hothouse

GAIL KINMAN reports on a talk by Michael Howe (University of Exeter) on geniuses and high achievers.

PEOPLE with exceptional abilities are often considered to be fundamentally different from the rest of us. The belief that genius involves some kind of 'special' or 'mysterious' powers that are out of the realm of normal human experience is commonplace, as is the perception that geniuses are born with their talents and abilities more or less fully formed, such that little effort is needed for them to become high achievers.

Michael Howe argued that such notions are mythical. His talk aimed to 'demystify' genius by focusing on the similarities between the exceptionally able and everyone else, rather than on the differences. Howe pointed out several ways we can learn from the experiences and activities of exceptionally high achievers in order to extend our own expertise and make the best of our lives.

Firstly, genius is not effortless: high achievement in any domain is not a 'gift' but the result of extensive training and a great deal of effort and practice. Howe argued that the Brontës did not just get up one morning and decide to write exceptional books, but spent literally thousands of hours from early childhood honing their literary skills. An intrinsic enjoyment of the subject area is vital. High achievement is only possible when the individual is deeply absorbed in an activity, is curious to gain more knowledge and finds the activity pleasurable.

Non-intellectual qualities such as levels of motivation and temperament are important. A firm sense of direction and an aptitude for hard work and perseverance are at the heart of high achievement. High achievers are able to experience failure, not give up and keep focused on the same problem for lengthy periods. Self-confidence is also necessary, but it is unclear whether this leads to high achievement or is an outcome of perceived success.

In addition, Howe emphasised the importance of developing a range of qualities and abilities — intellectual, practical and social. Although child prodigies undoubtedly exist, it was argued that such children tend to be high achievers in narrow domains only, and are likely to be underdeveloped in other areas,

MARY EVANS PICTURE LIBRARY

George Stephenson's **Rocket** — produced despite the fact that the designer was illiterate until he was 18

such as social skills. Howe explained that child prodigies often fail to fulfil their early potential by burning themselves out by early adulthood.

Rather than parents 'hothousing' their children and encouraging them to focus on a narrow intellectual area, it was argued that breadth, together with a background of independence in thought and action, is necessary for consistent high achievement. This does not necessarily mean that individuals can be exceptional in many different domains. It was emphasised that geniuses tend to have extremely rapid and flexible learning strategies: they learn quickly and generalise that learning widely. It seems important however not to aim to be a good 'all-rounder' but to achieve an effective balance between focus and breadth.

Whilst it is important to get a good start in life, there is little evidence for a critical period in the development of genius. Howe argued that there are many late developers; for example, the fact that the engineer George Stephenson was illiterate until he was 18 suggests that deprivation or a poor education does not exclude high achievement later in life.

The role of luck or coincidence was also mentioned — being in the right place at the right time, and meeting the right people. It is also important to recognise that progress to exceptional achievement in any domain is cumulative. Supporting most geniuses are Newton's giants on whose shoulders they stand.

As yet, little is known about the contribution of biological factors to prodigious abilities. It is clear however that this relationship is not likely to be a simple one, but an interaction between innate characteristics and environmental influences. Howe argued that it is extremely unlikely that there are specific genes for genius, but the potential for high achievement could be influenced by the personality factors outlined above.

In conclusion, Howe suggested that we should discard the erroneous belief that high achievers have some kind of innate talent, and do not need extensive and arduous training regimes. Such beliefs are self-restricting, he argued, in that they are likely to encourage those to whom achievement does not come easily to think they are unlikely ever to excel.

Promoting healthy behaviour

DENISE KIRKLAND reports on a symposium convened by Paul Sparks (University of Sussex).

In three separate papers, evidence was presented of improvement in 'health-related' behaviours through interventions designed with some reference to the theory of planned behaviour (TPB).

Charles Abraham (University of Sussex), working with Paschal Sheeran (University of Sheffield), found that prompting students to consider whether they would 'regret not exercising' not only increased intent to exercise, but also increased time spent exercising over the following two weeks. Paschal Sheeran and Michael Silverman (University of Sheffield) found that making a specific plan increased attendance at a health and safety training workshop. Christopher Armitage (University of Essex) and Mark Conner (University of Leeds) found that the information their intervention provided contributed to reduced fat consumption in participants with a relatively high fat diet.

Charles Abraham introduced TPB as a normative model of how beliefs about consequences and other people's approval will affect our behavioural intentions, and how these behavioural intentions will predict behaviour. He argued that since recent reviews had shown the model to predict in the range of 27–34 per cent of variance across a range of behaviours, it clearly had some explanatory utility.

This was borne out by the study he reported, where TPB constructs ('attitude', 'subjective norm', and 'perceived control') accounted for some 40 per cent of variance in behaviour intentions, with past behaviour increasing this to 51 per cent, and anticipated regret to 56 per cent. However, past behaviour seemed to play a greater role in 'explaining' variance in actual behaviour and, with this past behaviour effect controlled, anticipated regret appeared to strengthen the intention-behaviour link.

This led to the study reported above, which used the simple intervention of manipulating the sequence of items on the questionnaire so that the test group had to focus on anticipated regret before they completed the intention item.

Paschal Sheeran reiterated the pervasive correlational evidence supporting TPB while emphasising the lack of experimental data, and in particular how little evidence exists that change in intent leads to change in behaviour.

In the study reported, which was

DAVE ROBERTS

Information can reduce fat consumption

organised round an e-mail circulated to university employees, a 'motivational' (TPB) intervention had no apparent effect. However, making a clear implementation plan (in this case stating which training session would be attended) led to increased uptake of the training scheme. 'Implementation plans' do not figure in TPB, but since the 'motivational' intervention was a rather dull 150-word paragraph in the e-mail this may not be an entirely 'fair' test of the model.

However, the findings reported by Christopher Armitage were similarly problematic for TPB. Interventions addressing 'attitude' to fat consumption and 'perceived behavioural control' both had a significant effect on attitude, but not on reported behaviour or intent. Information, on the other hand, led to no change across the TPB measures, but did lead to reduced fat intake for those participants who were 'high fat consumers'.

Since 'anticipated regret' is also not a TPB construct the evidence would seem to argue against the utility of TPB in promoting health behaviour, though it might be argued that TPB facilitated the appropriate timing and placing of the interventions presented.

In an entertaining presentation John Smith (University of Sunderland) gave a more radical critique. He argued that years of research have provided more than adequate confirmation of the general structure of TPB, so we should stop 'testing the model', accept it, and use it to structure future health interventions. One might develop an online interactive program to explore an individual's salient beliefs, perceptions or views of friends, and so on. But Smith argued that we must draw on other psychological insights and theories to develop the appropriate 'rhetoric' for

interventions. For him TPB has some diagnostic value, but for intervention it 'doesn't cut the mustard'.

Steve Sutton (University College London) described how TPB constructs helped improve understanding of intention to undergo predictive genetic testing for inherited breast and ovarian cancer; though how much a woman 'values certainty' (non-TPB) also seemed particularly relevant here. The TPB construct 'perceived behaviour control' did not seem relevant, which generated debate about other models and the interpretation and operationalisation of constructs — a common diversion in this line of research.

However, Sutton was keen to focus on the more pragmatic issue of whether women have a realistic view of the extent to which 'having the test' is or is not under their own control. Perhaps this is another illustration of how TPB constructs can be a useful pointer to relevant issues in health intervention, irrespective of the results of 'model testing'.

Eating disorders

NICOLA STIMPSON *reports on a symposium convened by Julie Seed (University of Northumbria) on behalf of the Psychobiology Section.*

THE symposium was convened in an attempt to pull together the many different themes of eating disorders research. Key topics addressed included the extent to which genes play a role in predisposing a person to having an eating disorder, how cognitions and behaviour might change with the development of eating disorders, the changes that can be seen in the brain structure of people with eating disorders, and the extent to which emotions and personality are involved.

The fact that eating disorders such as anorexia nervosa exist in countries like China is probably not widely known. David Collier (Institute of Psychiatry) pointed this out and suggested that the blame for the rise in the rate of eating disorders could not lie solely with Western culture and the mass media. Indeed, the

heritability of anorexia is estimated to be around 50–60 per cent, suggesting a complex interaction of genes and environment.

Collier continued by explaining the role of the neurotransmitter serotonin in anorexia. Patients with anorexia often show an increase in serotonin levels in the brain. Serotonin works as an appetite suppressant, and higher levels of serotonin are also associated with certain personality traits (such as perfectionism and obsessive behaviour). These personality traits are often seen in those with anorexia. This suggests that people with these personality traits may be more predisposed to anorexia.

Julie Machan (Rochdale NHS Trust) summarised the past research on attention and impulsivity in eating disorders. This revealed that people with these disorders often have decreased attention and memory deficits. Those with bulimia nervosa and

binge-purge anorexia also show behavioural and cognitive impulsivity. Machan found that both anorexics and bulimics showed impairment on a range of cognitive and behavioural tasks. However, after controlling for depression and anxiety many of the differences in performances were reduced.

Personality also tended to influence performance on the tests. Anorexics, often found to have perfectionist traits, took longer to complete the tests. Bulimics, who are often impulsive, worked quickly but produced many errors.

Julie Seed (University of Northumbria) described her results on the role of cortisol in anorexia. An increase in the production of cortisol is associated with a range of cognitive impairments and with anorexia.

Seed found no differences between the levels of cortisol secretion in her groups of anorexics and controls. However, when the groups were working on recall tasks, performance by both groups was similar until distractor stimuli were introduced. When the distractor stimuli were introduced the anorexics performance fell, suggesting a heightened sensitivity to distraction. As cortisol secretion was

similar in both groups, the cognitive impairments found in anorexia must result from something other than heightened cortisol secretion.

Barbara Rost (University of Basle, Switzerland) presented work being carried out on how brain functioning and structure changes throughout the course of eating disorders. Metabolic changes had occurred in the brains of people with eating disorders — and the more severe the condition, the more severe the changes. However, these

changes did return to normal with the restoration of normal body weight and nutritional rehabilitation.

Finally, Janet Treasure (Institute of Psychiatry) talked about the role of emotion within eating disorders, an area that is often neglected. Disgust appears to be a key emotion and Treasure pointed out that although people with eating disorders lose their sensitivity for recognising the emotion behind most facial expression, their ability to recognise disgust remains intact. This

finding is similar to one noted in clinical depression whereby the ability to recognise sadness is retained when the ability to recognise other emotions is diminished.

Louise Dye (University of Leeds) drew the various areas of research together. She concluded that it is not clear why some people develop eating disorders where others do not. Certain people may have a genetic predisposition, and when it is coupled with other stresses of life the likelihood of developing an eating disorder increases.

Pathways to hopelessness

SIMON BIGNELL reports on a talk by Rory O'Connor on cognitive vulnerability, future-directed thinking, hopelessness and parasuicide.

EVERY 82 minutes there is a suicide somewhere in the UK and Ireland. The rate of suicide has been rising at an alarming rate over the past two decades. Although organisations like The Samaritans offer valuable emotional support, it is impossible to judge how effective they are at reducing levels of suicide in those at risk. Many studies have attempted to isolate the causes of suicidal thoughts and feelings, but such research (which has often taken a biological or medical perspective) has failed to provide an adequate understanding.

Rory O'Connor (University of Strathclyde) enthusiastically explored this topic, presenting recent research that was conducted with his colleagues Hazel Connery and William Cheyne. One of their primary aims was to understand the concept of hopelessness that is thought to underlie the relationship between depression and suicidal behaviour.

O'Connor suggested that the ways we go about looking at suicide are problematic as they have yet to reduce the incidence of suicide itself. He argued that being aware of the traditional risk factors for depression (unemployment, socio-economic status, social isolation, etc.) is not enough. For a long while it was believed that depression is the reason why people kill themselves, but we now know that this is not the case. He noted that while this view was useful for identifying individuals at risk, researchers have since identified the concept of hopelessness as more closely related to suicidal behaviour.

Hopelessness theories suggest that particular cognitive styles contribute to a person's vulnerability to depression and

hopelessness. O'Connor and his colleagues have been investigating whether cognitive style is involved in the development of future thinking as well as hopelessness. They studied a group of people who had



Rory O'Connor

been admitted to hospital following attempted suicide (parasuicide). The day following their attempts they were measured on hopelessness, depression, anxiety, cognitive vulnerability and future-directed thinking.

They found evidence that negative future-directed thinking, depression and negative cognitive style contribute to hopelessness. However, negative future-directed thinking was not correlated with either depression or negative cognitive style. Also, surprisingly, they found that negative cognitive style seems not to impede the ability to generate positive future experiences.

These results suggest that there is a separate route via negative future thinking to hopelessness, irrespective of cognitive style or depression. The findings have direct implications for clinicians using cognitive techniques to tackle suicidal

behaviour. In light of this, O'Connor and his colleagues suggest that 'interventions aimed at modifying habitual cognitive style for negative events will have no impact on the future thinking–hopelessness pathway; rather, they will affect the negative cognitive style–depression–hopelessness pathway'.

It seems there are dual pathways to hopelessness and the possibility exists that conventional cognitive therapies may be being ineffectually applied to those people with suicidal thoughts.

O'Connor called for future research to explore the nature of future-directed thinking — it is clear that longitudinal studies are required to investigate these complex relationships. Finally, he suggested that one area that may be revealing is 'perfectionistic' tendencies (unrealistic self-expectations and other people's expectations of oneself). This is the focus of the work of O'Connor and his colleagues at Strathclyde at present.

This was a very stimulating talk: Rory O'Connor succeeded in showing how this area of research is essential for us to develop a fuller understanding of suicidal thoughts and behaviour in order to allow better prediction, treatment and prevention.

WEBLINKS

American Association of Suicidology:

www.suicidology.org

Center for Therapy and Studies of Suicidal

Behaviour: www.uke.uni-hamburg.de/

[Clinics/Psych/TZS](#)

The pleasures and perils of being a new academic

DELLA MINETT-WESTWOOD *reports on the Division of Teachers and Researchers in Psychology symposium.*

THIS varied symposium, convened by Pam Newlands (Glasgow Caledonian University), included presentations from professors, lecturers and an educational developer on the plus and minus points of the first stage of an academic career.

Tony Gale (University of Portsmouth) began by providing an idiosyncratic view of academia based on 35 years of experience as a university teacher. He noted that the atmosphere created by the academic community is very important in a career, and that it can often be adversely affected by the fact that many heads of department are power and control 'mad'!

Gale suggested that academics should use their knowledge of psychology to guide their dealings with students and colleagues. He described three managerial types, invoking Skinnerian terms: the facilitator (positive reinforcement); the whip (negative reinforcement); and the blocker (induces negative affect through frustration). He concluded that academics should learn to emit the appropriate operants for their heads of department.

To further your career, Gale emphasised the importance of maintaining a balance in university work, keeping research focused and becoming an expert in one particular field. He extolled the reciprocal benefits of being an active member of the Society, for self-development and providing a voluntary contribution to the community.

Some useful practical advice on how to overcome student apathy was provided by Rhona Sharpe (Open University). She advised that lecturers should 'Prepare, Practise, and Pause'. She outlined ways of developing teaching skills, by having a plan

and reviewing it, finding the story, structuring sessions and requesting feedback on how it went. Finally, Sharpe suggested that new lecturers should attend other lectures, find out what support is available, talk about their teaching and collect feedback on it.

Steve Newstead (University of Plymouth) then gave an interesting, if at times disquieting, presentation 'On assessing and being assessed'. Newstead discussed the reliability of new and more experienced examiners, and aspects of the marking process itself. He commented on the frequency of cheating and plagiarism in the student population, and the problem of essay banks on the internet.

Newstead then turned to the issue of lecturers being evaluated by students as part of quality control procedures. He cited the 'Doctor Fox Effect' study, in which an actor posing as a charismatic lecturer gave a graduate seminar and was rated very highly by the students, even though he was talking nonsense throughout! Overall though, the evidence is that student evaluations are reliable and valid, and that well taught but difficult courses are not rated more highly.

The next talk changed the emphasis of the symposium from teaching to research. Darren Van Laar (University of Portsmouth) gave a constructive presentation 'Researcher droop — Or how to keep up your research output after starting a new lecturing job'. He began by defining researcher droop as 'the inability to achieve and maintain a programme of research sufficient to complete satisfactory Research Assessment Exercises'.

Van Laar described a typical case history: pre-lecturer research virility; first-

year abstinence from research due to teaching demands (but PhD papers still in the pipeline); second-year mastery as teaching becomes less time-consuming and the PhD papers are being published; and finally the third-year researcher droop.

Year four, then, is decision time: to research, or not to research. However, research is important to some extent in teaching, administration and research career paths, so Van Laar proceeded to offer some useful advice on how to keep up your research. These tips included always keeping a couple of research lines open, collaborating with colleagues, and taking on research students.

Van Laar ended with a discussion of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), posing the insightful question: Could God enter the RAE? Probably not actually, as He only has one publication, which was not in a refereed journal, and although He created the world, what has He done in the last five years?

Pam Newlands ended by presenting a survey of 20 new academics on issues including teaching, funding, marking, projects, and of course the RAE.

Plus points of teaching identified by the new academics surveyed included interested students, new personal learning, and being a facilitator of learning. The not-so-plus points included the regurgitation of the same material when seminars have to be repeated, the feeling of failure if students' attention has not been engaged, and many issues about marking.

Newlands then went on to discuss issues surrounding supervision of students, which can be enjoyable or frustrating depending on whether the student is enthusiastic or apathetic. On the more positive side, several factors were identified as definite advantages of being an academic, including autonomy, personal creativity and freedom.

It was apparent from the symposium that academic life does have its pitfalls, which appear in the most part to be valid concerns brought about by recent changes in the structure and accountability of academia. However, I left with the overall impression that becoming a lecturer is challenging, but ultimately rewarding.

Simon Bignell is from the University of Sussex

Anne Cooke is from the Salomons Centre, Tunbridge Wells

Gail Kinman is from the University of Luton

Denise Kirkland is from King Alfred's College, Winchester

Della Minett-Westwood is from the University of Southampton

Nicola Stimpson is from the University of Wales College of Medicine