

Reflections on the Needs of Society and what Psychology can Offer

Abstract

Where should the focus of applied psychology be in the coming decades? This was the question posed in the EFPA (European Federation of Psychologists' Associations) President's lecture by Robert Roe to the 2011 European Congress of Psychology in Istanbul. At the re-launch of the EFPA Board of Prevention and Intervention in 2014 he further outlined his views and made the case that the major pressing problems of society fall to some degree outside the traditional focus of psychology, that has mainly been on individual, one to one, therapeutic approaches. Given the very substantial advances in psychological science, he argued that there had been a significant and growing mismatch between what society needs and what psychology could offer. Through my experience of the work of three Boards of the EFPA, I hope to illustrate some examples of how we can think about overcoming this 'growing mismatch'.

Introduction and Context

This paper is an extended account of the Robert Roe Award lecture from the XVI European Congress of Psychology held in Moscow in 2019. It is particularly special to be able to contribute some ideas that draw on Robert Roe's work as I was and am a great admirer of his vision for how psychology can address real world problems and what its future focus should be. I have taken as a starting point his President's Lecture Delivered at the XVII European Congress of Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey, July 4, 2011 entitled 'Does Europe Need Psychologists' (Roe, 2011) and a talk he gave where he helped relaunch the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA) Board of Prevention and Intervention (now called the Board of Promotion and Prevention) in 2014 outlining some further ideas that were connected with his presidential lecture.

In this paper I have applied the themes Robert developed to the work of three EFPA Boards that I have been part of over the past ten years. I enjoyed my work with these groups and thank all the members who have made my time with them so rewarding and interesting; the Board of Ethics (<http://ethics.efpa.eu>), the Board of Promotion and Prevention (<http://preventionintervention.efpa.eu/introduction/>) and the Board Human Rights and Psychology (<http://human-rights.efpa.eu/information/>).

In his president's lecture, he sets out some quite tough challenges for psychologists concerning the reason for our existence as a profession. He recounts how he researched this partly by asking colleagues and finding that the answers were less coherent than if he had asked other professions what they were for. He also wrote that he framed his thinking by drawing on the book "Global Transformations", by the anthropologist, Michel-Rolph Trouillot (2016) that sought to understand anthropology's place in the world, in particular in an analysis of its role in historical terms, where anthropology could be seen as emerging to help the colonial powers deal with the peoples they were colonising. He says:

"I would like to apply Trouillot's question to psychology and ask: Why does psychology exist and what is the function of psychologists in society? In other words: What is the reason for our existence as psychologists, what is the essence of our work, what is it that society pays us for?"

Both here, and in other work, Robert takes up the issue of how psychology deals with its colonial heritage, and the need to expend more effort in decolonialising psychology for example in his paper *"We have always been indigenous: Thoughts about the past and future of psychology"* (Roe, 2014), and while this is a very important theme, I have chosen the other main focus of his paper.

He suggests there are (at least) three broad answers to the question of what psychology is for and the first two are:

- Psychology exists to help people make sense of their troubles, and as life is full of troubles (as well as joy of course) they are never short of work in that department.
- Psychology plays a part in helping people gain those things that they desire in life, what he calls 'determinants of success'.

However, it was the final element of psychology's role that he wanted to draw attention to in particular, and that was how psychology might function to serve powerful interests in society. That is to:

"..fulfil a need in people and institutions to exercise power and direct people's actions toward some common purpose. This seems to be something psychologists are involved with as well. It has been noted before: Psychologists are servants of power (Baritz, 1960). They are engaged in advertising and marketing, in managing organizations, and in the conduct of war."

In his talk to the Board of Prevention and Intervention some three years later, he described his thinking about the way psychology had positioned itself in recent years.

He said he had been impressed with the way psychological knowledge and professional competence had grown during the past decades resulting in the huge potential the discipline now has to help understand and so alleviate human problems in society.

He went on to say that there were significant barriers to this being realised. He thought this was particularly because the psychological profession as a whole had gravitated towards helping those with health problems, particularly mental health problems, on a one to one basis. He made it clear that helping people in this way was a good thing and an important part of our role. He also said that psychology, taken as a whole, was addressing many of society's needs. However, some areas of psychology that are critical to society's needs in our contemporary circumstances, were insufficiently prioritised and that this had resulted in *"a significant and growing mismatch between what society needs and what psychology offers"*.

These twin ideas, as I think they are closely connected, concerning psychology and power, and the “mismatch” has been the focus of my reflections for this paper, on the work I have undertaken with the EFPA.

The way they are connected will be developed later in detail but in outline I suggest that our codes of ethics, traditionally designed for one to one engagement – one psychologist with one client have acted as a sort of moral compass (or perhaps reflect the professions moral compass) which is linked to the way the profession positions itself.

Furthermore, I am also arguing that the Model Code that the EFPA general assembly endorsed in 2015 may support a repositioning of the profession in this regard as it makes explicit the professions commitment to human rights.

In order to illustrate how psychology can connect with these wider issues I will be describing the following areas of work:

1. Work on ethics at the end of life and the contribution psychology can make in the difficult area of voluntary euthanasia.
2. The work of the Board Human Rights and Psychology in its development of educational materials connecting psychology and human rights.
3. How through the work of the Board of Promotion and Prevention, given the strong evidence for early educational interventions and the wider issue of environmental psychology and climate change, possibly the most ‘upstream’ intervention we can make.

In the next section I will describe how the EFPA Model Code was developed, and the significance of the explicit connection that is made between ethics and human rights.

Work with the EFPA Boards

The Board of Ethics: Extending our Ethical Gaze

This was the first Board I joined when I was appointed to chair the British Psychological Society’s Ethics Committee. Its primary role is to provide review of the ethics code of any psychology association that wishes to join the EFPA to ensure it was consistent with the template ‘MetaCode’ that set out in outline what the key components needed to be (G. Lindsay, 2012).

If codes of ethics, as mentioned earlier, function in some way as a moral compass, could they have been too narrowly focussed in the past? While the ethical principles we use have stood the test of time and are, for some contexts and functions quite functional, perhaps there is a need for an additional principle that directly connects our work to the needs of society. A suggestion for this principle could be social accountability (Glavas, 2016; Pearson, Walpole, Barna, Id, & Walpole, 2015; Ventres, Boelen, & Haq, 2018).

To understand this further I looked for those areas of psychology where concern for social accountability was a key driver. One example is Peace Psychology (Christie, 2014) and I also went back and read the work of Kurt Lewin (Adelman, 1993), some of which was in work and organisational psychology that was Robert Roe’s speciality and whose writings on action

research relates to very directly. Lewin emphasised the importance for psychology of there being democratic engagement – still seen in, for example, Community Psychology and Social Psychology and he goes on to say “Research that produces nothing but books will not suffice.” (Lewin, 1946)

If this is correct, and I will develop this theme further, then perhaps our professional bodies need to make clearer public commitments contained in, perhaps, ethical codes for psychology’s professional bodies. As a parallel, in the business community, many connect their bottom line with social accountability connected with the impact they have on society’s needs – the so called impact economy – reflecting the fact that this will influence the decisions their customers and investors will be making in the future (Glavas, 2016) and connected with this is the rapidly growing fossil fuel disinvestment trend (see <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/news/2019/april/open-letter-on-climate-related-financial-risks>)

The EFPA MetaCode. For those unfamiliar with the Metacode, it was adopted by the EFPA in 1995 (Geoff Lindsay, 2011). All EFPA member associations codes are consistent with it and it has four principles:

- Respect for a Person's Rights and Dignity
- Competence
- Responsibility
- Integrity

Of these four, the principle of integrity comes closest to addressing psychologists addressing the ‘needs of society’:

“Psychologists are aware of the professional and scientific responsibilities to their clients, to the community, and to the society in which they work and live.”

It could be argued that this is framed rather narrowly given what psychology has to offer. In addition, it is also focussed on individual practice, and for those working in say organisational psychology or public health there is, again arguably, not a very good fit.

It was in 2011 as part of the work of the EFPA Executive, that Robert Roe wrote to the Board of Ethics asking it to develop a Model Code – which he said would need to include all the “*necessary ingredients*”, so professional bodies could ‘model’ their own codes on this. The Model Code was part of my (and the Board of Ethics’) life for over three years, but it finally got completed and was ratified in 2015 by the General Assembly.

A key issue for my thesis concerns the explicit link between ethics and human rights in the Model Code and the inclusion of specific human rights obligations. While undertaking the work on the development of the Model Code I began including human rights in my ethics teaching on the Exeter University clinical psychology programme and the following is a brief account of the approach I have been taking.

Teaching about Ethics and Human Rights.

While traditionally, teaching about ethics has been the province of philosophy, there has been a growing movement to develop a science of ethics and moral reasoning across the two relatively new fields of moral psychology and experimental philosophy. These are the

fields I primarily draw on when teaching on ethics and also on human rights and psychology. Both fields have much to contribute to both our understanding of our values but also how we make ethical decisions, and in connection with Moral Psychology the APA handbook of Ethics in Psychology states:

“Another approach is the current work in “moral psychology” by several individuals whose work promises to reshape the entire moral landscape of our thinking about ethics. How this work is to be integrated into such thinking remains to be seen, but almost assuredly it will result in a radical, naturalistic foundation for moral philosophy.” (Kitchener & Kitchener, 2012)

For example, Jonathan Haidt’s work on Moral Foundation theory helps understand how our value systems are organised (Graham et al., 2013). Paul Bloom and his colleagues show how moral sense develops – his book *Just Babies*, so called as it is just about babies, but also because it is about preverbal infants sense of justice – is a compelling read (Bloom, 2013). In addition to Moral Psychology I also find experimental philosophy a useful approach and include this as well (Knobe et al., 2012).

I have also been interested how we teach and assess ethical competence and helped the British Psychological Society develop their guidelines (Bullen & Wainwright, 2015).

In this guideline, we chose to use the four component model developed by James Rest, an educational psychologist (Rest, 1982). This provides a simple heuristic for learners to consider how they make ethical judgements and take ethical action. To be a competent ethical practitioner using this model, you need firstly to be able to spot an ethical issue because that’s fundamental (ethical sensitivity) – if you don’t perceive there is an ethical issue, you won’t do anything about it. Reasoning about it and being motivated are also important so you have a clear aim (ethical reasoning and ethical motivation). An equally fundamental component is being able to act (ethical implementation). All of these components map on well to large amounts of good quality psychological research.

I have used Rest’s approach in my teaching for some time and wanted to find a parallel that I could use for human rights teaching and came across the work of Urban Jonsson (Jonsson, 1996, 1997, 2003) who was an expert in both nutrition and human rights. He developed a framework so that workers in challenging situations could have a simple rules for applying human rights and it can work well as a parallel with the four-component model – sensitivity, reasoning, motivation and action. In his approach, the issue concerns the capability of those who are duty-bearers to fulfil their human rights obligations, and the capability of those who are rights-holders to obtain them and it is further discussed by Daniel Seymour in his chapter in the excellent book *“The Professional Identity of the Human Rights Field Officer”* (Seymour, 2016).

Combing these models with other material clinical psychology trainees reported in a recent workshop that I conducted with them, that they are very interested in human rights but feel very under-prepared. They had these comments and said that they wanted to know more:

- Human rights are under-discussed perhaps even silenced.
- Felt they knew little about the detail of human rights – are, for example, some rights more important than others?
- What do you do if you think there is a human rights issue – ask a social worker?

- Perhaps it is all included in ethics?
- Is it the law?
- Sometimes taking action on human rights isn't safe.
- Whose rights? – patients or staff for example
- Open to argument, not evidence based.
- Cultural issues – are some relative?
- Species-ism – what about animal rights?

While there is some material available for teaching about human rights in the context of psychology education it is relatively limited. I draw on work from Liverpool University that Sarah Butchard and Beth Greenhill and colleagues have published (and is free to download) and in that they say:

“..within our professional training, as for the training of most other health professionals, very little is said, or taught, explicitly about human rights.” (Butchard et al., 2015, p. 10)

This detour leads me back to the Model Code and how we linked up ethics ‘explicitly’ with human rights. This was one of the tasks set by the EFPA for the Board Psychology and Human Rights and one of the ‘necessary ingredients’ that Robert Roe referred to in his letter.

As part of the final phase of development, a group from the Board of Ethics and the Board of Human Rights and Psychology worked on the final version of the model code, incorporating specific references to human rights both in terms of the underpinning values, but also in the obligations:

1. The values of the Code are based on the European Convention on Human Rights
2. Psychological science and practice serve the well-being of people; as such psychologists also have a professional and scientific responsibility towards society at large.
3. The psychologist aims to actively prevent and report such actions as indoctrination, brainwashing or torture. Psychologists will report to the national association or relevant human rights bodies.

For all codes, a psychologist would have a duty to take some action about colleagues behaving unethically, but there was no explicit duty to either pay attention to or report on human rights issues. By including the reference to ‘actively preventing’ and ‘reporting’ to the national association’ or ‘relevant human rights bodies’ it broadens the span of duties required by an individual psychologist. By including the national associations in this definition, it also suggests that they also have a duty to report to relevant human rights bodies .

Now it may be that for an individual psychologist, their conduct has not been involved, and so the Code would not mean they had to take individual action, but for the profession as a whole, especially if there is a professional body, then there needs to be some accountability to address these potentially major public policy questions. The Model Code goes some way towards this, and I think firmly positions the profession in the role of an organisation committed to defending human rights. This broader reach for our Codes is in line, I think, with Robert’s vision.

In summary, then, my case is that we need to be concerned both with our values but also with how we take action. The Model Code, by including human rights in the duty of an individual

psychologist and also of the association that they belong to, provides the scaffolding that connects our practice to the protection of the vulnerable where power is in play. In order to be competent in this duty we need to be educated about human rights and not rely, as my trainees suggested, on asking another profession. Finally, all professional psychology associations, certainly those who are members of the EFPA should be familiar with human rights bodies in their countries and the relevant national reporting mechanisms.

In her paper "*The Human Rights Committee at the Norwegian Psychological Association: 20 Years of Work and Future Challenges*" Sveaass (2019) provides any professional body of psychologists that wants to establish a human rights committee a simple how to guide. So far as I am aware there are three such committees in the EFPA: Croatia, The Netherlands and, the one with the longest history, Norway. The paper describes the activities of the committee, such as including Human Rights in the National Association's statutes, engaging in political debates and criticizing ongoing practices within our own profession and in society at large where Human Rights are at stake, and taking part in the UN reporting and monitoring processes; in all this the importance of a human rights based psychology, and human rights education for psychologists, is emphasized.

In summary then, Robert was suggesting that there was a mismatch between what we can offer as psychologists and the needs of society, and I think that by extending the scope of our Codes to explicitly include human rights duties it can facilitate paying attention to these wider concerns. The move from the traditional, one to one model, then the Model Code and perhaps wider still in the Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychology of the International Union of Psychological Science (<http://www.iupsys.net/about/governance/universal-declaration-of-ethical-principles-for-psychologists.html>) is part of this broadening of our ethical gaze.

In reflecting on these points there were two things that occurred to me. The first is that perhaps there is a missing principle that could reflect this broader ethical gaze. I suggest it is something like social accountability. There are hints of it, for example, in the research ethics field, where accountability for the way research is conducted, the way the research is publicly represented, and used, is part of the duty of the researcher. The accountability doesn't end in the lab (see for example <https://www.acss.org.uk/developing-generic-ethics-principles-social-science/academy-adopts-five-ethical-principles-for-social-science-research/>)

Ethics at the End of Life: Voluntary Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide.

An illustration of how the broader theme of social accountability connects with psychology is some work concerning ethics at the end of life, that I have been working on with Miguel Ricou, a colleague from the Board of Ethics, and this also touches on human rights issues as well. In particular we have been concerned with how psychologists might engage with the debate over voluntary euthanasia and what skills and knowledge we might apply in this difficult area. As discussed above, my view is that the traditionally focused codes were not well suited to dealing with a topic like this, and perhaps the broader ethical commitments embodied in the UDEPP might be a helpful guide. So I am very grateful for a very insightful paper Carole Sinclair has recently written on exactly this topic (Sinclair, 2019). In her abstract she summarises her views, very similar to my own:

“Four particular responsibilities are highlighted: (a) increase professional and scientific knowledge; (b) use psychological knowledge for beneficial purposes; (c) adequately train its members; and (d) encourage beneficial social structures and policies. For each responsibility, some of the major societal-level ethical issues and current needs discussed in the literature are identified, as well as ways that psychology has contributed to dealing with those issues and needs. In conclusion, several recommendations are offered regarding ways in which psychologists and psychology could increase its contribution.”

Public policy on voluntary euthanasia and physician assisted suicide has been an emerging as a high-profile ethical question as different countries in Europe and worldwide adopt legislation legalising the practice. The term itself, euthanasia, has a difficult history of course. My own interest began with the teaching of Wolf Wolfensberger on Normalisation and Social Role Valorization (Wolfensberger, 2011). Wolf Wolfensberger, the late professor of psychology from Syracuse who led this work, introduced me to what happened during the Nazi Euthanasia programme and its implications for today’s practice (Baron-Cohen, Klin, Silberman, & Buxbaum, 2018). I have vivid memories of going to a commemoration at Hartheim Castle in Austria, some years ago, which was a learning disability centre in pre-war days. It was here that one of the first gas chambers can be found, built to kill the disabled and where psychologists played a role (Loistl & Schwanninger, 2018). This history is, of course, also connected with the history of eugenics and Sir Francis Galton’s work in the early part of the last century, supported actively by many at the time, and led at least in part by psychologists, which resulted in human rights abuses on a large scale (Kevles, 1999).

Miguel and I wanted to know how psychologists were involved in those countries where voluntary euthanasia has been legalised – and couldn’t find very much. This also seemed like an area that is profoundly important but not well addressed by psychologists. It was clear that this issue was one that was shared by others and we organised a joint symposium at the XV ECP in Amsterdam, jointly between the Boards of Ethics and the Board Human Rights and Psychology to consider the role psychologists might be playing, or indeed should be playing in this field, chaired by the Convenor of the Board of Ethics, Henk Geertsema. It was particularly clear we needed to discuss and debate this area of work, as in some countries, for example, Belgium, children are now able to ask for voluntary euthanasia. Miguel has now established a multi-professional network of clinicians and academics who have an interest in exploring this field and we have a PhD student working on identifying any guidelines that are available and how psychologists think they should be involved. A further symposium was held at the ECP in Moscow with a symposium chaired by Dr. Saskia Teunisse, and another symposium is planned for the International Congress of Psychology in Prague in 2020.

As a clinical psychologist whose specialty has been working with older people, including those with dementia I had worked with clients who wished to die, and some of whom, with full capacity, did take their own lives. My view is that there are many unanswered research questions as, unlike suicide that has had a good deal of psychological attention, this field is relatively neglected.

The research questions we are exploring include:

1. When someone, whether a child or an adult requests voluntary euthanasia or assisted suicide, how do you make a judgement on how long they should wait before they carry it out. There is evidence that people who attempt suicide but are unsuccessful report changing their minds (Rosen, 1975). The decision making at the end of life may be different for many reasons: How do we make decisions? What is involved in the decision-making process? What factors influence our decisions? May we control such factors?
2. How can palliative care influence this kind of decision?
3. What are the social impacts and repercussions of such decisions at the end of life? What is the impact of this kind of decision on a patient's family? Some people ask to die because they perceive themselves as a burden to their families. We need to know more about this matter, so we can most effectively support family members affected.

The debate around euthanasia and assisted suicide has underpinned two fundamental values that are crucial in modern societies: the respect for autonomy and the value of life. Since these two values carry such great importance, any attempt to make a simple choice becomes naturally very hard. At the same time, the possibility of arriving at a consensus appears to be virtually impossible. We seem to face an endless dispute, one that is grounded on each person's individual 'sacred values' (Sloman & Fernbach, 2018). Nevertheless, Miguel and I believe that psychology and psychological science can make a major contribution to helping resolve these dilemmas.

For voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide, we have been arguing that the debate should not be focused on deciding if we must respect autonomy or defend life. We suggest that one way would be to frame the question is whether the choice an individual makes to end their life is in their best interest. The main idea is if the decisions made by a person concerning their own death is a conscious decision and, more than that, if deciding so is indeed the best option for that person see Ricou and Wainwright (2018) for further discussion.

One key additional question concerns the relative financial cost of voluntary euthanasia compared with general healthcare costs among older people. The evidence is that in many countries a high proportion of health spending is in the last years of a person's life and overall spending on health and welfare rises rapidly over the age of 65. In the UK, the Institute of Fiscal Studies report indicated that 32% of all hospital spending in England is accounted for by just 1% of the general population (Kelly, Stoye, & Vera-Hernández, 2015).

In conclusion, health and welfare is expensive, whereas voluntary euthanasia is not. It is not hard to see that cost saving arguments can lead to vulnerable people being at best encouraged and at worst pressurised to ask to die. Particularly in times of austerity these economic challenges make the slippery slope much more slippery. There are many obvious human rights questions here and so human rights protection and advocacy will be especially important for these groups. So now I will turn to the work of the Board Human Rights and Psychology.

The Board Human Rights and Psychology. When I joined this Board, it was to meet with an extraordinary energetic group, passionate about human rights and working very much in line with Robert Roe's vision.

My personal challenge was to try to gain a clear conceptual understanding of the connection between human rights and psychology. I think I shared with many others, the notion that human rights were a good thing, but perhaps not really relevant to the day to day practice of psychologists, apart from in some specific settings – say prisons or mental health facilities where people may be compulsorily detained.

The Board was established in 2013 as a response to the what were described by the EFPA as ongoing threats to human rights and Robert Roe was a particular supported of our work. Our policy statement sets out the aims of the Board (<http://human-rights.efpa.eu/introduction/policy-paper>). The convenor when I joined, was Polli Hagenars, an enormously energetic leader , health psychologist and expert in human rights and psychology (Hagenars, 2016) and she circulates a monthly newsletter that can be accessed from the Board website (<http://human-rights.efpa.eu/introduction/>).

It was in this group, that Robert Roe's point about psychology being both in the service of power and defending those at risk from those in power came into particular focus. Two events come to mind. A conference one of the Board members, Artemis Giotsa organised in Greece (<http://humanrights.conf.uoi.gr/en/>) when the tragedy of people fleeing oppression was a major issue for the Greek people. The conference was inspiring as even though it dealt with difficult topics, the way people were addressing these problems gave great hope. The Board also visited the UN in Geneva and to get an insight into their work. As a clinical psychologist working in the health service in the UK this was new to me. The work they described was shockingly difficult and the people they supported were experiencing really terrible circumstances and again was a mixture of hope and tragedy.

As discussed earlier, the Board has an aim of developing educational materials for psychologists on Human Rights. In pursuit of this goal, it organised a meeting jointly with the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) and European Interuniversity Centre for Human Rights and Democratisation (EIUC). This was held in Venice in October 2016 at the EIUC (<http://congress-humanrights.efpa.eu>) and brought together human rights specialists and practitioners, psychologists and other related disciplines to discuss how we could facilitate human rights being informed by psychological theory and science, and how psychology could be informed by human rights practice and understanding. The goals we set were:

- Professional psychologists accept and realise Human Rights as a normative standard for their professional behaviour.
- Psychologists and their professional organisations take a public position as professionals condemning any Human Rights violations.
- Professional psychologists publicly intervene if they have the opportunity to foresee the negative consequences of certain kinds of public action and threats of Human Rights violations.

- Psychologists offer their support to alleviate the consequences of Human Rights violations if their professional knowledge and expertise can significantly contribute to a reduction in the negative consequences of such violations.
- These goals will be achieved, among others, through education of psychologists about Human Rights, one of the core issues for the EFPA Board Human Rights & Psychology.

As a follow up to this meeting the Board established two workstreams that I joined – one to publish a textbook on education on human rights for psychologists, and the other to organise a special issue on psychology and human rights to be published in the *European Psychologist*.

At the Venice meeting I met many people from whom I learned a great deal, and one person that influenced me enormously was George Ulrich, who is the EIUC Academic Director. In the textbook I worked with him on a chapter entitled professional identity and human rights. From the human rights perspective we have drawn on his work on the professional identity of the human rights field officer that tells the story of how human rights practitioners have developed their own professional identity (Ulrich & O'Flaherty, 2016) and his development of an ethical framework for Human Rights research (Ulrich, 2017). The story of the emergence of psychology's professional identity – what I have come to see very much as a family of professions – and putting the two narratives together has been our aim.

The textbook is work on progress and aims to be in print in the Summer of 2020 and we hope we can present the material in a way that will be accessible to students in psychology programmes and hopefully others.

We have 19 chapters covering specific areas including an overview of human rights frameworks, cross cultural issues, professional identity, use and misuse of psychological science, health, children, work related issues, how psychologists can respond to human rights abuses, discrimination, disability, migration, indigenous communities, torture, gender and war, human rights competence for psychologists and educational practice. There are, of necessity, areas we haven't covered, but we hope this will be a useful text book for both students and teachers in psychology who want to learn more about human rights and psychology.

As well as the text book we have produced the special issue of the *European Psychologist* on psychology and human rights (Söderström, Hageñaars, Wainwright, & Wagner, 2019)

In the editorial we comment on a worrying trend in way Human Rights are being eroded. For many years they had been improving, but the last report of the World Justice Project Rule of Law index for 2017–2018 shows that this trend has stopped, and the biggest reversal was in fundamental rights in over half the countries included (World Justice Project, 2018). Clearly there is much work to be done.

The special issue starts with four context-setting papers. These are followed by three in applied fields: two that cover the application of a human rights-based approach in the field of dementia care and another focusing on children's rights and bullying as a human rights

violation. The final two papers consider situations where psychologists are called upon to directly challenge authorities in contexts where public policy violates both ethical and human rights principles. Promotion of human rights and prevention of human rights violations provides a link to the work of the final Board I will describe, the Board of Promotion and Prevention.

The Board of Promotion and Prevention and expanding psychology's horizons.

Unsurprisingly, this board, with prevention in its name has a strong focus on early intervention and support for children. The members are a very interesting team including our colleague from the University of St Petersburg, Professor Rifkat Mukhamedrakhimov, whose international work over many years on how best to support children growing up under difficult circumstances, particularly when they live in institutions is of great importance (Muhamedrahimov et al., 2018; Mukhamedrakhimov, 1998). He and his colleagues, shows how such early difficult experiences can have a profound effect and also how best to alleviate these effects, unpicking what works for what developmental issue (Hawk et al., 2018; McCall et al., 2019)

There is now very extensive evidence that early access to good education has a major impact on children's life chances (Asmussen et al., 2018) and of course it is also one of the rights of the child <https://www.unicef.org.uk> .

To illustrate, here are two examples. The first is a study by David Weikart who randomly allocated at risk children to an educational intervention and had a control group of similar children who got their usual education. 50 years on we have the evidence. The unique aspect of this study was that he teamed up with the Nobel prize winning economist James Heckman who did the maths. The results are very powerful. The outcomes for the children in the study were significantly better than for the children in the control group in all sorts of ways. Not for all of them, but it was a very substantial effect. And spending a dollar on the education saved 13 dollars in subsequent costs – and that is probably an underestimate. And this year (2019) they have looked at the outcomes for the next generation and these young people show powerful effects too (<https://highscope.org/perry-preschool-project/>). It demonstrates that not only does the early intervention significantly improve the life chances of the children who were participants, but also their own children – an impact across the generations that not only does good but saves money.

The message is clear that if you want to persuade your government this is one of the best studies, but you will, as in much prevention work need to also persuade them to think beyond the next election.

The second example that Robert Roe mentioned in the published version of his 2011 Presidential Lecture where he refers to “An inspiring example is the “Fairstart project,” initiated by Danish psychologist Niels Peter Rygaard and funded by the European Union. I am happy to say that Niels is now a member of this Board and the work he and his team deliver is indeed inspiring. As he says on the website:

“We educate caregivers so they can give vulnerable children a safe upbringing – so these children grow up on equal terms with everyone else and will be able to make a difference in

the world later on. We are thereby contributing to the fight against inequality and helping to secure a more sustainable society for future generations.”

From 2008, Niels gathered an international network of researchers in traumatised children and youth, defining quality care. He now designs supervised online educations for Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO's) and governments in how to train caregiver groups: foster families, orphanage and refugee camp staff, in daily attachment based care. To date they have 540 instructors from 26 countries graduated their 6 month education and they have trained the caregivers of 35.000 children with his training programs in 20 versions, adjusted to language and local culture.

You can find his papers and presentations here: <https://bit.ly/2xmCbK5>

This focus on the collective as well as the individual is also very much part of the overall thinking in the Board of Promotion and Prevention, now led by Margarida Gaspar de Matos. To give an idea of the range we have Margarida's work linking individual psychotherapy with population-based approaches in young people; work in the field of developmental genetics – and as people will be aware the extraordinary developments in the field of genomics are astonishing and have important relevance to prevention; a colleague, who calls herself a “bureaucrat”, working with the whole city of Bergen in Norway; developing a universal curriculum for addiction; and developing ideas for how to apply behavioural economics. We have summarised this in a paper that was published in May 2019 European Psychologist describing the ideas the Board has for the role of applied psychology in promotion and prevention, each from their own professional role's perspectives (Gaspar de Matos et al., 2019).

Government policies all over the world say that prevention is really important and that we should prioritise it as it makes such good sense. Early intervention has strong evidence for its effectiveness and it is clearly in everyone's interest to give every child a good start in life. A recent report from the World Bank summarised the state of knowledge (Tanner, Candland, & Odden, 2015) :

- Early childhood interventions can, but do not always, lead to benefits later in life in the areas of cognition, language, socioemotional health, education, and the labor market. Evaluated interventions have not demonstrated consistent lasting advantages for physical development, although these outcomes are less salient to adult welfare.
- Gender-neutrality dominates outcomes generally, but schooling does tend to improve for girls, the poor, and those who are in quality preschool and supplemental feeding programs for longer.
- Nutrition interventions may need to be in place throughout and beyond the first 1,000 days in order to leverage the window of opportunity from conception to age 2 and achieve sustained effects beyond early childhood.
- Sizeable knowledge gaps persist but can be closed with careful planning and design.

However, the rhetoric of prevention is rarely backed up with resources and as Robert Roe pointed out, our efforts in psychology are generally not on prevention but on helping later

down the track. Furthermore, a survey our Board carried out suggests that psychologists do not routinely get much training in how to deliver prevention – upstream - interventions.

An intervention that couldn't get more upstream, is acting to prevent the worst impacts of climate change and the related ways we have been affecting the environment. The Lancet Climate Health Countdown (<http://www.lancetcountdown.org/>) summarises the issue from the health perspective well:

“Present day changes in heat waves, labour capacity, vector-borne disease, and food security provide early warning of the compounded and overwhelming impact on public health that are expected if temperatures continue to rise. Trends in climate change impacts and vulnerabilities show an unacceptably high level of risk for the current and future health of populations across the world.

A lack of progress in reducing emissions and building adaptive capacity threatens both human lives and the viability of the national health systems they depend on, with potential to disrupt core public health infrastructure and overwhelm health services. “

Climate Change and the Environment.

I would like to begin with some personal reflections. I am particularly concerned about the impact of climate disruption on future generations and so I asked my son, Luke to ask his daughter Jessica, aged 10, what she thought. And this is what she said after watching the TED talk by Greta Thunberg, who started the school strikes (Thunberg, 2019).

Hello, I'm Jessica. I want to talk to you about Greta [Thunberg]. She's the one that did the video about climate change. And I really loved that video and I agree with her 100%. People say like "kids you can change the world" you can do all these things about climate change, , but we can't. Because by the time we're like, your age, we won't be able to. It will be terrible by that time if we don't act on it. By the time I'm 50, about 2040, I'll probably have kids and they will also ask why we didn't act on it and I'll tell them it was because no one thought it was a big thing. Everyone thought we could deal with it like that! and its fine. But we shouldn't have. And that is going to be one of our biggest regrets when we are older. “

Her thoughts are clearly shared by millions of young people across the world.

In my own career, I have been deeply concerned about this issue for many years. I started out as a zoologist and then switched to experimental and then clinical psychology, so my interest in the environment and environmental psychology was there from the start. I was campaigning with Friends of the Earth 15 years ago for there to be a Climate Change Act and it became law in 2008 (<https://www.theccc.org.uk/our-impact/ten-years-of-the-climate-change-act/>). I believe that this law and the Committee on Climate that it established have been instrumental in what progress the UK has made in reducing its emissions (Committee on Climate Change, 2019). The good news is that we have psychology representation on the Climate Committee, Nick Chater.

Ten years ago, I helped the BPS host a conference on climate change and psychology for policy makers after the Ethics Committee had held a discussion on the topic; it was a good day, but it was disappointing that we didn't engage with the issue to any degree afterwards.

Around this time I also published a paper called Climate change and refocusing clinical psychology (Wainwright, 2009) in which I said:

“Climate change poses a major challenge to humanity. There are many aspects of the way we respond to this impending global transformation which are essentially psychological and social. A brief account of some areas of concern is presented.”

I went on to say:

“I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that climate change poses a major challenge to human civilisation. The impending transformation of the physical environment is unprecedented in human history. Along-side these changes are the equally unprecedented losses of animal and plant species through habitat destruction.”

Robert Roe did not discuss this area in any detail, although briefly mentions it in his 2011 paper, but this reflects the rapid way in which it has moved up the public, political and professional agenda in recent times. The EFPA did try and establish a task force on Environmental Psychology in 2009 proposed by Norway, but there were not enough interested people, so it never started. In retrospect, given the current awareness of the ‘climate crisis’ this now seems extraordinary.

Ten years on and the truth is that the global emissions of greenhouse gases continues to climb as though there had been no Kyoto or any other agreement reaching levels it has not seen for at least 800,000 years. We, as psychologists also need to understand how quickly this heating effect is happening and how adding this amount of energy to a dynamic complex system is creating very major instabilities that are already in train and will last for thousands of years. This may sound like hyperbole but sadly it isn’t. If this wasn’t depressing enough the need to foster international collaboration could never be more important, and yet there are many trends towards populism and alt-right ideas that run counter to what is needed. In addition, there are many other aspects of the effect human behaviour is having on the environment, from biodiversity loss to ocean acidification, but they are all part of the same interconnected system. The way that these impacts will differentially impact on those who contributed least to the harmful effects on the environment is particularly ironic and there is strong evidence that inequality that is a pervasive aspect of many countries will be made significantly worse by climate change. In an important report Nazrul Islam and Winkel (2017) say:

“This paper offers a unifying conceptual framework for understanding the relationship between climate change and ‘within-country inequalities,’ referred here collectively as ‘social inequality’. Available evidence indicates that this relationship is characterized by a vicious cycle, whereby initial inequality causes the disadvantaged groups to suffer disproportionately from the adverse effects of climate change, resulting in greater subsequent inequality.”

An important paper in Nature Climate Change (Rigg & Mason, 2018) provides a critique of the way climate science has developed being largely located in the physical sciences. They propose we urgently need a new model that incorporates social science as in its current form it is reductionist. This is an important lesson and underlines the importance of

supporting and engaging with those social scientists including psychologists who are already involved.

What can Psychologists offer? Alongside the more discouraging aspects above, by contrast, there are some very heartening developments. In 2011 the APA published an important report on psychology and climate change with advice to policymakers (Clayton et al., 2016; Swim et al., 2011). Today the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that advises policymakers now has expert members from psychology, described by Patrick Devine Wright, who is also involved as a stunning achievement for the discipline, as hitherto there were none involved. All are contributing to Working Group III, focusing on mitigation. These reports assess the psychological literature relevant to climate change mitigation and adaptation (<https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-cycle/>). They are, Linda Steg on behaviour change, from The Netherlands; Susan Clayton on adaptation, from the US; Elke Weber, on decision science from the US; Petra Schweizer-Ries on sustainability from Germany and Lorraine Whitmarsh on behaviour change from Wales in the UK – and there may be others.

Also, in the ground-breaking 1.5 report on which Linda Steg was one of the lead authors commissioned by the IPCC (Masson-Delmotte & al., 2018) they say in their typically understated way the following:

“Limiting warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels would require transformative systemic change, integrated with sustainable development. Such change would require the upscaling and acceleration of the implementation of far-reaching, multilevel and cross-sectoral climate mitigation and addressing barriers. Such systemic change would need to be linked to complementary adaptation actions, including transformational adaptation, especially for pathways that temporarily overshoot 1.5°C”

They also say this isn't happening yet.

Linda Steg has shown that among Europeans at any rate, there is now public awareness and understanding that climate change needs to be addressed. She says we need research to find out why people don't act (Steg, 2018). A good toolbox for action is the report on how to apply behavioural economics, psychology and other social approaches to environmental issues including climate change. It is detailed – primarily focussing on communities and individual change, rather than national approaches (Park, Reiner, Green, & Williamson, 2019).

My main conclusion is that we need to make our effort on environmental psychology part of all aspects of the family of psychology as we will have something to contribute. As the Paris agreement and the Conferences of the Parties (COP) process is the main international process, we urgently need to connect with it. I would suggest the following could be a goal for psychology: to have each countries psychology association identify the key aims their country has set and work with them to find the best and most effective psychological approaches to their achievement. I truly believe that this could become a unifying theme across countries as we all collectively are facing a dramatically disrupted future even with

the targets already agreed. This information is available so you can see how much needs to be done as there are no countries that is on target to remain below the 1.5 degree threshold set (www.climateactiontracker.org)

We need a strategy for mobilising applied psychology to address climate disruption (Mitchell, Rubb, & Wainwright, 2019). As we have seen we need change at all levels from global to very local and while psychological science is by no means the whole answer, we have much to contribute. It is also obvious that we will need collaboration like never before, and there are signs as we all know that this is not going well, so we need to redouble our efforts. Some international organisations of psychologists, for example the Caribbean Alliance of National Psychological Associations (<http://canpanet.org/>) the International Association for Applied Psychology (<https://iaapsy.org>) and the International Union of Psychological Science (<http://www.iupsys.net>) are important platforms for enhancing and sustaining this collaboration, and show how we can link the knowledge and skills we have as psychologists with the needs of society. Furthermore these collaborations can work to protect the vulnerable through the promotion of human rights.

Summary and Conclusions. Was Robert right in his contention is that there is a “significant and growing mismatch between what society needs and what psychology offers”? Was he also right that psychology can be a servant of power? I think he was right on both counts. However, I hope I have illustrated on the first issue, that psychologists are addressing this mismatch. However, make no mistake, the problems that our society’s face globally are very substantial indeed, and the major focus of psychology in broad terms remains somewhat distant from these issues. So, while there is active involvement of psychologists in a broad range of areas, from public health and education, to climate change and the environment we require a very substantial change in both culture and strategy if we are to genuinely address Robert’s challenge. Furthermore, if my contention that one of the most promising mediators between psychology and the needs of society is the framework of human rights, then the implication is that these need to be embedded in psychology education and practice, in accordance with the Model Code.

Bibliography

- Adelman, C. (1993). Kurt Lewin and the Origins of Action Research. *Educational Action Research*, 1(1), 7-24. doi:10.1080/0965079930010102
- Asmussen, K., Law, J., Charlton, J., Acquah, D., Brims, L., Pote, I., & McBride, T. (2018). *Key competencies in early cognitive development: Things, people, numbers and words*. Retrieved from <https://www.eif.org.uk/>
- Baritz, L. (1960). *The servants of power. A history of the use of social science in American industry*. New York: Wiley.
- Baron-Cohen, S., Klin, A., Silberman, S., & Buxbaum, J. D. (2018). Did Hans Asperger actively assist the Nazi euthanasia program? *Molecular Autism*, 9(1), 28. doi:10.1186/s13229-018-0209-5
- Bloom, P. (2013). *Just babies : the origins of good and evil*: Bodley Head.

- Bullen, K., & Wainwright, T. (2015). *Guidance on teaching and assessment of ethical competence in psychology education*. Retrieved from Leicester: <https://www.bps.org.uk/news-and-policy/bps-code-ethics-and-conduct>
- Butchard, B., Cameron, A., Donald, A., Dowling, C., Forde, E., Eames, C., . . . Roberts, B. (2015). *Human Rights in Clinical Psychology : Enquiry based learning resources for training clinical psychologists in human rights decision-making, leadership and evaluation*. Retrieved from
- Christie, D. J. (2014). *Global developments in the science and practice of peace psychology*. In S. Cooper (Ed.), *Psychology Serving Humanity: Proceedings of the 30th International Congress of Psychology : Volume 2: Western Psychology* (pp. 28-46). Retrieved from <http://www.myilibrary.com?id=621834>
- Clayton, S., Devine-Wright, P., Swim, J., Bonnes, M., Steg, L., Whitmarsh, L., & Carrico, A. (2016). Expanding the Role for Psychology in Addressing Environmental Challenges. *Am Psychol*, 71(3), 199-215. doi:10.1037/a0039482
- Committee on Climate Change. (2019). *Net Zero: The UK's contribution to stopping global warming*. Retrieved from <https://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Net-Zero-The-UKs-contribution-to-stopping-global-warming.pdf>
- Gaspar de Matos, M., Wainwright, T., Brebels, L., Craciun, B., Gabrhelík, R., Hjartnes Schjodt, B., . . . Richards, J. (2019). Looking Ahead: Challenges and Opportunities for Applied Psychology in Prevention and Promotion. *European Journal of Psychology*, *In press*.
- Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility and Organizational Psychology: An Integrative Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 144-144. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00144
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., Koleva, S., Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2013). Moral Foundations Theory: The Pragmatic Validity of Moral Pluralism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 55-130. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-407236-7.00002-4
- Hagenaars, P. (2016). Towards a Human Rights Based and Oriented Psychology. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 28(2), 183-202. doi:10.1177/0971333616657170
- Hawk, B. N., McCall, R. B., Groark, C. J., Muhamedrahimov, R. J., Palmov, O. I., & Nikiforova, N. V. (2018). Caregiver Sensitivity and Consistency and Children's Prior Family Experience as Contexts for Early Development within Institutions. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 39(4), 432-448. doi:10.1002/imhj.21721
- Jonsson, U. (1996). Nutrition and the convention on the rights of the child. *Food Policy*, 21(1), 41-55. doi:10.1016/0306-9192(95)00071-2
- Jonsson, U. (1997). Nutrition, ethics and human rights. *Shaping the Future by Law: Children, Environment and Human Health*, 115-122.
- Jonsson, U. (2003). *Human rights approach to development programming*. Nairobi, Kenya: UNICEF.
- Kelly, E., Stoye, G., & Vera-Hernández, M. (2015). *Public Hospital Spending in England: Evidence from National Health Service Administrative Records*. Retrieved from
- Kevles, D. J. (1999). Eugenics and human rights. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*, 319(7207), 435-438.
- Kitchener, R. F., & Kitchener, K. S. (2012). Ethical foundations of psychology. In S. J. Knapp, M. C. Gottlieb, M. M. Handelsman, & L. D. VandeCreek (Eds.), *APA handbooks in psychology* (pp. 3-42). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Knobe, J., Buckwalter, W., Nichols, S., Robbins, P., Sarkissian, H., & Sommers, T. (2012). Experimental Philosophy. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol 63, 63, 81-99. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100350
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2, 4, 34-46. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34-46.
- Lindsay, G. (2011). Transnational ethical guidance and the development of the EFPA meta-code of ethics. *European Psychologist*, 16(2), 121-131.
- Lindsay, G. (2012). Ethical decision making. In M. S. Leach, M. J. Stevens, G. Lindsay, A. Ferrero, & Y. Korkut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international psychological ethics* (pp. 74-89). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Loistl, S., & Schwanninger, F. (2018). Vestiges and Witnesses: Archaeological Finds from the Nazi Euthanasia Institution of Hartheim as Objects of Research and Education. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 22(3), 614-638. doi:10.1007/s10761-017-0441-2
- Masson-Delmotte, V., & al., e. (Eds.). (2018). *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty.*
- McCall, R. B., Groark, C. J., Hawk, B. N., Julian, M. M., Merz, E. C., Rosas, J. M., . . . Nikiforova, N. V. (2019). Early Caregiver-Child Interaction and Children's Development: Lessons from the St. Petersburg-USA Orphanage Intervention Research Project. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 22(2), 208-224. doi:10.1007/s10567-018-0270-9
- Mitchell, A., Rubb, & Wainwright, T. (2019). Demanding disruption: Extinction Rebellion and changing psychology. *Clinical Psychology Forum*.
- Muhamedrahimov, R. J., Chernego, D. I., Vasilyeva, M. J., Palmov, O. I., Vershinina, E. A., Nikiforova, N. V., . . . Groark, C. J. (2018). Developmental Change in Full- and Preterm Infants between the Ages of Three and Nine Months in Institutions with Different Caregiving Environments. *Psychology in Russia-State of the Art*, 11(3), 152-167. doi:10.11621/pir.2018.0311
- Mukhamedrahimov, R. Z. (1998). Interaction and attachment between mother and infant in risk groups. *Voprosy Psichologii*, 2, 18-33.
- Nazrul Islam, S., & Winkel, J. (2017). *Climate change and social inequality*. Retrieved from UN New York:
- Park, T., Reiner, C., Green, K., & Williamson, K. (2019). *Behavior change for nature*. Retrieved from Arlington, VA: Rare:
- Pearson, D., Walpole, S., Barna, S., Id, & Walpole, S. O. h. o. o. (2015). Challenges to professionalism: Social accountability and global environmental change. *Medical Teacher*, .37(9), pp. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2015.1044955 26030377
- Rest, J. R. (1982). A Psychologist Looks at the Teaching of Ethics. *The Hastings Center Report*, 12(1), 29-36.
- Ricou, M., & Wainwright, T. (2018). The psychology of euthanasia: Why there are no easy answers. *European Psychologist*(Pagination). doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000331
- Rigg, J., & Mason, L. R. (2018). Five dimensions of climate science reductionism. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(12), 1030-1032. doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0352-1

- Roe, R. A. (2011). Does Europe need psychologists? EFPA president's lecture delivered at the European Congress of Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey, July 4, 2011. *European Psychologist*, 16(3), 247-253.
- Roe, R. A. (2014). *We have always been indigenous Thoughts about the past and future of psychology*. In S. Cooper (Ed.), *Psychology Serving Humanity: Proceedings of the 30th International Congress of Psychology : Volume 2: Western Psychology* (pp. 98-115). Retrieved from <http://www.myilibrary.com?id=621834>
- Rosen, D. H. (1975). Suicide Survivors - Follow-up Study of Persons Who Survived Jumping from Golden-Gate and San-Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridges. *Western Journal of Medicine*, 122(4), 289-294.
- Seymour, D. (2016). New Models for Human Rights Capacity Building in the Field: Human Rights Field Officers and Relief and Development Professionals. In G. Ulrich & M. O'Flaherty (Eds.), *The Professional Identity of the Human Rights Field Officer* (pp. 115-132). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Sinclair, C. (2019). Societal-level ethical responsibilities regarding active euthanasia: an analysis using the Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists. *Ethics and Behavior*. doi:DOI: 10.1080/10508422.2019.1636654
- Slovan, S. A., & Fernbach, P. (2018). *Knowledge illusion : why we never think alone*.
- Söderström, K., Hagenaaars, P., Wainwright, T., & Wagner, U. (2019). Human Rights Matter to Psychology - Psychology Matters to Human Rights. *European Psychologist*, 24(2), 99-101.
- Steg, L. (2018). Limiting climate change requires research on climate action. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(9), 759-761. doi:10.1038/s41558-018-0269-8
- Sveaass, N. (2019). The Human Rights Committee at the Norwegian Psychological Association: 20 Years of Work and Future Challenges *European Psychologist*.
- Swim, J. K., Stern, P. C., Doherty, T. J., Clayton, S., Reser, J. P., Weber, E. U., . . . Howard, G. S. (2011). Psychology's contributions to understanding and addressing global climate change. *American Psychologist*, 66(4), 241-250. doi:10.1037/a0023220
- Tanner, J. C., Candland, T., & Odden, W. S. (2015). *Later Impacts of Early Childhood Interventions: A Systematic Review*. Retrieved from
- Thunberg, G. (2019). *No one is too small to make a difference*: Penguin, Allen Lane.
- Trouillot, M. (2016). *Global Transformations Anthropology and the Modern World*. In. Retrieved from <http://public.ebib.com/choice/PublicFullRecord.aspx?p=5660792>
- Ulrich, G. (2017). Research Ethics for Human Rights Research. In B.-A. Andreassen, H.-O. Sano, & S. n. McLnerney-Lankford (Eds.), *Research methods in human rights : a handbook*: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Ulrich, G., & O'Flaherty, M. (2016). *The Professional Identity of the Human Rights Field Officer*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Ventres, W., Boelen, C., & Haq, C. (2018). Time for action: key considerations for implementing social accountability in the education of health professionals. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 23(4), 853-862. doi:10.1007/s10459-017-9792-z
- Wainwright, T. (2009). Climate Change and refocusing clinical psychology. *Clinical Psychology Forum*, 200, 7 - 11.
- Wolfensberger, W. (2011). Reflections on a Lifetime in Human Services and Mental Retardation. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 49(6), 441-455. doi:10.1352/1934-9556-49.6.441

World Justice Project. (2018). *World Justice Project Rule of Law Index 2017–2018*. Retrieved from