Equality Week Special Edition

The School of Psychology has produced this special edition of the newsletter in support of the University of Kent’s first Equality Week starting Monday 17 November. A number of free activities and events will take place during this time including film screenings, music and dance workshops, sessions that enhance your employability, the Anne Frank Exhibition (see details on this page and on page 4), and talks from high profile campaigns like No More Page 3 and Stonewall.

Equality Week is an excellent opportunity for Psychology at Kent to celebrate what we do in the school in terms of research, and also the inclusive and diverse community in which we study and work at the University. In the last few weeks, staff in the School have been attending Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI) workshops titled ‘Valuing Everyone: Building and Maintaining an Inclusive Culture’. The workshop focuses on the benefits of an inclusive culture at Kent and connects directly with other initiatives that encourage the development of mutual respect, shared values, and collaborative working with the goal of positively influencing staff engagement and organisational performance.

There are a number of support structures and services in place for students registered at the University of Kent. The Dignity at Study Policy (bit.ly/1tMfFmE) covers in detail the right of every student registered at the University of Kent to study in a safe and supportive environment. At School level, Psychology will deliver an equality-themed Cafe Psychology seminar on Monday evening. This will be followed by the launch of the School’s Equality Week exhibition which will feature poster presentations of research conducted by Kent Psychology academic staff and students. Join us for the Cafe Psychology region’s Springfield Lecture Theatre 4 and also for the exhibition and drinks and nibbles at 6pm in the Keynes Teaching Foyer.

Many thanks to Lisa Clark, Student Advisor, for coordinating the School’s Equality Week activities and to all of the staff members and students who contributed to this special issue.

Kent Age Research

On 8th October Dr Hannah Swift, from the School of Psychology, and Brian Lingley, from Research Services, brought together over 25 academics from across the University to launch the Kent Age Research Network. The interdisciplinary network brings together academics from psychology, social policy, engineering, arts, humanities and biological sciences (just to name a few!) that are interested in age, ageing and issues affecting older people. The Network aims to develop the profile of age research at Kent by fostering active collaboration across the University. At the first meeting Dr Swift introduced the Kent Adult Research Unit (KARU) a research participation initiative managed within the School of Psychology that allows adults in the community to participate in research being conducted at the University. If you are interested in finding out more about the Network or KARU please contact Hannah on H.J.Swift@kent.ac.uk.

Anne Frank Exhibition

The Anne Frank Trust are a charitable organization that work to challenge prejudice and reduce hatred. Working primarily with secondary schools and prisons, the Anne Frank Trust aims to provide young people and prisoners with the right tools to feel empowered to change the world around them. The Trust has created an effective educational programme involving a guided ‘Anne Frank - A History for today’ exhibition. The programme is currently being delivered by the Trust to over 30,000 young people a year in numerous regions across the UK including; London, Yorkshire, Scotland and the North East.

The exhibition explores the rise of the Nazi party and organized genocide, as well as the consequences and victims of the Holocaust, alongside the powerful entries in Anne’s Diary. The educational programme uses the tragic and short life of Anne Frank...

Continued on page 4

Dr Joe Brooks on LGBT Staff Network at Kent

The University of Kent is not only an environment for students but it is also one of the biggest employers in the Kent region. The University’s Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity (EDI) office works to make the university’s policies, procedures, and environment more diverse, equal, and inclusive of people from all backgrounds. As the Chair of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) Staff Network, I work with the EDI office, other LGBT members of staff, and our “Straight Allies” to raise awareness of LGBT issues, organize resources for those who struggling with their sexuality at work, and advise on the university’s activities to promote respect and a good working environment for people of all sexual orientations. There are also networks for other equality strands such as the Women’s Network and the Disability Staff Network. Recently we have coordinated a series of LGBT-themed films at the on-campus Gulbenkian Cinema, put together a collection of personal stories of LGBT members of staff, worked with Kent music and organized the flying of the rainbow flag over the University’s Templeman Library to mark International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia. You can find out more and see our LGBT Staff Role Models (blogs.kent.ac.uk/lgbtstaffrolemodels/) at our webpage: blogs.kent.ac.uk/lgbtstaff.
Civil Partnership: What it Means to Me Personally

A friend of mine was 82 when he passed away a few years ago now. He was in a same-sex relationship with another man for 21 years of his life, they lived together as a couple and they were also business partners. The problem was that for the first 17 years of their relationship it was actually illegal according to UK law, and so they could have been arrested, imprisoned, or blackmailed. Fortunately for them they were wealthy, they lived in a large isolated house in the country, they worked in the media and somehow - with that somewhat privileged background to help them along – they “got away with it” … but the threat was always with them and present in their minds. In 1967 the law changed, their relationship became legal and so the dangers they faced reduced, although it would still need public opinion to come to accept them living out their lives as homosexuals to truly make their lives easier.

I was born in 1967 and during my lifetime I am very pleased to say I have experienced a great improvement in the acceptance of gay relationships in the UK. I have been with my same-sex partner for nearly 23 years now and, as for my late friend and his former partner, a significant change has happened in UK law during the time that we have been together, I’m referring in this case to the introduction of the Civil Partnership in 2005. From that point on Simon (my partner) and I had the right to have our relationship recognised legally in the UK. We signed our Civil Partnership contract in the Registry Office with a ceremony that we enjoyed with our closest friends and family and while doing so gained much the same legal rights as a married couple. It was the date of our 14th anniversary of being a couple which we chose for becoming Civil Partners in the eyes of the law.

I am very glad that during those first 14 years we did not live under the same legal threat of prosecution as did my friend and his partner for the first 17 years of their relationship, however our relationship was not “protected” during those years by the law either - for example we weren’t recognised as each other’s next of kin. Not many weeks after gaining our new legal status as a couple Simon was rushed into hospital in a lot of pain and with breathing problems. It made a very real difference to us both that I could easily persuade the ambulance crew that I had a right to travel with him in the ambulance to hospital, and that at the hospital, late at night, with him in considerable distress, I could declare myself legally to be his next of kin and so avoid any possibility of having to alarm his elderly mother with a phone call from the hospital in the middle of the night - should his condition deteriorate seriously. Happily Simon recovered fully in due course, but the legal recognition of our relationship made a very real difference to me during a stressful and potentially devastating experience.

This year Civil Marriage was introduced in England and Wales for both gay male couples and lesbian couples. Ironically, the only people in the UK not able to benefit from this new law yet are those of us in Civil Partnerships, because the law hasn’t yet been introduced to allow conversion from the one status to the other. However, this “inequality” pales into insignificance in a world where some countries still carry out the death penalty for gay consensual sexual activity and relationships. Civil Marriage is to be introduced here in the UK for Civil Partners as well soon and I shall then marry my partner (in all probability as part of a big “silver” anniversary celebration) and thereby gain legal recognition for our relationship made a very real difference to me during a stressful and potentially devastating experience.

Apart from legal considerations I would very much like to be able make a social statement - in the recognised format of a marriage - about just how important we are to each other, about the strength and depth of our feelings for each other, and the extent to which we have grown together in our relationship.

I am immensely grateful for the improvements in the UK in the law and in public attitudes towards gay people that have happened during my lifetime. With this article I wish to show that gratitude by dedicating it to my wholehearted support for Equality Week and to all of those people who work towards tackling prejudice and unfairness in all of their guises. I also would like to say how much I find it enriching to listen to people who in some way can be considered “different” from myself (I suppose just about anyone qualifies for that title really, seeing as us human beings are such a diverse crowd) and to learn from their experiences. The Equality Week initiative is a wonderful opportunity for that sort of learning exchange to be encouraged.

Written by: George Oatridge, Personal Assistant to the Head of School and School Administration Manager.

Athena SWAN at Kent

The University has committed to the principles of the Athena SWAN Charter, and this commitment was recently recognised with an Athena SWAN Bronze Award. The Athena SWAN Charter was launched in June 2005 and is a scheme which recognises excellence in higher education employment practices in the subjects of Science, Engineering and Technology.

Any university, or research institution, which is committed to the advancement and promotion of the careers of women in Science Engineering and Technology in higher education and research, can apply for membership.

The beliefs underpinning the Charter are:
- The advancement of science, engineering and technology is fundamental to quality of life across the globe.
- It is vitally important that women are adequately represented in what has traditionally been, and is still, a male-dominated area.
- Science cannot reach its full potential unless it can benefit from the talents of the whole population, and until women and men can benefit equally from the opportunities it affords.

The School of Psychology has an Athena SWAN working group comprising: Aleksandra Cichocka, Karen Douglas, Heather Ferguson, Nathan Heflick, Erika Nurmsoo, Afroditi Pina, Esme Rigden, Gary Samson, and Robbie Sutton. The group meet regularly to discuss a variety of issues related to gender, equality and diversity.

To find out more about Athena SWAN and Kent’s commitment to improving and developing the careers of female scientists at Kent, go to: www.kent.ac.uk/human-resources/athenaswan/index.html.
The Gender Agenda: Looking Beyond the Pay Gap

Women have never been in a stronger position to lead, change and shape the economic, social and political landscape. The 21st Century has seen a dramatic shift in ‘traditional’ family dynamics and greater recognition of gender in legislation has helped pull apart traditional gender-role divisions. As a result women are now far more economically independent and socially autonomous, representing 42% of the UK workforce and 55% of university graduates. Yet, women are still less likely than men to be associated with leadership positions in the UK (they account for 22% of MPs and peers, 20% of university professors, 6.1% of FTSE 100 executive positions, and 3% of board chairpersons). This stark inequality is consistently reflected in pay gaps, despite the introduction of the Equal Pay Act in 1975, between women and men has risen faster in the UK than any other OCED country and today women earn on average £140,000 less than men over their working careers.

In recent reports 2.4 million unemployed women said that they want to but (were unable to) find employment, and, 9 out of 10 people want to see men and women equally represented in leadership positions. If the intention to change is there, and basic social and political frameworks support women in the workforce then we need to look beyond facts and figures to understand what other influences contribute to the gaping hole in gender equality. And whilst statistics offer insights into current patterns and behaviours they do not address why the skills and talents of women are not being fully utilized despite clear indications that women are just as capable - what other processes are behind this persistent level of gender inequality?

A relatively neglected factor is the role of stereotypes. Stereotypes reflect expectations, prejudices and beliefs that we all have about the characteristics and behaviours of other groups. These stereotypes are intertwined with and reinforced by social and cultural ‘norms’, which underline certain expectations about others e.g. gender, masculinity and femininity. Decades of social psychological research have shown that stereotypes about the way men and women ‘are’ have a huge impact on our beliefs about how they should (or should not) behave. Consequently gender stereotypes reinforce social status and gender hierarchies, for example, surveys and experiments show that women are generally perceived as more ‘communal’ and ‘loyal’, whereas men are described more as ‘protectors’ and ‘competent’. Of course not everyone subscribes to these stereotypes, but there is evidence that men and women who behave in ways that contrast with these traditional stereotypes, such as ‘career women’ or ‘stay at home Dads’ are likely to be evaluated negatively by others. These stereotypes have major consequences for how women and men are treated, judged and described in (and out) of the workplace. And a lifetime of exposure to what women should be, how they should behave and who they should represent drives and reinforces unconscious and unseen biases.

Unconscious bias is particularly important as it arises from the implicit assumptions and unspoken and indirect attitudes, beliefs and expectations that we all have about others. Study after study has highlighted that both men and women have unconscious gender biases. For example, people view men as more capable leaders, men are rewarded more highly than women, just having a male name is more likely to get you the job. Furthermore, if you are a mother too your chances of getting the job are reduced by 70%. Overcoming stereotypes and unconscious bias can only be achieved if we are all willing to address our own immediate judgments. Of course, we cannot completely eradicate our own biases and preferences but we must ensure that we are mindful of them, and can put in place practices and procedures to mitigate their potential effects.

When we pair the psychological evidence with the economic facts, the argument for gender equality is overwhelming. Research consistently shows that groups perform to a higher standard if the gender balance is even, or when women outnumber men. For example, Catalyst found that companies with high-level female representation on boards significantly outperformed those with sustained low representation by 84% on return on sales, 60% on return on invested capital, and 46% on return on equity. The Women’s Business Council predict that we could add 10% (that is over £150 billion) to our GDP by 2030 if all the women that want to work were employed.

In the long term encouraging women to actively participate in the labour market is vital to ensure economic growth at both a micro and macro level. As we are faced with an increasingly ageing population, and the resulting shortage of skilled workers, it is fundamental that we also depend on high female employment and high wage returns in order to manage the skill deficit.

It is true that we are making bigger and bigger steps towards providing more flexible workplaces, better parental leave policies and more chances for women to get back into the workplace. But these opportunities are wasted if our stereotypes and biases distort the way we evaluate others, and often to their disadvantage. That is why further psychological research is required to understand what interventions will best alleviate these biases.

Written by: Abigail Player, Postgraduate Researcher in the School of Psychology.

Understanding Ageism: The Forgotten Prejudice

In the UK one in three people report being treated with a lack of respect due to their age, yet, despite its prevalence, ageism is also known as the forgotten prejudice. Not only is it under researched compared to other forms of prejudice, but (and this may be related) it was one of the last characteristics to be protected under UK law, with the Equality Act (2010) making it unlawful for service providers to discriminate on the basis of age from 1st October 2012.

Ageism is complex. Commonly people assume that ageism only affects ‘older’ people, but in reality ageism can be experienced by anyone at any age. So far, research exploring people’s experiences of ageism has neglected the fact that anyone at any age may be judged ‘too old’ or ‘too young’ depending on the age of the person making the judgement and the situation they are in. There is even the possibility that someone maybe simultaneously judged too old in one situation, but too young in another! This transient nature of categorising people into age groups makes ageism very interesting to study, but also very difficult to combat. More needs to be done to understand when a person’s age becomes an important factor in a situation, what age-based assumptions are being made and what the consequences are.

The fight against ageism is made all the more difficult given that there is often a certain level of acceptability and a sense that ageism is inevitable or somehow justified. It is often hard not to make assumptions about a person’s health, experience or competence based on their age. Older people may find it particularly difficult to recognise prejudice against them as reportedly they are more likely to experience prejudice in form of being patronised, pitied, ignored or treated with a general lack of respect. In comparison, younger people are thought to experience more direct, negative or hostile expressions of ageism. However, it is unlikely that experiences are so clear-cut, can’t younger people be ignored or patronised too? Aren’t there situations where older people experience hostility?

In the context of an ageing population and changing patterns in our life course and life expectancy, attitudes to ageing are fundamental to how society prepares to ensure we all grow up and grow old well. The Everyday Ageism Project aims to raise awareness of the many different ways ageism is experienced by people of all ages. It provides a safe and secure forum for people to share their experiences of ageism anonymously. If you are interested...

Continued on page 4
Equality in the Classroom

It is often surprising for people to learn that from an early age, children are aware of social categories such as race, nationality and gender, are knowledgeable about stereotypes associated with those categories, and sometimes endorse these stereotypes. They are aware of conflict between groups (e.g. religious conflict in Northern Ireland), react to social norms around whether or not they are ‘allowed’ to play with children belonging to different racial groups, and hold implicit biases, just as adults do.

Importantly, psychological research has shown that children's attitudes and behaviour towards members of other groups are malleable: with the right intervention, at the right age, more positive attitudes can be fostered.

Over a number of years, my research students have been conducting research to investigate how we can change children's attitudes towards people who are different to them. One major line of research has focused on the importance of intergroup contact. That is, meaningful interactions between members of different groups. Research has shown that when children are given the opportunity to form diverse friendships, they are more positive about difference: they hold more positive attitudes towards that group.

In other research, rather than providing contact, we focused on developing life skills that young people can apply to messages about difference. This project, ‘My Dad Says…’, was funded by the Department for International Development, and conducted with local charity WEDG. We delivered a programme designed to foster critical thinking and cultural openness in young people. This project came about because in schools we often heard young people say ‘My Dad Says…they all get phones/they are all on benefits/they get big houses/they take all the jobs’ (‘they’ being immigrants).

We wanted to empower young people and help them develop critical thinking skills so that when they receive information about a group of people from the media, friends, parents, teachers, books, internet – they question that information, think about the sources, motives, consider alternative views, and in general become more media savvy.

For me the main conclusions from my research are that children are keen to learn, and are generally excited and curious about difference, and accepting too! They are also incredibly moral and will fight inequality wherever they find it. But they are just as prone to stereotyping as we are, are aware of conflict between groups and pick up on media messages portraying groups in a negative light. In other words, they are under exactly the same influences as we are as adults, the one main difference being that as these views are less entrenched, there is more opportunity for change.

Written by: Dr Lindsey Cameron, Lecturer in Psychology at the University of Kent.

Anne Frank Exhibition Continued

...to inspire its participants to become more active citizens in preventing, recognizing and challenging prejudice.

Schools taking part in the Trust’s schools project are lucky enough to have the exhibition visit their school for 2 weeks; where young people have the opportunity not only to view the exhibition but also to become more involved in the delivery of such an important message. Those who wish to, will be trained as peer guides through a series of workshops focusing on topics such as: responsibility and resistance, understanding prejudice, human rights and identity and diversity – enabling them to deliver the exhibition to other young people within their school.

After becoming a peer guide, participants then have the option of applying to receive further training and become an Anne Frank Ambassador, who has the chance to deliver the exhibition to members of the local and wider community.

The exhibition and workshops help young people to; learn more about their communities and celebrate cultural diversity, increase their empathy and respect for others and gain an in-depth knowledge of Anne Frank and the Holocaust.

This month the exhibition arrives here at The University of Kent. Not only will this be the first time that the Trust’s work will be carried out in Kent, but it is also the first time that a university will be hosting the “Anne frank - A History for Today” exhibition.

The arrival of the exhibition at the University of Kent is unique in that the exhibition guides are not secondary school pupils, instead they will be our very own team of student volunteers. Furthermore, students, staff and members of the public will have the chance to visit the exhibition and receive a similar in-depth tour and learning experience to the school groups and prisoners that the Trust currently works with. We are proud to be hosting the “A History for Today” exhibition, as the Anne Frank Trust’s important and outstanding work is now able to reach a wider audience including the young people of Kent.

The first display of the exhibition will take place in Keynes Atrium during Equality Week (17th-21st November). To book a place on the exhibition please visit doodle.com/ukgsya7n47mgss or contact the School of Psychology.

Written by: Kirandeep Purewal, Postgraduate Researcher in the School of Psychology.

The School of Psychology is very pleased to support this wonderful exhibition.

Understanding Ageism Cont’d

...in ageism, think you might have experienced or witnessed ageism then visit our website www.everydayageism.co.uk. On the website you can submit your experience or observations of ageism to the project, and if you wish – your experience can be shared anonymously. By participating in the project you can help make ageism the last prejudice, and not the forgotten prejudice.

Written by: Dr Hannah Swift, the Eastern Academic Research Consortium Fellow for the Quantitative Social Sciences at Kent. The entry was taken from the Group Lab Blog ( grouplab.wordpress.com/).
Ancestral Disease and Modern Discrimination

In our clean and disinfected offices it is easy to forget how much of a threat parasites and pathogens were for our ancestors but, by many estimates, infectious disease has been the most influential factor in human history, certainly in terms of mortality. This strong selection pressure led to the evolution of an elaborate and energetically expensive immune system and, in addition, the a more economical, and sometimes more reliable psychological defence system allowing us to behaviourally avoid sources of infection in the first place - including potentially contagious con-specifics.

The main problem for such a pathogen-avoidance adaptation, though, is that of detection – pathogens are usually too small or hidden to be seen directly and instead must be detected by cues associated with them, such as lesions or morphological abnormalities. Symptoms of infectious disease are highly variable, however, and because the cost of failing to avoid an infectious person is far higher than a false alarm - thinking a person is diseased when they aren’t really - disease perception is predicted to be highly sensitive to any sign of atypical behaviour or morphology. This may be one reason why people form negative associations towards slightly atypical groups like obese people, even when they are not objectively infectious.

Based on this evolutionary perspective, Justin Park and others have investigated whether discrimination towards obese and disabled people might result in part because of unconscious associations with infectious disease. They found that people who are chronically concerned about infectious disease endorse more extreme anti-fat attitudes and when they manipulated subjects to make them temporarily concerned about disease, they showed more implicit associations between obesity and disease related concepts. Many other studies have supported the role of disease perception and disgust sensitivity in prejudicial attitudes towards superficially abnormal groups, including disabled people, homosexuals, old people, colostomy patients, foreigners and people with facial disfigurement.

Although our hyper-vigilant disease avoidance psychology may be an evolutionary adaptation which is automatically activated by subtle cues of infectious disease, this does not mean that it inevitably causes prejudice and discrimination since, unlike animals, we have the ability to regulate our automatic affective and cognitive reactions. Since people are likely to be especially able to do this when they are aware of the causes of their reactions, research aimed at understanding the psychology of disgust and disease perception has potentially important implications for reducing prejudice.

Equality Week Wristbands

Collect a FREE Equality Week wristband from the School of Psychology Student Counter. Wear this accessory to show your support for Equality Week and to promote the Expect Respect message after the events have drawn to a close. Why not share photos of your wristband with us on our social media sites: @KentPsychology and www.facebook.com/pages/Kent-Psychology/100134906699098?.

Are Koreans More Sensitive about Age than the British?

For Koreans, the information about age is important in daily interaction. Koreans have a tendency to ask the age of interlocutor to manage the relationships. One reason is that interaction in Korean society is based on hierarchy unlike in Western society and the hierarchical relationships are confirmed and maintained by language. In particular, Korean language consists of sophisticated honorifics and the appropriate usage of honorifics is prescribed by age, status, position and situation. This rule operates as a social norm and it must be followed in the relationships. If the rule is violated, interpersonal conflicts can arise. In other words, Koreans judge the legitimacy of the usage of honorifics on the basis of the age differences between two interlocutors because this is associated with politeness. Koreans widely believe that seniors hold a higher rank than juniors and they are allowed to speak using the informal form to their juniors, whereas juniors must speak with appropriate honorifics by showing their deference, protecting the relationships between seniors and juniors. Even if the age gap is only a year, juniors are required to follow the rule. The age effect indicating the sensitivity of the interaction by the difference in an age can be cultural-specific in Korean society, but we need to share the effect of age in Korean society to other cultural areas for globalization. Interestingly, in my experience, the age effect does not occur in the interaction with foreigners because of the language difference between English and Korean. Even when I communicate with a Korean in English, the age effect does not occur in the interaction and I feel more comfortable. This is because I consider the use of honorific form less from an interlocutor and get less cognitive loads.

As for equality, modern Korean society is oriented toward the value of equality, but inequality exists everywhere. As mentioned earlier in the previous paragraph, age plays an important role for maintaining inequality. Also, Confucian values influence Koreans to accept inequality. According to Hofstede (1980, 2001), Korea is a high power distance country compared to the UK which is a low power distance country. In turn, the extent of acceptability of inequality may differ between the two countries. For example, according to the result of my current studies, Koreans were more tolerant of transgressions committed by a senior person compared to a junior person. In contrast, British encountered transgressions with equal disproval regardless of the transgressor’s standing. In sum, we can encounter inequality all around the world, but the degree of acceptability of inequality may be different in each culture. For now, age can be a suitable and interesting factor to investigate the cultural differences between the UK and Korea in daily relationships.


1 The interactions among Koreans are influenced by the five cardinal relationships in Confucianism (i.e., emperor-subject, father-son, husband-wife, older brother—younger brother, and friend-friend).

2 Power distance refers to the extent to social acceptability of power which is uneven distributed in institutions and organizations (Hofstede, 1980).

Written by: Chanki Moon, Postgraduate Researcher in the School of Psychology.
It’s a Man’s World: Gender as a Boundary Condition of Preference for Potential

I joined the Research Experience Scheme at the beginning of the academic year 2013 with an interest in Organisational Psychology. I began working with Dr Georgina Randsley de Moura and Abigail Player (PhD researcher working with Georgina), on gender barriers to leadership. We based our plan of study on the McKinsey (2011) report stating that “men are promoted based on their potential, while women are promoted based on past accomplishments” to explore the barrier that women face in the promotion process. Sheryl Sandberg highlights this report in her Lean In TEDTalk, highlighting that women are denied access to the valuable resources that are necessary for advancement (such as mentoring and sponsors). The aim of the research was to provide empirical support for this bias against female potential that is an increasing relevant topic.

We based our research on an empirical paper for the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (Tormala, Jia, & Norton, 2012), and used some of the materials from the paper for our experiments. Most of our studies are hiring simulations, and participants were asked to evaluate applications and make hiring decisions based on stimuli we provide. The success of the work I conducted as part of the Research Experience Scheme led us to pursue a scholarship from the British Psychological Society available to second year undergraduates as a Research Assistantship award (for details of this year's award process see bit.ly/1sCbZPH). We were successful in our application and received this prestigious award, allowing for funding for a six-week project to continue working over the summer.

This was a really great experience and I learnt a lot about the research process, from preparation of materials to data collection to analysis, interpretation and dissemination. I presented our findings at the BPS Social Psychology Section Annual Conference at Canterbury Christchurch University in September and will be presenting again at the BPS Annual Conference in Liverpool in May 2015.

Answering the question on whether biases persist against female leaders with potential has led us to ask further questions such as why these biases arise and under what conditions are they overcome? Our research has led to important insights on this important issue, and paved the way for further research into the biases women face in their quest to lead. This year we will be testing whether exposure to diversity is the best way to inform interventions in order to overcome such biases and increase equality and inclusion in organisational practice.

Written by: Dr Nathan Heflick, a Postdoctoral Research Associate in Psychology at the University of Kent.

Physical Appearance and Inequality

As the saying goes, none of us are truly free unless all of us are free. And, none of us are truly free unless we are treated equally.

Gender is, unfortunately, one area where inequality is pervasive throughout the world. The more we know about what causes people of different genders to be evaluated and treated differently, however, the more likely it is that gender inequality can be reduced. One potential source of this inequality, as research shows, is that focus tends to be placed more on women’s physical appearance than men’s. As a member of the School of Psychology, I research the effects this has on how women are both evaluated and treated. Typically, men and women in these studies are randomly assigned to either spend some time focussing on a woman’s physical appearance or her personality (or ability). They then rate their impressions of the woman’s personality and abilities. Regardless of how attractive the woman is perceived to be by participants, she is perceived of in more prejudiced and dehumanized ways more when people are focussed on her physical appearance. For instance, she is perceived of as possessing less kindness, intelligence and trustworthiness. This is rather alarming, as research also shows that these three traits (representing warmth, competence and morality) represent an average of over 90% of what determines a person’s impressions of another person or group. And indeed, when people focussed on the physical appearance of a female politician in one study, they reported less likelihood of voting for her as Vice President of the United States. In yet another study, colleagues and I found that women are even rated as having fewer traits that people rate as “essential to human nature” following focus on her physical appearance. Other studies by scholars across the world are consistent with these findings, showing that, for instance, people are more likely to blame a woman for being raped after it is made known that she was wearing revealing clothing, and are more accepting of her experiencing physical pain. Interestingly, it does not matter if the participants are male or female, but men (usually) are not more negatively evaluated when people focus on men’s appearance.

Is dehumanization inevitable when focussing on women’s appearance? Surely not I hope! I am currently examining whether or not physical appearance focus leads to dehumanization of women even in the context of close relationships. If it does not, not only would this be a positive sign for humanity, but it also might provide clues for how to defuse the impact of objectification on how people think about, and act towards, women.

Of course, women are not alone in experiencing dehumanization and prejudice. And there is ample evidence that dehumanization has a serious impact in other highly important areas of life. To take but a few examples, dehumanization during war is correlated with greater war support and dehumanization of Black people is associated with harsher criminal sentencing. All of these realities are unfortunate, and point to the importance of granting all people a basic level of human decency, kindness and appreciation.

Growing Up with Diversity

Dr Lindsey Cameron tells us about equality-related events taking place early next year in the School of Psychology in partnership with the British Psychological Society:

The University of Kent has been awarded funding to hold a seminar series on young people’s experiences ‘Growing up with Diversity’. We live in an increasingly diverse society. This presents many opportunities for new and rich forms of psychological growth and social development, as well as many challenges. This diversity can come in many forms; from the increasing variety of ethnic and religious groups in society, to changing gender relations, to a range of differing socio-economic and personal needs. Psychologists are beginning to understand a little about how individuals’ knowledge of and attitudes towards diverse groups affects judgments and behaviour. Our seminar series will bring together high profile senior academics, and early careers researchers from around the world, working in the area of social development. The meetings will draw on our expertise to explore how ‘Growing up with diversity’, can impact on young people’s cognitive and social development, their educational attainment and clinical outcomes. Of particular interest are the positive outcomes of growing up with diversity: what cognitive abilities are developed as a result of negotiating diversity and difference at a young age?

Written by: Fatima Tresh, final year undergraduate student in the School of Psychology.
Ending Bullying and Harassment at Work

Being treated with dignity and respect at work is one of the basic human rights and one that is currently protected by the Equality Act of 2010. Although legislation has been put in place since the Sex Discrimination Act of 1975 to protect employees and employers, [up to 83% of UK employers have a policy on bullying/harassment (90 per cent in the public sector)], CIPD (2004), unfortunately statistics unveil that bullying and harassment of different forms at work are frequent occurrences (Annual Tribunal Statistics 2012; Pina, Gannon & Saunders, 2009). Approximately 8 in 10 individuals are affected by workplace bullying and 80% of managers know that bullying is occurring in their workplaces (Annual Tribunal Statistics, 2012). Furthermore, between 40-50% of women in European Union countries experience unwanted sexual advances, physical contact or other forms of sexual harassment at work (UNWomen Online, 2014).

Harassment is defined in the Equality Act 2010 as “Unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, which has the purpose or effect of violating an individual’s dignity or creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for that individual”. Bullying may be characterised as “Offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means that undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient”. Bullying or harassment may be perpetrated by individuals against individuals or involve groups of people. In whatever form it manifests, it is always unwarranted and unwelcome to the individual (ACAS Advice Leaflet for Employees, 2013, p.1).

Bullying and harassment, although different terms, are often used interchangeably at places of work to describe a multitude of behaviours ranging from the obvious to the insidious. They can result in discrimination, intimidation and a host of negative consequences for both employees and employers alike. These include sickness absence, reduced productivity, negative turnover as well as potential litigation costs (Gannon, 2010). Victims of bullying at work take on average 7 days more sick leave per year than those that haven’t endured or witnessed it, amounting to millions of lost working days in the UK (CIPD, 2004).

Behaviours come in many forms but they may include:
• spreading malicious rumours, or insulting someone by word or behaviour (copying memos that are critical about someone to others who do not need to know, ridiculing or demeaning someone – picking on them or setting them up to fail)
• exclusion or victimisation
• unfair treatment
• overbearing supervision or other misuse of power or position
• unwelcome sexual advances (touching, standing too close, the display of offensive materials, asking for sexual favours, making decisions on the basis of sexual advances being accepted or rejected)
• making threats or comments about job security without foundation
• deliberately undermining a competent worker by overloading and constant criticism
• preventing individuals progressing by intentionally blocking promotion or training opportunities.

An intimidating and hostile work environment can cause a variety of negative feelings such as anger, fear, anxiety, frustration and humiliation. People may feel unable to cope, become frightened or demotivated (especially in cases where they feel they lack power within the organisation) or may try to retaliate in some way (when they perceive having some relative power within the organisation). Feeling helpless within the workplace leads to loss of self-confidence and self-esteem and almost always job performance is affected and relations in the workplace suffer (ACAS, 2014; Pina & Gannon, 2010).

It is important to understand that bullying and harassment can also come from people with more, equal or even less power than us. People are usually much better at recognising harassment that comes from more powerful people (e.g. Stockdale, Vaux & Cashin, 1995) but not so much from equals or subordinates. Power can be tangible, but also relative and even people with less organisational power can exercise harassment or bullying over someone with more power.

A crucial first step in protecting employees is to legislate against bullying and harassment and to set out clear policies and guidelines outlining acceptable conduct at work. Furthermore, it is important that there are independent tribunals (or independent individuals), not belonging to the organisation or department, for employees to feel safe in coming forward with complaints. However, guidelines without appropriate training on how to implement them are not as useful. Training offered in groups can be really helpful, also if performed by people that do not belong to the organisation at hand, creating a safe forum where people can bring their experiences forward, discuss their opinions and challenge their biases. Harassment may be really easy for someone to recognise but it may take someone else longer to realise and react against, and this is what makes these behaviours so insidious. Some people may find certain things humorous, but others will not. The lines are sometimes blurry and researchers, such as me, recognise the difficulty in tackling behaviours of this kind. Often, we are mistakenly criticised for going against free speech, for wanting to over-police workplaces to the extent that you will not be able to interact freely with your colleagues.

I recognise that workplaces are where one spends most of one’s daily life. They are an extension of society, where people meet, and sometimes even find love. However, the crucial difference lies in the purpose and nature of the workplace and people’s right to a safe working environment. Although some people may find flirting or even sexual banter acceptable, for others it is completely unwelcome, unwanted and discriminatory. It becomes even more problematic if that flirting or joking comes from people with relatively more power than the recipients, where the latter may not feel that they have the means to refuse or react. When your livelihood is dependent on your work and the enjoyment of a safe and inclusive environment, reacting to a colleague’s, manager’s or even student’s inappropriate joking or flirting is not as easy as reacting to a stranger, and that fine balance can be very easily disturbed.

For real change to occur and for inclusive environments to succeed, we need to recognise and accept our own biases, and work in conjunction with colleagues on changing our attitudes to become more inclusive and respectful. We must become more understanding of other people’s perspectives, as it is easy to realise that bullying and harassment can often be attributed to lack of perspective and empathy on the part of the perpetrator. People need to feel secure in tackling the behaviour that often starts as innocuous, to be able to say that you don’t find something funny, to be able to say that you don’t appreciate being left out, or made to stand out. We have an obligation to make workplaces the safe environments that will foster dialogue and acceptance. We need to respect and listen to one another. Therefore, my perspective certainly isn’t against free speech, to me, it’s all about equal freedom to speak, but also to listen and to speak out against prejudice and discrimination.

Written by: Dr Afroditi Pina, Lecturer in Forensic Psychology at the University of Kent.
A new generation of feminists are campaigning on multiple gender inequality issues, using the internet as the most effective way to get their message across to as many people as possible. A recurring motif in these campaigns is resistance to objectification (treating women as objects) because of the adverse effect it has on women’s lives, creating mental health problems such as habitual body monitoring, eating disorders and sexual dysfunction.

On everydaysexism.org people can recount instances of sexism, whether it be a traumatic event in their lives, or a small, easily-disregarded comment by passers-by. Losetheladmags.org.uk is a campaign to cover “lad” mags with black “modesty bags”, so that the front-cover pictures of half-naked women cannot be seen on the shop shelves. Another is nomorepage3.org, which encourages people to sign a petition asking the editor of the popular Sun newspaper to remove its Page Three pictures of bare-breasted women.

Many people are against these campaigns, and see no need for any changes. To explore the reasons people gave for this, comments left on newspaper websites discussing these campaigns were examined. The expectation is that these comments are likely to express the true views and feelings of those writing them, because of the degree of anonymity on the internet.

**Method and materials**

Two campaigns were chosen for research, the first demanding that more women be represented on banknotes and the second demanding that Page Three topless models be removed from the Sun. Comments on similar articles in two national online newspapers (the Daily Mail and the Guardian) were read, and those deemed in any way disparaging were recorded, then categorised.

**Results**

29% of 989 comments were disparaging, with the most frequent categories in each of the newspapers being Inferiority of women (claimed women were useless) and Objectification (mentioned women’s bodies in a degrading manner). There were statistically significantly more disparaging and sexist comments in the Daily Mail than in the Guardian, and in the Page Three campaign than in the Banknote campaign.

**Discussion**

Sexist comments are common in an online setting that guarantees a degree of anonymity, with around 45% of disparaging comments about each campaign being misogynistic (stating that women are inferior, hypocritical, or unattractive).

The greater number of sexist comments on the Page Three campaign may be because it is in relation to changing an existing situation (Page Three already exists, whereas the Banknote campaign is about the future representation of women), which people find harder to cope with.

The high number of objectification comments may mean that some people do not see objectification as sexism, but simply as a “normal” way of representing women (models are used extensively in advertisements for a wide range of products, and TV series such as Secret Diary of a Call-Girl romanticise the sex industry).

The results suggest that there is still a reluctance to treat women on an equal basis to men, and that some people will dismiss campaigns for equality in an openly misogynistic way.

Written by: Lois Catrin Donnelly, final year undergraduate student in the School of Psychology.

---

I Do Not Feel Discriminated Against

“I do not feel discriminated against.” - I often hear that from other women. That is quite surprising if you consider the fact that they all live in societies that are far from treating men and women equally. Research on gender equality allows us to understand why frequently discrimination is not “felt” by those who might experience it.

Psychological research shows that people are motivated to support existing, well-known social arrangements (e.g. Jost & Hunyady, 2003). They do not renounce this support even if the societal arrangements are unfavourable to them (for example if they are members of disadvantaged groups, such as women). One reason why people seek to maintain the status quo is that it provides them with a sense of living in a predictable, familiar and, thus, secure reality. As a consequence, members of disadvantaged groups can to some extent contribute to the support of social inequality through the internalisation of their lower social position. Studies show, for example, that women themselves expect less pay than men for work of equal quality (e.g. Hogue & Yoder, 2003).

Another reason why people might not feel discriminated is that gender based prejudice is often hidden beneath the guise of positive attitudes. Research shows that both women and men accept so-called benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001), in which negative attitudes towards gender equality stem from the belief that women need protection from men. Such beliefs can be called paternalistic, which means that they are aimed at limiting the privileges of others (in this context women) beneath the guise of taking care of their well-being. On the surface, benevolent sexism is then motivated by care for women’s welfare. And it is easier to accept unequal treatment, if we believe that it arises from a concern.

In my own research into gender equality I seek to determine what factors may contribute to the acceptance of gender inequalities among women. For example, I was interested in testing whether feminists are more sensitive to discrimination against women - and whether they are equally preoccupied by the fate of women with traditional and feminist values (Cichocka, Kofa, Golec de Zavala, & Rozum, 2013).

Research into the processes associated with maintaining gender (in)equality allows us to counteract inequalities between sexes. It also contributes to our understanding the causes of broader social inequalities related to the socio-economic status, ethnicity or appearance.

*This is a translation of an entry for the “Why do we need gender?” blog (first published on December 9, 2013). The original version is available at: poconamgender.pl/?p=24

References:


Written by: Dr Aleksandra Cichocka, Lecturer in Social Psychology at the University of Kent.
Beyond the Body: The Social Justice Impact of Sexual Objectification

Across many cultures, girls and women regularly encounter public scrutiny of their bodies, or observe other women being scrutinized, from sexualized gazing and leering to verbal harassment and physical violence. In all its many forms, most people know sexual objectification when they see it. People are also aware that girls and women experience sexual objectification to a much greater degree than boys and men. What most people don’t realize and fail to see is the negative impact of sexually objectifying encounters on the lives of girls and women.

Numerous psychological, emotional, relational, and physical health consequences can lead to decrements in performance due to fear of confirming such stereotypes. Indeed, research aiming to elucidate the underpinnings of stereotype threat has employed a variety of operationalizations, with some studies attempting to produce threat by soliciting information about social group memberships prior to test-taking (e.g., Steele & Aronson, 1995; Stricker & Ward, 2004) or by reminding participants of typical group differences in performance on the task (e.g., Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keough, Steele, & Brown, 1999; Beilock, Rydell, & McConnell, 2007; Yeung & von Hippel, 2008). Other studies have primed participants by informing them that their performance will be diagnostic of their ability (e.g., Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001; Marx, Stapel, & Muller, 2005; Steele & Aronson, 1995) and some induce stereotype threat by exposing participants to media materials that reflect such stereotypes (e.g., Davies, Spencer, Quinn, & Gerhardtstein, 2002; Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005; Oswald & Harvey, 2000-2001).

Despite the prodigious effect of stereotype threat on performance, research has also shown that performance deficits can be reduced or eliminated. For instance, in their study for the Educational Testing Service (ETS), Sticker and Ward (2004) illustrate that moving standard demographic inquiries about ethnicity and gender to the end of the test resulted in significantly higher performance for women taking the AP calculus test (see Danaher & Crandall, 2008). Similarly, Ambady, Paik, Steele, Owen-Smith, and Mitchell (2004) highlight that women who were encouraged to think of their valued and unique characteristics, were less likely to experience stereotype threat in mathematics. Also, Rydell, McConnell, & Beilock (in press) showed that contextual cues reminding female undergraduates of their status as college students (a group that is expected to do well at math) eliminated gender-based stereotype threat. Equally, Gresky, Ten Eyck, Lord, and McIntyre (2005) indicated that when prompted to create 'self-concept maps' (i.e. to reflect on one's fundamentally important characteristics), women's mathematical performance was significantly enhanced.

Despite their different techniques, the aforementioned studies use methods that reduce the salience of identities that are tied to poor performance in a domain. Emphasizing the idiosyncratic valued characteristics, characteristics shared with other groups, other identities, or complex identities all appear to reduce the salience of a threatened identity. Reducing the salience of a threatened identity appears to serve a protective function, supporting continued high performance for those individuals already identify with the domain in question. Ergo, it is important to highlight that gender differences in the brain can not be accountable for gender disparities in academic achievement. Indeed, it is vital to understand the significant effect of stereotype threat and consciously try to battle its effects.

**Stereotype Threat on Performance**

The concern with gender disparities in academic achievement and attainment has been a prevalent topic not only in the media but scientific research too. Much of contemporary deliberation has emphasized the underrepresentation of women at the higher end of the continuum, particularly with respect to STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) subjects. Lawrence (2006) computes that Undergraduate and Postgraduate degrees in Maths, consist of merely 39% and 26% of women respectively, whilst the amount of women entering higher education in Physics is 20% at undergraduate level and 25% at postgraduate level. Steele and Aronson (1992, 1997) propose that the self-relevance of negative stereotypes can lead to decrements in performance due to fear of confirming such stereotypes. Indeed, research aiming to elucidate the underpinnings of stereotype threat has employed a variety of operationalizations, with some studies attempting to produce threat by soliciting information about social group memberships prior to test-taking (e.g., Steele & Aronson, 1995; Stricker & Ward, 2004) or by reminding participants of typical group differences in performance on the task (e.g., Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keough, Steele, & Brown, 1999; Beilock, Rydell, & McConnell, 2007; Yeung & von Hippel, 2008). Other studies have primed participants by informing them that their performance will be diagnostic of their ability (e.g., Kray, Thompson, & Galinsky, 2001; Marx, Stapel, & Muller, 2005; Steele & Aronson, 1995) and some induce stereotype threat by exposing participants to media materials that reflect such stereotypes (e.g., Davies, Spencer, Quinn, & Gerhardtstein, 2002; Davies, Spencer, & Steele, 2005; Oswald & Harvey, 2000-2001). Despite the prodigious effect of stereotype threat on performance, research has also shown that performance deficits can be reduced or eliminated. For instance, in their study for the Educational Testing Service (ETS), Sticker and Ward (2004) illustrate that moving standard demographic inquiries about ethnicity and gender to the end of the test resulted in significantly higher performance for women taking the AP calculus test (see Danaher & Crandall, 2008). Similarly, Ambady, Paik, Steele, Owen-Smith, and Mitchell (2004) highlight that women who were encouraged to think of their valued and unique characteristics, were less likely to experience stereotype threat in mathematics. Also, Rydell, McConnell, & Beilock (in press) showed that contextual cues reminding female undergraduates of their status as college students (a group that is expected to do well at math) eliminated gender-based stereotype threat. Equally, Gresky, Ten Eyck, Lord, and McIntyre (2005) indicated that when prompted to create ‘self-concept maps’ (i.e. to reflect on one’s fundamentally important characteristics), women’s mathematical performance was significantly enhanced.

Despite their different techniques, the aforementioned studies use methods that reduce the salience of identities that are tied to poor performance in a domain. Emphasizing the idiosyncratic valued characteristics, characteristics shared with other groups, other identities, or complex identities all appear to reduce the salience of a threatened identity. Reducing the salience of a threatened identity appears to serve a protective function, supporting continued high performance for those individuals already identify with the domain in question. Ergo, it is important to highlight that gender differences in the brain can not be accountable for gender disparities in academic achievement. Indeed, it is vital to understand the significant effect of stereotype threat and consciously try to battle its effects.

From a social justice standpoint, sexual objectification is another way that gender inequality is perpetuated and maintained. Beyond a benign communication of sexual interest, sexual objectification signals women’s decorative status, positioning them as available for sexual evaluation and consumption. When sexually objectified, women’s bodies become—even if just for a moment—the property of the observer. Under these conditions, women tend to be viewed as less competent, intelligent, and not fully human. When people are viewed as less human, or dehumanized, it is easier for others to dismiss, degrade, and harm them. This situation is not one that women can just opt out of, as sexual objectification often occurs outside women’s control and in unpredictable ways.

**Consequently, then, have a situation**

where some women may self-objectify in an attempt to elicit or maintain “positive” attention from men, viewing sexual objectification as flattering or beneficial to them. Some women feel quite powerful by “controlling” or “choosing” their sexualized appearance to capture the attention of men. The following quote by a female executive at Sony Pictures to Ariel Levy during the preparation of Levy’s (2005) book, Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the Rise of Raunch Culture, captures the positive view of sexual objectification that some women hold:

*My best mentors and teachers have always been men. Why? Because I have great legs, great tits, and a huge smile that God gave to me. Because I want to make my first million before the age of thirty-five. So of course I am a female chauvinist pig. Do you think those male mentors wanted me telling them how to better their careers, marketing departments, increase demographics? Hell no. They wanted to play in my secret garden. But I applied the Chanel war paint, pried the door open with my Gucci heels, worked, struggled and climbed the ladder. And made a difference!! And I did it all in a short Prada suit.*

Does the fact that women have to climb the ladder in Gucci heels reflect tangible power or mark them as different and serve as a decorative handicap? I think, along with many others, that there is reason to...

**Continued on page 10**

Writte: Ioanna Kapantai, Postgraduate Researcher in the School of Psychology.
Beyond the Body: The Social Justice Impact of Sexual Objectification Continued

...be skeptical of the empowerment veneer. First, it is important to point out that even when women feel good about compliments on their appearance these effects seem to be short-lived. Research has shown that appearance compliments (not just criticisms) increase body monitoring, body shame, and body dissatisfaction. Second, the fact that women's social, economic, and legal outcomes hinge upon their physical appearance to a much greater degree than men's do, suggests that women are only empowered to the extent that they are viewed as sexually desirable. Agency and ability may not be enough to be successful. If women's outcomes are dependent on others' (often men's) evaluations of their appearance and sexual appeal, do women actually hold the power? Not really.

Of particular interest to me is the possibility that self-objectification (a key psychological response to sexual objectification) further perpetuates gender inequality by undermining women's motivation to change these situations that disadvantage them. It stands to reason that if women come to rely on their appearance for power and status, they would be less likely to challenge the status quo that produces those power arrangements. In fact, some of my research has shown that women's engagement in gender activism is disrupted because they are more motivated to support (and thus less likely to challenge) gender inequality when they are more focused on how they look than on how they feel or what they can do. It seems that by directing women's attention to their appearance, self-objectification encourages women to comply with traditional gender roles (e.g., that of a sex object), and discourages them from viewing the current situation for women as something in need of change. The impact of sexual objectification on perceptions of gender equality and justice is perhaps the most insidious problem to overcome.

According to the United Nations, a cultural practice is considered harmful to women if the practice: (a) is harmful to the health of women and girls, (b) arises from material power differences between the sexes, (c) is for the benefit of men, (d) creates stereotypes which thwart the opportunities of girls and women, and (e) is justified by tradition. Sexual objectification meets these criteria for a harmful cultural practice; yet men and women justify and promote its occurrence. While gender discrimination has declined in other areas of women's lives, the sexual objectification of girls and women seems to be on the rise, and remains one of the greatest obstacles to achieving gender equality.

Written by: Dr Rachel Calogero, Reader in Psychology at the University of Kent.

Sources of Advice

Student Support & Wellbeing EDI Team
The Student Support & Wellbeing Team provides a range of support and guidance to students on all matters relating to EDI.
Dr Wayne Campbell, Director of Student Services w.campbell@kent.ac.uk
Graham Gorvett, Head of Student Support & Well Being g.d.gorvett@kent.ac.uk
Becky Lamyman, Student Experience Support Officer r.s.lamyman@kent.ac.uk
There is a network of services available on campus that aim to meet the needs of students by providing high quality specialised guidance and welfare advice, including:
- Counselling Service (also available for Staff)
- Mental Health Support
- Disability Support
- Specific Learning Difficulties Support
Web: www.kent.ac.uk/student-services

Master's Office
Each of the five Colleges, as well as the Medway Campus, has a College Master whose role it is to offer advice, help and support to all students for all types of concerns. The Master's Office is a first port of call when you need assistance of any kind.
Web: www.kent.ac.uk/student-services/masters-office/

Kent Union
The University of Kent Students Union represent the views of students through a number of elected posts. They organise student societies, events and activities to support diversity, as well as campaign for change through formal Liberation Officer posts:
- LGBT Officer
- Ethnic Minorities Officer
- Students with Disabilities Officer
- Women's Officer
Tammy Naidoo, Union President union-president@kent.ac.uk
Web: www.kentunion.co.uk

Harassment Contacts
The University has a network of Harassment Contacts who provide advice and support to staff and students who have concerns about bullying, harassment or inappropriate behaviour. A conversation with a harassment contact will not lead to formal action without the consent of the complainant except in cases where there are concerns about the complainant's safety and well-being.
Tel: 01227 827825
Web: www.kent.ac.uk/hr-equalityanddiversity/support/harassment

Chaplaincy
The Chaplaincy team is both ecumenical and multi-faith, serving various Christian traditions as well as the Muslim, Jewish and Buddhist communities. The Chaplains can provide information and advice about all aspects of the religious traditions they represent. They are also available to offer appropriate support to any member of the University staff or student - whatever the circumstances.
Email: chaplaincy@kent.ac.uk
Web: www.kent.ac.uk/chaplaincy

Need Help/Advice?
If you have any personal or academic issues that may affect your ability to study you can talk to Lisa Clark, Student Advisor for Psychology.
Please email her at: psychadvisor@kent.ac.uk
There are a range of services available to all Kent students including the following:
- Careers and Employability Service
- Student Support and Wellbeing
- International Students
- Counselling
- Chaplaincy
- Medical
Plus many more...
You can find more out about Student Services from the following webpage: www.kent.ac.uk/studentservices/

Any Suggestions?
If you have any comments or suggestions for the staff in the School of Psychology, then you can feed these back to us by using our suggestions box located outside the Psychology Student Office (Keynes M1.13).

Kent Psychologist
The School of Psychology’s Newsletter is for students and staff. We welcome contributions from both staff and students for future issues. If you would like to write an article or have any news you’d like to share, please contact Carly Turnham.
School of Psychology, Keynes College University of Kent, CANTERBURY, Kent. CT2 7NP
Email: C.Turnham@kent.ac.uk
Telephone: 01227 824775