

**Selected Topics in Psychology
Positioning Psychology in the Modern Context.
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences.
Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur**

**Scientific Publications in Psychology
Trend, Issues and Concerns**

(Refer Slide Time: 00:11)



We continue with our effort of positioning psychology in the country. And till now, our focus was primarily we begin with the UG teaching, the PG teaching and primarily quality was major concern that was deviated at large. And there were you know several suggestions the way forward. Today, now we shift our focus to the research outcomes, primarily in terms of journal articles, in terms of book chapters, in terms of volumes that one publishes, the challenges, the issues concerns, but primarily trying to say that what is way forward.

This is just to have a cumulative experience, of people who have been in the profession for years, contributed you know significantly to the area. How their collective experience can be utilized by the forth coming researchers so that they can also make their mark. And they can take psychology from where it exists today to some other level.

With me, I have you know Professor. Ajit. Dalal, who was the editor of psychology in developing societies. And Professor. Girishwar. Misra who continues to be the editor of editor in chief of a psychology studies. Professor. Ramadhar. Singh, who happens to be

associated editor of IIM management review? I will first ask Professor. Dalal; that having your long experience as an editor of a journal, what type of trend did you see in the articles submitted to your journal? Also do you describe the issues and methodology in these submissions? How do find the quality? Your comments about the quality of scientific publications in psychology in India at large?

Well. I took over the as editor of the journal psychology and developing societies in 2001. That was I took over as the editor. And this particular journal; the psychology and development society was started in 1989 by Professo. Dugan Sinha as a journal of the developing countries. And the whole face is at the focus of the journal was that, we should be able to highlight and bring out issues which are more pertained, and relevant for that no for the developing countries.

So, that was our idea was to publish those articles, which of most non western nature and which are actually highlighting the reality of this particular region. And he was a editor for some time. Then, Professor. R. C. Taipei took over as editor of to the journal and I took over the journal in 2001. And what I see as when I took over the journal; journal was already established borrowed by sage, as one of the prominent journal in this particular field.

Because, of the efforts of the earlier editors, the journal was well know in the developing countries and it was well circulated. And what we idea we had that, there should be articles in this journal, half of the articles should be from India, other half of articles should come from other developing countries. Primarily we have been focusing on the Latin, America African countries, South Asian countries and other countries, were you know psychology and which was which are still developing.

Now, when I looked at the as a editor, I continue for to be the editor of journal for 12 years. And when I looked back at these 12 years as a editor, I saw that journal was in a way doing well, in the sense of bringing out the scenario concern of the developing countries in 1 sense. But you look in terms of the research methodology, in terms of the content of these articles, you look in terms of the issues which they were bringing up, I think I found that, there was a change in marketable change which I could see that; more and more people from developing countries were really writing per these for journal.

Our concern was that, they were writing for the journal, they were sending articles this is good ideas, not very good methodology or proper methodology they have been using. But the ideas were really they have the ideas which, were publishing and many time in the beginning, I remember that of the articles from African countries; those countries where they were not have the research culture of that kind of proper training. These articles had to be rewritten had to be revised and has to be you know properly grammatically in the properly English.

It has to be revised because; they were have been doing a good work, but did not has a good language. So, that was a, we think many of these articles which we published in the in the initial stage of my editorship that, we did this job of rewriting these articles and rewriting in terms of language, not in terms of ideas and concepts, but in terms of the idea either language. And these articles are published and whole idea was that, people from and scholars from these regions should be encouraged to bring and something make submission to the journal.

We found that, what we had we have a point, we had a as a part of editorial board which was practice 1 before, that we had the a kind of advisory board of the journal, in which we selected scholars; very major scholars from North America, from South America, from African countries, from South Asian countries. Reason why we took those the whole idea was; these will find these articles, find the people who can write for the journal, make the submission to the journal.

The whole purpose was in the particular region, they will encourage scholars to submit the articles. And that thing was, we have worked for some time and it did not for some time. And what I find finding that, in terms of g u articles, in journal in terms of conceptual articles, they were good articles we were seeing. But in terms of the articles which were empirical nature, were gradually becoming less and less.

Earlier there were many, but the articles were less or empirical nature. And conceptually taking up the issues of the developing countries that, was happening and we have there was research, there were many major scholars, who have contributed those articles. But gradually and slowly what I was finding that, a new the input in the journal was and in terms of from India particular. The natures of articles are a kind article we were receiving was not of that quality.

Quality was a in terms of particular for empirical articles, that the quality of the articles in terms of methodology, in terms of conceptualization and in terms of understanding implication of what they are saying. Because you know most of articles, that what I found that, when they submitted a article, they write at the end of the article 1 paragraph as a ritual implication of this work. I thought that may not be a sufficient way of making and writing a article and making its applied implication. There should be bulletin in the article right from the beginning that, the issues are concerns then that was the 1 professor the thing which I found was a problem.

Another thing which I saw that, in terms of the quoting the Indians work, I profound that in most of these articles which were from developing countries or from India, most of the work which they were quoting. If you look at the list of references they were giving; hardly there was any Indian work which was they were quoting, most of the research which was in that they were referring to passed on the western countries. And the emphasis which we were really putting in that, if there are writing from the developing countries point of view, there should be material and there should literature, which is vote out in from this country.

Another thing which I found that, as an editor I found that increasingly more than more and more number of articles had to be written back as they can. I think our purpose acceptance rate right from the beginning was; beginning it was much more; 30 percent, 35 percent, for increasing I was finding that it was reducing, number of increase was more, but I think we have our reject out file rejecting more than 50 percent of articles. At their dash cup of the editor, because of the event, it will not go to the stage of sending them to any reviewer. Even that only the dash cup the editor, if we did not find these articles even worst reviewing and the number of articles which was of that nature was increasing.

So, during my period, I found that more than 50 60 percent articles had to be returned as they can. This was another problem which was we were experiencing thing that, there were more entry, more submissions, but quality of submissions was very poor getting poor and poor. Another problem which I experienced throughout the period, that getting good reviewers for the articles, even if we accept that, we were publishing the journal twice in a year 2 issues. And that is was not much we were publishing around a 15 or

maybe more than not more than 15 18 articles in whole a year, in the 1 particular volume.

Even finding reviewers to look at these articles; to give the proper feedback that was going down you know, we even could not find them. And another thing which I found that, if you send the reviewer outside the India, it is easy to get our reviewer in a within the stupid ridicule year: 1 month or 2 month or 3 month. But many times, we were sending it to Indian reviewers; the problem is that unless you keep on reminding, you can send keep on requesting them to send the review as earlier as possible. Many times reviewer not coming, many times they were not sending, that was another problem.

So, we tried to find out some of the reviewers which will be more committed to this kind of work. And we did found some and I think they did the good job in a reviewing some article. But this problem persisted, till I left the journal that, increasingly in increasingly it was finding due you have finding difficult to find reviewers. And many times on the basis of 1, we thought we will have to anonymous view for each article, but many times we had to only confine to 1. Or there were other contingencies, you know that the journal has to be brought out and the view has not come.

So, we will do some kind of in house viewing of the article and that was happening. And then, knew that because of this, in house reviewing is not way doing it, but there was a compulsion of a time because, journal has to be brought out in the on time. This was one thing I found and I thought that 1 important thing is that, if the viewers can pay of the writers can pay more intention, to a whole idea was that if you have sending the article and articles are being send by those, you know the journal writer is a very difficult job.

If somebody submits an article and he is a eminent called somewhere he is a professor somewhere, he is a senior to me and if I reject the paper, if I say this paper on the basis of review which I am getting; if I say this paper was what was not publishable, this creates a kind of serious problem for the editor. I think I faced that problem very often that, I to say no and this no is not taken very kindly. And they would make all kind of personal attributions, that why this paper was not accepted.

My concept was that, if you can maintain the quality as much as possible and strictly read to the professional criteria. And many times it is for writer even this researcher be very professional to bring out the journal, here to make something sometimes some kind

of compromises. So, that beside that, but I think what we the happened to journal that, the leadership of the journal was increasing. I think sage was bringing out this journal. I think in the beginning, we had only a small few catties where, the journal was going and I left the journal if the journal was going to more than 45 countries all around and there was.

So, that way circulation went on. The visibility of the journal went on. But I would not say that, the quality of the paper we were publishing was commensurate with that kind of visibility you know, that kind of standard and which was not wanted to maintain. That was becoming increasing difficulty getting good article. And so what we did used to do in between these 2 right people person actually requesting people may not be we have to do that. We request people to contribute or send us some article, those who are really active in the field and doing work.

So, managing a journal you know, you have to manage many of these things; encouraging people, doing this kind of a job which is a difficult job of giving a negative feedback. But I think, if the process my whole concern was that, if this journal as a reading journal can be you know, quality can be maintained.

Well I what now, seek now the experience of Professor. Girishwar. Misra for long years been in editor in chief of a psychological studies. So, your concern about the quality of scientific publications in psychology in India, especially with reference to the publications and submissions to a psychological studies.

The journal psychological studies, started with the initiative of Professor. B. Krishnan long back in 1956. Subsequently it was being edited by Professor. Formukhi. And it was in 2000 that, the national academic of psychology requested Professor. Faruki, who because of his ill health and old age, expressed the view that, if someone is interested to publish this journal, he would like to give that journal to the association or the person and the now came forward and it was decided that it will become the chief organ of national academic of psychology.

The academic ask me to act as its editor. From 2000 to 2009, I had to do everything for the journal; as editor, as publisher and it was a very difficult exercise in terms of gaining support for publication. And we had very tough time to organize the journal and gradually the journal became more and more popular amongst the colleagues in India.

And we found that, a variety of articles were submitted and gradually with the experience, we develop a particular orientation in terms of, organizing the different issues of the journal. For instance, we decided that in year there will be 1 issue, where we will publish 1 target article by 1 colleague and there will be commentaries by at least 2 or 3 colleagues and the author will respond to that.

This was an idea to facilitate dialogue and making certain issues prominent. I remember 1 such issue was of the Indian mindset and the article was written by Professor. J. B. P. Sinha and his colleagues and then, we had responses from 3 colleagues and then there was respond to that. So, this was one initiative. In addition to that, we also organized special issues on important themes. For instance, we have 1 issue on self and identity. And I am really happy to share that; we could get contribution from many senior colleagues including Raba mister, Makleri, Kashima and many others. And there was good responds to such an issue.

Similarly, we organized 1 issue on social constructionism and focusing on the work of Kenneth Gergen, that also receipt good response to for colleagues. We had many such issues; 1 was also on health and wellbeing. So, this was 1 way to create a focus on research publication. But everything is not well with the journal. I would like to share the journey through the last 1 decade or so. When we were engaged in increasing the number of issues, as well as size of the journal, we had to create more and more resources with it get some support my ICSR but it was quite difficult. In 2009, we were able to get support from Springer and that created a new scenario.

With the help of Springer, we went for joint publication of now and Springer. And now, the submissions were made electronically; a system was created to get the articles, reviewed to contact the authors to get submission at various stages by authors and reviewers that is streamlined the process. And now, things are in place and the journal is doing quite well.

At the same time, I would like to draw attention to some of the important features that, demand attention of authors. For instance, many of the authors give a lot of references and times many references are irrelevant. They are not relevant to the theme; just to cite many references and indicating that this work relates to many others kinds of efforts, made by researchers. People bring in a lot of information, it is something which is quite

problematic, in the sense that, many authors start with writings of others and indicate that, I am doing this particular research because, so and so theory, so and so research tells these things.

So, here is my hypothesis. And then again towards the end, they will come back and say that, my work goes with the research, the findings which were obtained by, those who provided the initial empties for my research. I do not see any progress in terms of ideas, in terms of contribution. This is an important lacuna; the kind of critical reflection which is require to contribute to knowledge, developing specific hypothesis, is missing in many of the contributions. And we have to ask the authors to revise the article. We often reject the articles submitted by the authors on account of inadequate theoretical argument or analysis of past research.

We also find that, many of the articles deal with issues, which are really not issues worth y for pursuing the research. I would like to mention that, doing good research requires a critical understanding and identifying a good research question. There are numerous variables and can relate any variable with n number of variables and there is no point in pursuing this kind of arbitrary selection of variables and relating to them. For instance, age, grade, gender are very common variables and 1 goes for frequent analysis of variance across these variables and there is no theorization. There is no understanding about the nature of variables, whether the variables are categorical, nominal, ordinal or interval these issues hardly get attention of the researchers.

So, the kind of research culture which is prevailing and the kind of research which is being done, lacks this kind of distinction, this kind of vivek that, what should be the right kind of question, which question is worth pursuing. So, we had to take a tough stand and many colleagues are annoyed because, of the response of the editor. But if we have to progress, if we have to contribute to knowledge, we need to taker stands in terms of the qualitative standards, pertaining to a particular piece of work.

Editing is a very difficult job, where 1 has to respond to the reviewers, as well as authors. We are trying to seek cooperation from reviewers from India as well as abroad, we were successful to some extent, but it is a difficult job. As I have observed, reviewers need to attend to many aspects of an article. They need to think about the relevance of the work. They need to examine, whether the methodology has been followed suitably or not. They

have to see whether, proper inference has been drawn or not. They have to decide, whether there is any substantial contribution to theory, method or application pertaining to a particular piece, which has been submitted to the journal.

It is a tough job, it requires time, it requires reading current literature. It is unfortunate that, there are not many people who are interested in a taking of this kind of challenge. I think there should be some component of this kind of review, work in training at doctoral level, where students are required to read articles critically and learn to examine the critical components of a given piece of research. This kind of insight is missing in many students. I think that should be made part of training; how to learn about the nuances.

We often follow the APA style of writing and it is very difficult to train everybody in that, because people are not familiar with that. And if one follows that style, the APA manual; I will have to understand the details of organizing a manuscript using proper language and putting things in a manner, which should be the mode of publication in scientific domain, in public sphere. I must say that, research is important, but publication of research too is important, it is more important than merely submitting the work and putting that in library. I think it is sane; if the work is done and it is not put in the public sphere.

Knowledge have to be disseminated. I think doing that will reduce the kind of duplication which is taking place. We find that the same kind of topic is being used in research, at many centers, in many university departments, without any kind of a movement or progress, in terms of cumulative knowledge. If, we want to bring in change in the quality of publication, it is very crucial that, we make ourselves updated. Psychology is a discipline which is growing very fast. It has many traditions; there is qualitative research tradition, there are quantitative methods. I often see that, most of the studies end up with a simple correlation or a t test or a simple ANOVA.

We also find that, a very small sample is used and claims are made of very high order. If we examine international publications, most of the journals now publish a series of studies, a number of experiments, where people replicate the findings, extend the understanding which emerges and ready to understand the influence of various mediators and moderators.

So, the kind of demand in terms of quality of research, which is available in literature at international level and the way we think in our universities and most of the stream departments, there is a gap between the 2. We need to bridge this gap. So, in terms of statistical analysis for example, we find that confirmatory factor analysis or a discriminate function analysis or other higher orders statistics or use of manova. These are things which are very common in international publications.

The training of research, training for research, which is available in Indian context, misses these new techniques. There is hardly improvement in terms of the repertory of statistical techniques or use of good quality qualitative research in the research traditions that are going on. So, in order to improve the quality of publication, it is important to bring in these changes in the training at a doctoral level. I also feel that, the articles often relate to the kind of theories, concept, perspectives which has a kind of origin, in purely western cultural context.

I sincerely think that, the human science research has to be local, in terms of the questions that are raised. We need to address problems which are present in our society. And qualitatively, the work which is rooted in specific cultural setting can provide better insights and there can be give and take between the traditions of research in different cultural context. This kind of awareness is also missing. We consider theory is as universal, we treat data as universal, and we hardly examine the specific cultural context, well articulate in the concerns and issues with which we deal with.

Now, it is high time that, we move towards a system of training, at post graduate as well as the doctoral level, where writing or scientific writing gets an important place, data analysis gets a new kind of input, only then we will be able to achieve the goals of quality publication. And there is 1 more important point that point is that, researchers in India, often get stimulation from the work done by colleagues in other countries, in cultural context. They hardly refer to the work done by Indian psychologists when, those studies which have received international recognition, are not looked into while designing the studies.

So, I think there is very little impact of Indian research on Indian research. I want to emphasize this point that, the understanding that has been gained, is not use to further knowledge in our culture. It is a very sad state of affairs. The ICSR has completed 5

rounds of research surveys. I have been associated with the fifth round of survey. I am also editing the sixth survey. What I find is that, people are not using those analyses, those kinds of conclusions and they hardly go into the details of that. It requires attention of teaching departments and those who are supervising students that, they should make it mandatory, that students who aspire for the total work, must attend to the studies done in India. In the textbooks, these studies hardly get any attention, they are not included.

So, the research which is being done has a very short life. It has life which begins with research and ends which research is completed. It has no place in the academic curriculum; it is a very sad situation. The teachers and researchers need to think about, using these inputs in teaching programs, in writing textbooks and seeing their implication sincerely. I think teaching and research are interrelated. What I find is that, the 2 function separately.

Our research has no reflection in teaching and teaching has no reflection in research. These are two different things what we teach and the topics that we take up for research, they become quite independent. That is not the situation in United States of America and other developed countries. The research they do is intimately related to the culture and it is integrated in the teaching material. I think we need to think about it very seriously, only then a qualitative change can be brought in. Thank you.

Professor. Singh, you have stayed and walked for a long in South East Asia and you have also written about state about psychology in South East Asia. How do compare contributions by Indian authors to that of other Asian country contributors? And if you can further you know extend it to the contributions from the western world. Also an important issue that, publications from the western countries, when we look at them, we find that they have you know good number of authors for a work whereas, has been you look at the publications from India, you rarely find more than 2 authors. So, can you elaborate on that dynamics of this collaborative research?

Thank you Doctor. Prad. Bhushan. I think my 2 colleagues here, who have been editing journals for so many years, have given you reasons about what the scenario in India. So, first I would in very brief, I would like to talk on Indian scene and then compare with a international scene. Earlier we discuss about quality of our Ph.D program. Now 1 of the

reasons for poor quality of our doctor program is; that most professor do not have a research program.

If, the professor himself is having a research program, which is being extended, developed by their graduate students. Then, the outcome would be something of high quality. So, in my opinion this is the 1 reason because, my experience as a graduate student in seventies and after subsequent visits to other universities, I found that all those professors who are famous and productive, they have a research program in which there would be 5 10 20 Ph.D students working and expanding that paradigm. We lack that. So, this is the one reason I think.

Another thing I to say that, we have poor quality submissions to our journal would be to stress now obvious. But I would like to give you the reason why this is happening. I I said like a doctor program is problematic. At anywhere in the world, journals are surviving or prospering because, there is a tough competition given by the doctoral students, in terms of quality of submissions and getting their space in the journal. Because they have long careers to go, they want to make a mark, they want a job.

So, the same thing has to be cultivated here that, unless you do we cannot, but here is some dilemma. Most institutions have now prinking of journals, in which internationals journals should get carry greater weight than the national journals. Now if this is so, why would anyone who has any quality journal manuscript would, give to the Indian journal? If, it can be exported they would like to export it. So, that leaves of those manuscripts which cannot really be exported.

So, here is a problem. Then again I agree with both of my colleagues here, that even though we have a poor quality journal, a article it does not mean that the research was really bad. What is required that, when we send to the reviewer, reviewer should at least read and see what the author wanted to do, to what extent he or she has been able to formulate the hypothesis and translate into regress methodological test, are the data analyzed, what contribution the article is making and can the article be improved and how. Instead of a balance review like this; what we get would be, why like this article they wanted to do it and I am happy to support you.

Now think of an editor is like a judge, in which we are having a trail for the author. And the reviewers like advocates; they have to make a case. Now, if they write a review like

this, what the editor can do, because there is no input for editors. So, either he or she has to read the entire article and then decide what to do. Now, in this context you say international, so I would like to give you example, when I came across a reviewer like this, in future I never send any manuscript to that person. And in forth in my editorial lather, I write to the author that, I send to this reviewer, he has not done good work and in my opinion he should be doing things like this.

Now, 2 examples I would give you: 1 in child development in a TA and other in organizational behavior human decision process, I think in 96, reviewers were being harsh with me and editors wrote to me; do not do what this reviewer is doing. We need our editors to a lemar here. Sometime to take a position, to give justice to the author, you have to disagree with the reviewer. You have consulted them, he is not God. But unfortunately even on international scenario now, editors are very much afraid of reviewer, they are going by the tick mark, rather than seeing how the manuscript.

Even though we are getting poor quality, still there is some merit, it can be strengthen. We can make the author realized that, these are the weakness which the future structures can improve, this is not happening. So, a professional problem we have here. So, priority should I submit to Indian journal or to a Foreign journal. Second priority is; are we giving a good feedback.

Now, if we are not giving it, then we are not making a good investment and frankly I am saying in public now, that I grew more from the reviews of my article than from my training at Purdue University. Some time the reviews would be 8 to 10 pages of 1 article. So, in the article is 30 pages, review would be 10 to 15 pages criticizing telling how it can be done how; now if, there is no programmatic research, then you can raise an issue, but you cannot answer it.

So, if we have a series of experiments 6 7 8 9 10, then you are able to give a definitive answer to the question as Professor. Misra also made. And that is the reason you see, most of the international articles in which you have multiple task, more than 6 7, there are a series of experiments conducted at different laboratory, different culture, and different places. So, that what the position we are taking is very definitive title.

So, this collaboration also helps. It is also possible in this country that, the same experiment we conduct in Delhi, we conduct in Chennai, we conduct in Pondicherry, we

conduct in Shillong. Do it at a similar kind of finding. If, we make a change, is the process applicable. We can also come up with this, but somehow this is not happening. And that culture has to be built in this country.

Now, let us come back to the international scenario now. Institutions all over the world are giving top importance to a scholarship. When people are being hired as assistant professor; a point which we also agreed yesterday, they are given 6 years period in which they have to distinguish themselves as a teacher and a researcher. If they demonstrate it, then they get promoted at associate professor with 10 year. If they are not able to do, then we extend for 1 year and 2 and say that you look for somewhere else.

Now here, we do not have that demand either. If we demand like this then apparently people would like to do. Another thing which I now, I am almost having in this country for 3 years. Inspiring teachers or professors maybe also an issue; research; there is no one on this earth whose article is not rejected. If an article is rejected, it does not mean that it is a poor piece of research. All it means that, there are not 2 or 3 reviewers whose imagination your article can catch. And I have many examples like this; how many times the manuscript cross Atlantic at a time from 1 journal to other journal, in 1 journal there would find, everyone who would find trash, in another everyone who would admire the work. It gets published, it gets cited. So, this kind of persistence we are not giving the culture here.

So, once we complained about the reviewers. The truth is sometime when the reviewers have done authorial, authors are not willing to revise it. They say either I have no competence or I have no time and that I whether it is a Ph.D dissertation or whether it is a journal article. If, somebody is telling you that, you have some virtues major strength in this paper, actually you should take advantage of it. That negative attitude is also a problem here. This you would not find in international. Everyone is revising, improving and that is why the quality is higher.

So, these are the contrast I am notice noticing here. The journal which I am, we have at a management review; it is brought out by 1 say elseve here. And in 3 years now our impact value is 0.4. So, we have made some progress and same thing has to be done in psychology department. Now, let us suppose; when I write a research piece, whether it is a dictate volume or researcher, article or a textbook or a doctoral dissertation. If

somebody is able to bring a new perspective on it, we should actually feel grateful to that person who has brought it. And willingly revise and see whether it make sense or not. In many cases, suggestion would be irrelevant ones. You can always said that, these are the things which are not possible I do not agree. Most editors' want that. You revise your paper and things you do not do please a letter so that, I can decide it. We have that option.

But here simply saying; I have no time or I will consider later on, that is not the right kind of attitude for a researcher. We have to have a desire and willingness to change and improve our work because; it is going to part of the literature. And in my life, at least my professor told me that, do not put in print until you are double see or everything is accurate. Here people want to publish first whether it is accurate or not, this is a problem.

Another important issue, especially now concerning the researchers is the IRB approval. And especially those who are not attempting to publish abroad; they will always have you know certain issue that has to do with IRB approval. Compare to all three of you are have a very small experience in the area. But I feel that as an doctoral reviewer, I find you know the other reviewer has not raised any issue, regarding the IRB approval if the paper comes from the west. But as an author, I find that always there is some clarification needed about the IRB approval.

So, I think it is also time you know for the researchers, to be a quoted about the IRB issue. I will ask Professor. Ramadhar. Singh to elaborate on this. Now, this IRB means institutional reviewer board. Because of the human rights and so many legal complications now, we have to protect the interest of the researcher, participants and the institutions, where the study is being conducted. If you notice the change, earlier we used to say subjects, now we are not saying human beings as subjects, we say participants you know freedom and dignity part.

So, this idea of IRB or institutional reviewer; it consists of some lawyers, some ordinary people, some from your field, some from outsider complete layman. And when we propose any research your methodology, how would you conduct it, how you would recruit the participants, how you would terminate your experiment, what kind of benefits you give to the participants. We describe everything. And once we describe, then it goes

to the review board and then they decide, whether this study should be allowed to be conducted here or not.

If, they approve it then you can collect data. Not only this, in some of the American schools, you have to pass 1 online test. If you pass that test, only then you are allowed to collect data from human beings. All these would be required by the IRB. Now, journal people; if they publish something controversial, they are also likely to be sued. So, they require that, your study must have been cleared by the IRB.

So, in an online submission you would see, there would be a last tick mark; that this research was conducted according to the ethical standard of APA or British psychological society or national academy of psychology. If you do not make the tick mark, your manuscript would not be considered. Sometime in spite of that, the editor says can you show me, send me this kind of copy of the approval letter from the IRB. If they suspect that it has not been cleared.

So, these are the requirements and we also need to do the same thing. This is applicable not only to psychology. Medical research, anywhere human subjects are being used, we have to have approval.

Another interesting thing I wanted to ask you, it was basically you know when I saw a publication. Most underappreciated 50 permanent social psychologists and I find a chapter from you there. My idea was that, see this could be a fantastic way of you know putting forward a research, which somebody considers they deserve much more attention, compare to the those work which did get that attention. And it could be an interesting way of presenting the facts.

Another interesting observation I had was; at 1 of the events at Goldberg university. In the discussion an issue came that, they have come forward with the journal, some European publisher, where you report those studies, where you found that all those quantitative figures, did not report significant findings. So, largely because you report significant findings, here you have an outlet for studies which were fantastically done, but results were not found to be significant. And I found these 2 things very interesting. So, I would like to comment on that: Professor. Ramadhar. Singh.

You know the your first point was about the most underappreciated. Now that piece has big history. The first experiment was conducted in 1975 in the psychology laboratory of IIT Kanpur. And we, 4 5 experiments we did and then added I think 3 or more experiments at IIM Ahmadabad. And I thought that was the best piece I have written and it should go to the journal of experimental psychology journal. And we had a very simple idea you know like; usual idea was that if you give 2 things, then how do people integrate it and the method was that. So, give 2 things and also give 1 of the things, 1 of the 2.

So, how people respond to the 1, should be the basis of judging how they dealt with the. We reverse the process; we say that if you give 2 things which are necessary to make the judgment and then you give 1 of the 2, then what would happen? Now, 2 things are necessary, but you are giving 1, would your participant or any decision maker act on the basis of only given 1, our point was that no. From the given infer the missing. And we developed the method by which we can tell that, if you say motivation and ability or if you say generosity into income and they are giving gift. How would people deal with 1.

So, our approach was to show that, first deal with, tell how the 2 were attended 2 and then, we can tell how we handle that was the piece and I thought it was very engineering's one. And since, then under sun approach me that, you give me to my contributions to information integration theory, we gave. So, it did not get as much attention as it is. But many colleagues made such mistake like this and that is why that haio state professor brought this book, that most underappreciated. The author thought it is very important, but the professional world did not receive that way.

So, he thought that those works must get attention of the graduate students that is why we all were required to write that research in 2000 words. And I did it. Now, come to the non significant point. Earlier this is the way Nyman Pearson approach to psychology weekend, where we were trained only to look at significant differences. But now the situation has changed. Data analysis as Professor. Misra also advances. We have an data analysis that, even non significant effects are interpretable. And this is what I discussed in my presidential address; how to interpret non significant effects or null effects. It is possible to interpret it. So, we should be surprising.

In the second panel discussion, you heard the editors talking about trend issues and concerns, that 1 should be aware of. The issue of a ethical clearance, reporting of non significant findings and other relevant issues were also discussed. I am confident that the views discussed in the 2 panel discussions, must have helped you to position psychology in India as well as a globally in different perspectives.

My sincere thanks to all of you and of course, the emanate panelist.

Thank you.