

Feedbacks by all ESRs to Sapienza SB replies to the REA

IOANA GURALIUC

Research Focus “Genesis and development of the “structural paradigmatic approach” in more than 50 years of social representation theory: mapping theory, methods, thematic areas and applications”

Oggetto: Answer to the suggestions of EC

Data: 19 ottobre 2015 13:21:08 CEST

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Hello!

This is my answer to the EC suggestions:

Suggestion 1:

The solution to make this differentiation between Program Director and Fellows` Program Coordinator it is great and the fact that this last position is taken by prof. Giovanna Leone is greater, in my opinion prof. Leone having the wright qualities to take this position. I am sure prof. Leone has the necessary skills to meet the fellows needs.

The second solution to integrate fellows in the meetings of the Sapienza Supervizor Board is also great, giving the fellows the opportunity to speak their voices and take part in the decision making, giving them the opportunity to develop some skills concerning the decision making in a project evaluated so highly by EC.

Suggestion 2:

Concerning the time management work, the solution to have fixed 3 days of lab attendance and 2 days of flexible time comes in the help of having less rigid time work and to our more freedom of choices, as long as the quality of work is not affected in any way of the physical attendance at the lab each day and the days worked from home can be used for working at the project for the PhD Diploma.

Suggestion 3:

I believe that even though the title of our theme and title of the dissertations was established at the beginning of the project, we can find some solutions to include in the thesis and some of our own ideas, as long as does not change the topic and the area already assigned at the beginning of the project. Every paper needs to have the fingerprint of it`s author, this being the whole idea of a dissertation.

Suggestion 4:

I agree that the career plan development must be done taking into consideration the personal goals of the fellow and the future plans the he has. In order to make it possible and to do the present work duties and the future plans we have to find a good solution. Taking in consideration that the current project refers and is about social representations filed, I find it obvious that we should participate at the conferences that have social representations as theme, combined with the field of our personal interests. For exemple, in my case could be social representations and clinical psychology or speaking problems at children or body language etc. This is possible for any of colleagues, taking into consideration that social representation field is very open and collaborations between this filed and many others are very common.

Suggestion 5:

About the places of our secondment, we knew since the beginning where we are going and this could not be changed after, since the agreements with the co-tutors from the host University were already made. Of course we have to try and to demand as many fruitful results from this period, in order to gain as much knowledge as we can, and this can be done by having a close collaboration between fellow – professor from the host University – Director of the Program from Sapienza.

Suggestion 6:

Taking into account that the virtual library is our tool for our own research, we have to work on it, trying to improve as best the data, so we have correct and extensive results, in order to use as much as we can for our own project. Obviously, we need a balanced time to integrate in our dissertations personal ideas and data, but also the data from the virtual library, from the MTA`s, as we found out long before entering in the project. Basically, we are using and also we are producing the data, learning a lot from the information that we analyse, analyse done with a critical mind and fuelled with previous knowledge from our previous background. We certainly do more than a librarian work. We use our minds to gain knowledge and to further use it in our presentations, conference presentations, abstracts, our final thesis and of course, our future career.

Suggestion 7:

The second supervisor is present, we know about him/her since the beginning, beside the co-tutor from the host University from secondment. I believe that the real important idea is to have a real collaboration between the fellows and the other supervisors and more important between the supervisors themselves, in order to fully help the fellow to do a great paper that will have a real chance to be published in an important journal after finishing it.

Suggestion 8:

The fellow should go to the conferences that meet his/her professional and personal interests, but in an equal fair way between all the fellows and with the condition to respect the daily duties that he/her has, in order not to affect the work of the entire team (for example, one fellow travels all the world for conferences and another stays at the lab doing the work of the one who travels). It has to be a balance between fellows, work and the main goals of the project.

Suggestion 9:

It is important to establish contacts with the possible future job prospects. In this order, until now this possibility of meeting some of these contacts from private sector, during the summer schools or winter schools. However it would be even better to have this kind of meeting in less formal ways, having the opportunity to learn more practical things and less theoretical ones.

Suggestion 10:

In my personal case, this issue is not very important because of my background and also my future plans are in psychology, but this does not mean that I would not be interested to find more about other different topics and areas.

Suggestion 11:

Concerning this suggestion I agree with it and I am looking forward to learn as many interesting things about how to write an article paper and even for the phd thesis. We had this opportunity in the past, when we went at a seminar in the Sapienza Campus, which for me was interesting because a lot of the information was new to me, and also when at the laboratory came a person from the Elsevier and shared with us other interesting ideas. But, I agree with your suggestion,

because never is too much information and the more people you talk the more knowledge you can learn.

Suggestion 12:

At the previous winter school and also for summer school we worked at our individualised presentation and it was a great help to learn better how to do a good presentation and to improve as much as we can. It is important to present as often as it is possible, in this way gaining experience. Concerning the presentations, time management has to be improved, in order to have time to fully present our work and to receive feedback – a very important aspect for improvement of work.

Suggestion 13:

All the presentations, with some exceptions, of the guest-lecturers were on the web site, at our disposition to read them even before presentation took place.

These being said, I strongly believe that every problem has a solution and that the only thing that we need to do is try to find that solution. My opinion is that this program, as all the things in this life, can be improved in order to meet all the wishes of each fellow, as it is possible, but seeing the bigger picture it is a great program that can offer lots of opportunities if you know to see them and to take advantage of them. I started this program with the obvious idea of finishing it in 2017 with my Phd thesis and diploma, I invested a lot of time preparing for it and after entering I invested one year in doing my best. I planned my future goals and plans taking into account these two more years, so I want to finish what I started, without any delay and problems.

I believe that one of the qualities of a profesionist is to think twice before taking a decision, to make sure it is the wright one and when you take the decision you have to do your best to finish it.

These being said, I am looking forward to improve my work, my thesis and to celebrate the day when I will take my PhD Diploma. We are a team and we have to find the best solutions for us and our work!

I clearly want to continue the project and I am willing to work hard to accomplish this job, in the best way possible. This project offered me the chance to meet and collaborate with great scientists, authors and people and to learn a lot from all, to gain experience and to be a better version of me, in just an year – imagine what I can do in two more years!

Thank you!
Ioana Guraliuc

MARIJA ADELA GJORGJIOSKA

Research Focus “Genesis and development of the “socio-dynamic paradigmatic approach” in more than 50 years of social representation theory: mapping theory, methods, thematic areas and applications”

Oggetto: Re: Document to be discussed during the on-line Meeting with Sapienza Supervisory Board

Data: 19 ottobre 2015 13:08:21 CEST

A: Annamaria de Rosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Dear Prof de Rosa and members of the board,

I read your proposed answers to the recommendations you have suggested. As I said during the Skype conversation on Thursday, I think the EC expects under recommendation 1). to see the appointment of an external member to the board (someone who doesn't belong to Sapienza University but to the network of associated partners, in order to act as a bridge between the network and the programme). In addition, under suggestion 1). it should be clarified that there will be at all times at least one student representative on the Board (the selection and the length of the mandate to be decided democratically amongst the students).

On the third recommendation, I believe that the European Commission is concerned with the scientific vigor of our research and we must all dedicate the period until the next EC evaluation in January, to make sure that each individual research has a research design, with research objectives, scope, hypothesis and proposed methodology. The MTAs will be included as a part of the research design, however, it must be clarified that additional methods will also be allowed, within the scope of the objective of the individual research approach and the wider programme: mapping the genesis, evolution and development of social representations theory across geographic, thematic and paradigmatic directions.

In this vein, it should be expected that the methods employed by the 3 specific sub-groups (geographic, thematic and paradigmatic) are likely to diverge in the extent to which they utilise the MTA as a source of data simply because of the nature of the focus. Therefore, if the MTA is relevant for the geographic focuses, it may be less so for the paradigmatic, which may require in addition for those students to employ additional avenues to get insights and more data. This must be taken into consideration as a possibility and not as an obstacle to the programme as whole. In addition what I encourage is for the students to start developing and working within the three working groups (geographic, thematic and paradigmatic) to share ideas, cross-check each other's work and also contact appropriate academic advisers at Sapienza and beyond.

The allowance of two days per week of independent work addresses the EC's concerns about independent work, and I am sure the results of this change will become apparent immediately in the work produced, and the general productivity of the ESRs.

Finally, the inclusion of the ESRs should not be limited to evaluating the success of the spring and summer schools, but they should be more actively involved in the selection of guests, the content, the coordination of the events, as in fact their main purpose is to offer training to the students.

With the commitment and understanding of the scientific coordinator and the Sapienz, the EC and the ESRs on the above-mentioned issues, I am confident that we will be able to successfully complete this project.

Kind regards,
Adela

MARYIA KUKHARAVA

Research Focus “Genesis and development of the “dialogical, conversational and narrative paradigmatic approaches” in more than 50 years of social representation theory: mapping theory, methods, thematic areas and applications”

Oggetto: Re: Document to be discussed during the on-line Meeting with Sapienza Supervisory Board

Data: 21 ottobre 2015 16:16:30 CEST

A: bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Annamaria de Rosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear Supervisory Board,

I am writing to you regarding the suggestions proposed by the REA upon the mid-term review of our project. First of all, I would like to emphasize that indeed, our project was in need of some changes. In my view, these changes should have addressed the following main issues:

- amount of time dedicated to the individual elaboration of our research (and subsequently, thesis)
- the opportunity to conceptualize this research according to our own individual backgrounds.

These were my areas of concern and dissatisfaction regarding this program.

I would like to state at this point that I am happy with the way the Supervisory Board addressed both of these concerns, respectively:

- having two days a week dedicated to individual elaboration of my research is enough time for me to prepare the more “creative” dimensions of the thesis at my own pace
- being able to conceptualize the research according to my previous background, individual needs and own interest. Essentially, the solution found by the Supervisory Board does indeed increase the degree of individualization of my research, and I am satisfied that I can pursue my own vision regarding this topic of research.

So far, I wanted to make clear the dimensions with which I, personally, was not quite content with this PhD, and that the manners in which the Supervisory Board chose to approach them was, to me, satisfactory.

Regarding the other suggestions made by the REA and their respective solutions found by the Supervisory Board, the solutions seem logical and common sensed to me. Given that my background is not in Social Psychology, I will ask Prof. Giovanna Leone upon my arrival to recommend a professor within or outside our network that can provide me with assistance in my research according to my previous specialization.

All in all, I think that this was a productive change for our PhD and I feel good about the new modifications and about the future of our project.

Regards,

Maryia.

LAURA ARHIRI

Research Focus “Genesis and development of the “anthropological and ethnographic paradigmatic approach” in more than 50 years of social representation theory: mapping theory, methods, thematic areas and applications”

Oggetto: A further developed point regarding the suggestions of REA

Data: 21 ottobre 2015 00:54:29 CEST

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>, Bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, Giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>

Dear Prof. de Rosa and Sapienza Supervisor Board,

Lately, there has been a lot of focus on the level of satisfaction experienced by us, the Fellows of the program, with regard to this PhD. I would like to use this opportunity to also express some of my more personal views on our doctoral program.

As you well know, I have been immersed in the academic setting for a while now. I got my Bachelor's Degree and my Master's Degree, produced two theses I aced, and published ten papers in peer-reviewed journals, and I can tell you without hesitation that it was mostly through hard work and perseverance. What I learnt through the process (both by doing actual research for my publications and by attending classes) is that anything worth pursuing, in general, requires two things: *inspiration* (a good researcher has to be creative and generate ideas) and *work* (it takes effort to turn said ideas into scientific research). Thus, this process is almost never easy and fun from start to finish.

These days, I often hear things like: "I just want to feel inspired". I will be the first to agree with this and admit to the importance of passion and inclination towards this type of analytic work, through which you get to satisfy your intellectual curiosities. Frankly, I imagine that without it, it would be almost impossible to maintain the motivation needed to do what we do – I always had it, for all my previously published papers. My experience taught me that in order to see a scientific research paper to its end, one must follow the three stages: conceptualization, collection of data, and interpretation of results. In preparation for the first stage - the conceptualization part - we had ample room to read scientific literature produced in the field; we have been exposed to lectures and presentations from scientists with experience that activate within the domain of Social Representations, some of whom had been directly trained under the guidance of Serge Moscovici, the creator of the theory. This is the way in which I got inspiration: by being exposed to knowledge, in order to both understand the theory and to see how the theory has been applied in empirical work by other scientists. What follows now is for me, and us, to develop our own research designs, which we are strongly encouraged to individualize; actually, we have always been supported to try to think about hypotheses for our theses while we were collecting data and getting acquainted with the field. This, our personal research designs, is also the part where we may put to good use all the knowledge we gathered so far from being intensively exposed to the scientific material and to the ideas of those with experience in the field.

I whole-heartedly agree that freedom is important, and so is focus. We are here because we exercised our freedom of choice in selecting this doctorate to enroll in, out of a pool of programs available worldwide, and now I think it is time to focus on carrying out the task to its resolution.

In the end, freedom without any focus is just chaos in disguise.

Now, I would like to submit one final aspect to your consideration, before I move on to addressing the changes proposed by the Board in response to the recommendations provided by REA. The outline of the project was specified from the start, and on the basis of this outline, we decided that it was inspiring enough to go through a quite lengthy preparation process before applying for it. We even conceded to moving to another country for its duration. Something must have motivated us to do so, and since the program was carried out in a manner consistent with its projected outline, I think we might just need to refocus on those aspects and remember where the initial motivation came from. Those reasons couldn't have gone anywhere, since nothing was altered or modified in the initial scientific plan.

This being said, I move on to specifically address the issue at hand. I will start off by saying that the changes that were proposed by the Sapienza Board seem very good to me and I think they will go a long way in increasing the overall level of satisfaction of all of us, as a group. I would also like to emphasize that my satisfaction primarily stems from the fact that I enrolled in this PhD with certain expectations after reading the call for papers. All of those expectations have been met: everything that was planned to happen, actually did happen. We did move through the stages of the project at the estimated pace. We did have individual meetings with the Sapienza Board to discuss our Individual Career Plans. We attended a multitude of training events since our arrival. We did benefit from additional experience gained during our secondments. When expectations are matched by reality (and I say this by way of logical consequence), that results in satisfaction.

Now, the reason for which all of my expectations have been met and every single one of the activities planned actually came to pass is that the project is carefully structured according to a timeline. A structured work plan within a research project (especially one involving such a large team of people) is an asset in this sense, as it allows you to finish within the established period, and deliver the expected result.

Specifically:

With regard to the first suggestion of establishing a more open decision making process at the project level, I believe this was very well addressed by the changes which will be implemented in the structure management: Prof. Giovanna Leone has already been appointed as the Fellow's Program Coordinator, and the ESR's will have a more active role in the decision making process as well, through the election of a representative who will provide feedback from us to the Sapienza Supervisor Board. In my view, this will ensure the interactive bidirectional communication process we need in order to deal optimally with any issues and questions that may arise throughout the duration of this program.

With regard to the second suggestion concerning the transition to a less rigid time management work plan, I think the solution by which those who want to work from home for 2 days a week can do so takes care of this issue. I, personally, will be able to plan my schedule in such a way as to maximize my productivity. Everyone who knows me can confirm I work better in the evenings and at night, especially when it comes to doing creative work, and this will allow me to better work on developing the creative aspects of my thesis, while, of course, also being able to keep up with my contractual obligations. Since this is a collaborative project, it is also necessary, in my view, to have access to each other's different fields of expertise, since our work within the project is both collective (we do need a degree of interaction with each other in this respect) and individual (when it comes to working on our thesis).

In respect to the third suggestion, which is to afford the ESR's the right to use their own backgrounds and expertise to develop their theses and individualize them, I believe that, while some degree of personalization of one's own work will emerge naturally anyway, specially when it comes to the interpretation of the results obtained (we come from different disciplines), it is also important to take caution as to not completely change the collective project. Any major

alterations will result in turning the project into something else. This is a cause of concern as well, insofar as our objectives here are intertwined, us being part of a collective program and assigned to different themes within said collective program, which is unitary in nature. There could be negative consequences on the project as a whole if the framework is completely abandoned and some of us end up doing their theses on a topic that has no connection whatsoever to the theme we were assigned.

With regard to the fourth suggestion, according to which our career plans should be revised, I must say that, frankly, my immediate career objective that I plan to attain in my future is to finish this PhD in three years time, and not stall forever as the eternal student. My firm belief is that we should be able to finish in the established time - not *obligated*, I grant you that, *butable*. For those of us who want to finish the PhD later on, I think that's more a matter of personal preference than anything else, but a preference nevertheless. My interest resides in finishing this program in 3 years' time.

Suggestion number 5 touched upon the utility of the secondment period. My take on this is that it was (and continues to be) productive, in the sense that I am doing all that I was meant to do here: I'm gathering new publications on S.R., I am continuing with the work of meta-analysis so that I finish by the end of 2 years time and start analyzing the data afterwards, and I am attending a seminar held by Prof. Martha de Alba. Currently, I am also preparing for a conference on Social Representations that I will be participating to with a joint paper. The conference is at the end of this month in Veracruz, Mexico. Also, I have had the opportunity for networking, as Prof. de Alba put me in contact with several researchers in this field.

With regard to the sixth suggestion, I agree with the reply from the Board. The library is in itself a research tool; all the meta-analysis we are doing will generate meta-data that we will be using in our individual papers, so the fact that we are also adding to the library is just an additional consequence of the work that we are already doing, and not an additional task. I understand that some of the Fellows found the work related to checking the bibliographic information boring, but in any effort of conducting meta-analysis in general, this is the first stage. As a general rule, all research has stages that are less interesting than others - any person who ever did a large database in SPSS can agree with this. However, these tasks must also be carried out, although they are not as exciting as the creative part of elaborating a research. It's important to acknowledge, I think, that research is a process with several stages, and some are always more stimulating than others.

With regard to the seventh suggestion, I believe that the involvement of second supervisors will become more substantial from now on, as we are moving on to the next stages in the project.

I think that I already provided above my feedback in regard to the eighth suggestion referring to the participation to conferences. I, personally, am already signed up to participate at the conference in Veracruz at the end of the month. Prof. de Rosa was the one who suggested that I participate. She advised me to take advantage of my presence in Mexico at this particular time at which this conference is being held here, as it isn't only a good opportunity to gain additional knowledge in S.R., but also a good opportunity for networking, as many renowned professors in this scientific field will be attending this event.

Regarding increasing participation of the non-academic partners in the training activities, I think their further involvement in our project is something we can benefit from. It should be said that they have been present to our events several times up until now, too, and it is a good idea that they continue their involvement.

To shorten an already long email, I will say that I agree with the Board in their replies to suggestions 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Thank you for your attention to my message and for the patience to read it through to the end.

Best regards, Laura

Data: 18 ottobre 2015 02:10:20 CEST

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>, Bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, Giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>

Dear Prof. de Rosa and Sapienza Supervisor Board of Professors,

I am writing this email as a follow up to our Skype meeting from Wednesday, October 14, 2015, where we discussed the R.E.A. recommendations and the proposal elaborated by the Sapienza Supervisory Board.

With regard to the first suggestion of establishing a more open decision making process at the project level, I believe this was very well addressed by the changes which will be implemented in the structure management: Prof. Giovanna Leone has already been appointed as the Fellow's Program Coordinator, and the ESR's will have a more active role in the decision making process as well, through the election of a representative who will provide feedback from us to the Sapienza Supervisor Board. In my view, this will ensure the interactive bidirectional communication process we need in order to deal optimally with any issues and questions that may arise throughout the duration of this program.

With regard to the second suggestion concerning the transition to a less rigid time management work plan, I think the solution by which those who want to work from home for 2 days a week can do so takes care of this issue. I, personally, will be able to plan my schedule in such a way as to maximize my productivity. Everyone who knows me can confirm I work better in the evenings and at night, especially when it comes to doing creative work, and this will allow me to better work on developing the creative aspects of my thesis, while, of course, also being able to keep up with my contractual obligations. Since this is a collaborative project, it is also necessary, in my view, to have access to each other's different fields of expertise, since our work within the project is both collective (we do need a degree of interaction with each other in this respect) and individual (when it comes to working on our thesis).

In respect to the third suggestion, which is to afford the ESR's the right to use their own backgrounds and expertise to develop their theses and individualize them, I believe that, while some degree of personalization of one's own work will emerge naturally anyway, specially when it comes to the interpretation of the results obtained (we come from different disciplines), it is also important to take caution as to not completely change the collective project. Any major alterations will result in turning the project into something else. This is a cause of concern as well, insofar as our objectives here are intertwined, us being part of a collective program and assigned to different themes within said collective program, which is unitary in nature. There could be negative consequences on the project as a whole if the framework is completely abandoned and some of us end up doing their theses on a topic that has no connection whatsoever to the theme we were assigned.

With regard to the fourth suggestion, according to which our career plans should be revised, I must say that, frankly, my immediate career objective that I plan to attain in my future is to finish this PhD in three years time, and not stall forever as the eternal student. My firm belief is that we should be able to finish in the established time - not *obligated*, I grant you that, but *able*. For those of us who want to finish the PhD later on, I think that's more a matter of personal preference than anything else, but a preference nevertheless. My interest resides in finishing this program in 3 years' time.

Suggestion number 5 touched upon the utility of the secondment period. My take on this is that it was (and continues to be) productive, in the sense that I am doing all that I was meant to do here: I'm gathering new publications on S.R., I am continuing with the work of meta-analysis

so that I finish by the end of 2 years time and start analyzing the data afterwards, and I am attending a seminar held by Prof. Martha de Alba. Currently, I am also preparing for a conference on Social Representations that I will be participating to with a joint paper. The conference is at the end of this month in Veracruz, Mexico. Also, I have had the opportunity for networking, as Prof. de Alba put me in contact with several researchers in this field.

With regard to the sixth suggestion, I agree with the reply from the Board. The library is in itself a research tool; all the meta-analysis we are doing will generate meta-data that we will be using in our individual papers, so the fact that we are also adding to the library is just an additional consequence of the work that we are already doing, and not an additional task. I understand that some of the Fellows found the work related to checking the bibliographic information boring, but in any effort of conducting meta-analysis in general, this is the first stage. As a general rule, all research has stages that are less interesting than others - any person who ever did a large database in SPSS can agree with this. However, these tasks must also be carried out, although they are not as exciting as the creative part of elaborating a research. It's important to acknowledge, I think, that research is a process with several stages, and some are always more stimulating than others.

With regard to the seventh suggestion, I believe that the involvement of second supervisors will become more substantial from now on, as we are moving on to the next stages in the project.

I think that I already provided above my feedback in regard to the eighth suggestion referring to the participation to conferences. I, personally, am already signed up to participate at the conference in Veracruz at the end of the month. Prof. de Rosa was the one who suggested that I participate. She advised me to take advantage of my presence in Mexico at this particular time at which this conference is being held here, as it isn't only a good opportunity to gain additional knowledge in S.R., but also a good opportunity for networking, as many renowned professors in this scientific field will be attending this event.

Regarding increasing participation of the non-academic partners in the training activities, I think their further involvement in our project is something we can benefit from. It should be said that they have been present to our events several times up until now, too, and it is a good idea that they continue their involvement.

To shorten an already long email, I will say that I agree with the Board in their replies to suggestions 10, 11, 12, and 13.

To summarize, I would like to thank you for your continued effort to address all of our concerns. I am well aware of the fact that it is not easy to manage a team of people with such diverse interests and disciplinary backgrounds. I am confident that we will be able to continue to work collaboratively to see this program through to its successful completion.

Kind regards,
Laura Arhiri

AGNESE PASTORINO

Research Focus “Genesis and development of the “modelling paradigmatic approach” in more than 50 years of social representation theory: mapping theory, methods, thematic areas and applications”

Oggetto: Re: Scheduling on-line Meeting with Sapienza Supervisory Board

Data: 17 ottobre 2015 23:22:18 CEST

A: Annamaria de Rosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: Lorena Gil de Montes UPV Psic soc cult <lorena.gildemontes@ehu.es>, JOSE FRANCISCO VALENCIA <josefrancisco.valencia@ehu.es>, Dario Paez Rovira <darioalexpaez@gmail.com>, bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear Supervisory Board,

I inform you that my position is in line with all the suggestions proposed by the REA. The proposals made by the Supervisory Board might be misunderstood and in some cases don't correspond to the suggestion.

If possible, I would propose to present a shared document (collectively signed by the ESRs) after the secondment in December. In addition to this, individual issues and requests might be addressed separately by each ESR.

Thank you for your attention,
Best regards,

Agnese Pastorino

ANA TOMICIC

Research Focus “Mapping the impact and dissemination of the social representation theory across different geo-cultural contexts: “Europe”, the theory’s homeland”

Oggetto: Re: Scheduling on-line Meeting with Sapienza Supervisory Board

Data: 18 ottobre 2015 19:46:50 CEST

A: Annamaria de Rosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: Fabio Lorenzi-Cioldi <Fabio.Lorenzi-Cioldi@unige.ch>, bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear all,

Having carefully read both the EC's recommendations and La Sapienza's supervisory board's suggestions, I stand by my own suggestions which I shared with you from the beginning and which, I believe, will increase the value and quality of our project and make it a truly interdisciplinary one. Those suggestions of mine have already been discarded in the past, but this is an opportunity to reiterate and re-evaluate them.

These are:

- to get half a week working from home but not on metatheoretical analysis (from wednesday afternoon to friday afternoon) and be able to dedicate time to working on methodology, papers, etc
- to change one of my italian co-tutors to an anthropologist and get an additional 3 months secondment minimum in his/her institution
- to be able to use my own methodology

Moreover, lead by the experience we have had up to now with the Sapienza supervisory board, who have NOT ONCE backed us up in any of our requests - be it Vladan, the career development plan or any other minor issues - but have ALWAYS backed up Annamaria in her wrongfulness, I do not believe your recommendations will lead to a real change. Whether the Project coordinator changes or not, that will stay the same.

I believe Annamaria will continue to pursue her personal goals in this project as it has been until now. Therefore, my goal is to ensure my personal freedom with regard to the 3 points I listed, so that it doesn't turn out I am stuck AGAIN in negotiating my thesis with anyone in a manner we have "negotiated" everything up to now (where us ESRs basically get nothing and everything remains the way Annamaria wants it to be).

Looking forward to your reply.

Regards,

Ana Tomicic

MIHAELA-ALEXANDRA GHERMAN

Research Focus “Mapping the impact and dissemination of the social representation theory across different geo-cultural contexts: “North-America and other continents (Oceania, Asia, Africa)”, the new emerging scenarios”

Oggetto: Regarding the recommendations from the REA-Research Executive Agency after the Mid Term Review

Data: 12 novembre 2015 14:35:02 CET

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, Giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear Members of the Sapienza Supervisory Board,

I'm writing this e-mail to provide my feedback to the modifications that were made by the Sapienza board in the manner in which the project will be carried out, following the REA recommendations after the mid-term review.

It is no secret that, lately, these suggestions which were meant to enhance our level of satisfaction and their implementation by the board quickly turned into the centerpiece of every conversation among us, the fellows of this PhD. I will try to be brief in expressing my own opinion on the topic, so what I would like to tell you won't take very much of your time at all.

Ever since we have received the REA recommendations, an ongoing dialogue has emerged between Sapienza and us, the fellows of the program, in which Sapienza demonstrated a good deal of flexibility in working with us to accommodate our needs. They made modifications to the initial contract, which we signed at the beginning of the second year, by reducing the lab attendance hours almost by half. They stressed again and again that individualization of the project is not only permitted, it is strongly encouraged, and it constitutes, in fact, the next step we will be taking upon our return from the secondment. Prof. Giovanna Leone is now in charge of actively working with us, and she is currently the person through whom all exchanges between Sapienza and us happen. I can personally attest that the professor has taken this role very seriously and has dedicated a good deal of time lately to talking to us, one on one, so as to eliminate any possibility that we might feel any kind of pressure (actual or perceived). At current, I personally don't know of any single request from our part that has remained unaddressed by the board. In the conditions in which flexibility and willingness to work together in order to obtain mutually satisfactory terms of our work contract are evident by their subsequent modifications, I really think there is ample room for improvement toward everyone's satisfaction. An ability to compromise from the part of Sapienza in order to reach our common objectives has been apparent in our latest exchanges.

Right now, I think that inclination towards compromise should find its counterpoint amidst us, the fellows, as well at this time. It should be acknowledged that no string of rights ever comes without any obligations on the part of the beneficiary. Things are expected from us, too, in lines of results that have to be delivered by the end of the project and throughout all the time in between. It was clear from the beginning (I remember that this was actually the main topic of the admission interview for this PhD) that we are supposed to study how the Social Representations Theory was disseminated across the world according to the three criteria: the geo-cultural one, the thematic one and the paradigmatic criterion and the implications of this dissemination. We knew what we applied for, and *we agreed to it twice by signing two contracts* (one in the beginning and one after a year). I believe that it is high time we saw that along with the right to individualize our

projects in line with the considerations of the Supervisory Board, we also have the *responsibility* to do so.

To sum up, REA made suggestions directed toward improving the project, the Sapienza Board came up with a first round of solutions corresponding to those suggestions, talked to each ESR individually in order to tailor their solutions to our specific needs and, based on our individual feedback, re-wrote the aforementioned solutions. This was a collaborative, transparent and democratic way of addressing the mid-term review and it reveals, in my opinion, the good intention of the Board regarding both the development of the project and the development of the ESRs.

In my view, there seems to exist little focus right now on either *personal academic training* (that some of my colleagues seem to emphasize without proposing any actual specific ways of improving the already existing opportunities we have, like, for example, Summer Schools) or on *working on the theses*, which are (or should be) the main goals of a researcher when engaged in a PhD program. These issues are highly time sensitive, and our efforts in meticulously addressing every aspect of our working conditions have lately turned into massive background noise that has put a halt to efficiency and actual work. Ever since this ongoing strive for rights has commenced, it hasn't finished or quieted down, and continues to be the center stage star of the program. Personally, I think our expressing our views on each and every single one of these issues has been productive, but if it continues to take up so much time and energetic resources from both our part and Sapienza's, there will be no project left within which to enjoy those rights at all. As I know for a fact that many colleagues with whom I have spoken individually agreed with me at this end, that the working process slowed down considerably as a result of all this constant dispute, all I can do is hope that we are adult enough to admit to this and make an effort to return to working.

I will address one final aspect before I thank you for your attention and patience for my email. In these last weeks, it seems to me that all these constant discussions surrounding our satisfaction have also created this divide between Sapienza and us, such that it may seem to the outside observer that we, the fellows, have now began to perceive Sapienza as being in an opposite camp than our own. I think to continue to stay passive and not dissipate this impression right now would be a mistake on our part. We are not "at odds" with the board here; we have common objectives, which we can only attain by working together. Now, Sapienza has put a lot of attention into each of us, to ensure we are getting all we hoped for out of the project, and maybe, just maybe, the time has arrived for us to acknowledge this and work a little, too, towards moving closer to them, in order for us all to get back to work again.

Sincerely,

Mihaela-Alexandra Gherman

Oggetto: Regarding the recommendations from the REA-Research Executive Agency after the Mid Term Review

Data: 16 ottobre 2015 21:35:20 CEST

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it, giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it, paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it, elena.bocci@uniroma1.it, mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>, Lilian Negura <lilian.negura@uottawa.ca>

Dear Professor de Rosa and dear members of the Supervisory Board,

I am writing to you with regard to our meeting today in which we discussed the recommendations of the REA following the Mid-Term review of our project, as well as the proposed solutions of the Supervisory Board.

I shall comment on each REA recommendation and its respective proposed solution:

1. Regarding the augmentation of the openness of decision making processes, I believe that the addition of Professor Giovanna Leone as part of the structure management of the project will go a long way toward improving our communication with the Board. I am basing this opinion on two aspects: a). Professor Leone is one of the professors who have been actively involved with this project from its first stages, so she is very clear on the scientific as well as social dimensions of this PhD; b). Over time, she has proven to be very diplomatic and solution-oriented during our meetings with the Board, thus successfully mediating the ESRs interactions with the Professors. Personally, I feel like she was one of the best choices for this position and I am sure that, along with Dr. Laura Dryjanska, who has been highly committed (and most efficient) in facilitating and clarifying both the scientific aspects and the interpersonal ones, which are inevitable in any newly formed organization.

I was very pleased to see that the representative of the ESRs would be appointed in this position on a rotational basis, because this type of procedure will provide each and one of us with the opportunity to communicate with the Board in an open and extensive fashion. Also, I would like to confirm that following each scientific event, we did fill in evaluation forms with open-ended questions and based on a Likert type scale as well. Moreover, we had the opportunity to personally discuss with the Project Leader our impressions of the event both during and after the event was finished.

2. Indeed, the less rigid time management work plan was, to me, the most important aspect of this evaluation, because personally, I have always been more productive during the afternoon and during the night for creative tasks, such as the conceptualization of the research design, consulting the pre-existing research on this field etc. I know that spending two days a week working will significantly improve my personal experience at this PhD because I will be free to manage my working hours according to my natural circadian rhythm. I plan on making the most of the three days at the lab in terms of consulting with Dr. Dryjanska, Professor de Rosa and Professor Leone regarding potential scientific inquiries, as well as with my colleagues who have different scientific backgrounds and can provide me with guidance in theoretical areas I have not studied before (I plan on using theories from the Sociology of Science and Anthropology to provide further insight on my research focus). Also, it is always nice to spend time with my colleagues and I will be happy to see them, since I feel that we have a good relationship, overall, and I enjoy their company, as well as the Professors' (we really had some fun during birthday parties the last year).

3. Regarding the individualization of the research projects, it was very clear to me since I have enrolled in this PhD program (that is, from the Call for papers, which was very explicit and detailed) that the purpose of this PhD program was to systematically review the existing literature

on Social Representations Theory using a method (meta-theoretical analysis) designed by Professor de Rosa and previously used in her past publications. The method consists in employing both qualitative and quantitative analyses in this type of systematic review, so that the analysis of the literature may be performed in depth with more refined statistical procedures. Each of us, however, is working on a different focus and has a different object of research, which, in turn, require a different theoretical and interpretative framework, and also different statistical analyses, according to the ESR's own research design and hypotheses. I am, for example, working on the Mapping the Impact and Dissemination of SRT in North America, Asia, Oceania and Africa. My theoretical framework will combine theories from the Sociology of Science, Cultural Psychology and Anthropology, as I attempt to shed light on the reasons that underlie the weaker penetration of the theory in these geo-cultural contexts. My focus is thus very specific - how can it not be individual if no one else is tackling my research questions? So basically, to sum up, I have an individual theoretical framework, I have individual hypotheses, individual research designs, for which I will take the relevant and applicable data from the meta-theoretical analyses on which I am now working and, if need be, I will collect other data to investigate my hypotheses.

To be clear, I agree with the individualization strategy proposed by the Board (which I already knew because it was communicated to us from the first day we met if I remember correctly - that we are greatly encouraged to make use of our individual scientific backgrounds to conceptualize our thesis and also to make use of our colleagues different expertise in order to expand the scope of our papers, which I actually did so far and will keep on doing). As I said, doing the meta-theoretical analyses means gathering data about our participants, which are the publications in our case. This is the stage at which we are now, which is in line with the internationally agreed upon procedure of conducting a systematic review (first, choosing the papers, then, gathering information regarding them). Since the number of publications that fall under our individual topics are of course not the same, we divided the phase of gathering this type of data among ourselves, so if someone completely changes their research focus, the entire project is at risk of falling apart, just like Domino pieces. So I do share the vision of the Supervisory Board that completely changing the methodology employed to gather the data (the nature of which, again, was clear since the Call for Papers) would affect the integrity of the project (which is not to say that adding things that are relevant to the topic would not be of great use - I myself plan on adding another research endeavor which falls in line with my project).

4. I have already discussed with my co-tutor (Professor Lilian Negura) and members of his department regarding my Career Development Plan and have identified some future opportunities that fall in line with my further interests. Also, while still in Italy, I had the opportunity to speak with several professors that attended our Summer / Winter / Spring Schools / Sessions, who shed light on some of my future professional plans by informing me of some more closeted details about research work - these events provided me with the chance to interact informally with practitioners and theorists alike, which is great, because they shared with me their personal experiences in the job market, about which I could not have found out within more formal contexts.

5. Indeed, my secondment destination was chosen in line with my research focus - I am studying the impact and dissemination of SRT in North-America, Oceania, Africa and Asia and I am in Canada, at the University of Ottawa. Professor Lilian Negura was more than welcoming and helpful on both a personal and professional level and he facilitated my access to physical and human resources provided by the UOttawa. I did receive e-mails from Professor de Rosa and Dr Laura Dryjanska who checked if I arrived safely and whether I managed to find optimal solutions for accommodation, transportation etc., and although I did manage to solve all these issues, it was nice to be asked. Moreover, being in contact with the North-American culture provides me with more insight regarding the cultural differences that may contribute to the disparity of the dissemination of SRT around the globe, which aids me in the conceptualization of the paper.

All in all, I would like to add that my purpose here is very clear to me: to retrieve new publications for my thesis, to participate in events related to the topic of my research, to enhance my social networking opportunities and to be immersed in the North-American academic and organizational culture, so that I may have a better understanding of their perspective on SRT (Moscovici himself needed to visit North-America in order to understand their apparent resistance to this theory).

6. As I have previously mentioned, the work for the electronic library is actually a step in our own research - gathering information regarding our participants. All types of systematic reviews (classical narrative reviews, meta-analyses, narrative reviews etc.) that I have read about took their publications one by one and gathered from them the information relevant to their own research questions. The fact that this data will be used for an online platform as well which is capable of performing multidimensional statistical analyses on the data is, in my view, a positive aspect - we would have to create a database for our research anyway, but in this manner, the data per say will become a library.

7. Given that the first phase of the project was to identify our participants and gather basic information about them (the bibliometrical dimension of my research project), it seems logical to me that my other tutors will be more involved in the future - Professor Negura has already shown great support in this area by sharing with me his own experience in analyzing bibliometric data within the framework of SRT and offering to provide me with future assistance with my research. Also, upon my arrival in Italy, I believe that Professor Leone will have more time to discuss with me my ideas and my approaches regarding the data, and given her experience in this field and general willingness to support students (that I have noticed so far), I am quite hopeful that she will provide me with the necessary guidance as the project moves forward.

8. To me, it seems reasonable that I should be reimbursed from funds dedicated to this project if the conference I am attending is related to this project.

9. Regarding the contact with the industry and the private sector, I feel like we had plenty - representatives of three different institutions were present at the events organized by the EuroPhD (Summer Schools, Winter Session, Spring Session). Also, Dr Grigore Havarneanu, one of the alumni of this PhD who has worked in the private sector shared with us his strategies and his experience there. I always felt very satisfied with these contributions (the speakers had very good communication skills and they encouraged interactive sessions) and I am happy to hear that we will have more of these sessions in the future.

10. I think it is important to encourage the interdisciplinary aspect of the PhD by individual presentations created by the ESRs, because we have very diverse backgrounds and it will be of great help for me to find out more about anthropological and sociological theories and their connections with SRT, as perceived by specialists with already one year of contact with SRT. I would feel very comfortable to ask my colleagues any and all questions related to the topic, as the context would probably be more informal; this is a great idea and I am looking forward to its implementation.

11. Surely, writing research papers is of great importance and I do believe that it cannot be achieved in one training session, but rather during an extended period of time.

12. We already had individual presentations at the first Summer School and yes, I agree that we should have them again - it was a good experience for me both from the writing a research paper point of view and also from the oratorical point of view.

13. I always found the materials of the guest lecturers on the website in advance.

On a different note, from what I have gathered today from my meeting with the Supervisory Board, 10 ESRs have stated that they are dissatisfied with the scientific dimensions of this project. I would like to clarify my position in this regard. I have known what this project entails before applying for it, from the Call for Papers and the links to the EuroPhD website. My decision to apply was based on the fact that I wanted to conduct this type of research, specifically

because I find it both pleasant and useful for my professional development as a researcher. After more than a year spent here, I can say that my initial expectations were met, because the project followed its projected trajectory that I had anticipated based on the project description. To me, critically reviewing the pre-existing publications in this field (which is what I am doing for my thesis currently and have been doing since January, after the initial part with collecting the bibliometrical data was over) is a great opportunity to get acquainted with both the theoretical and empirical intricacies of this research field. This is a very special type of training – the opportunity to critically assess and discuss with experts theoretical, empirical and methodological issues – which is going to result in a systematic review of the literature in my PhD thesis. Nowadays, there is a lot of pressure for researchers to be able to publish in high Impact Factor journals, and I have noticed that systematic reviews that employ both qualitative and quantitative methodologies (such as mine, if I finish my project) have been accepted by such renowned journals, so the ensuing thesis and the article I shall publish based on it will be a great addition to my Curriculum Vitae.

Also, to conclude, I would like to highly emphasize that it is very important to me that I finish my PhD in 3 years' time – this is perhaps the most important part of my Personal Development Career Plan, because time is a very valuable resource that I do not like to squander. On my part, I have conceptualized my paper and worked on it for more than a year – it is important to me to be able to keep my research focus and my research design, as I am very much attached to them and what to see my paper through in its due time.

Best regards,

Mihaela.

--

Mihaela-Alexandra Gherman

TERESA FORTE

Research Focus “Mapping the impact and dissemination of the social representation theory across different geo-cultural contexts: “Latin America”, the most fertilised scenario”

Oggetto: RE: Feedback REA recommendations

Data: 20 ottobre 2015 01:04:48 CEST

A: Annamaria de Rosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>, mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>

Dear all,

I hereby express my agreement with the proposal elaborated by the Sapienza Supervisory Board taking into account the REA recommendations.

After consulting it carefully, I believe that these changes will be a profitable venue to reach the project goals while also meeting individual interests within the So.Re.Com joint IDP scope.

I also want to stress that the information made available to me as an ESR and the contents of the EC contract as defined by Annex 1 are coherent. Furthermore I deeply appreciate the possibility to discuss ,as a member of a team, these matters that can arise in an ongoing research process.

Kind regards,

Teresa Forte

AMINAT RAMAZANOVA

Research Focus “Taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Science, Social Representations and Communication”

Oggetto: Re: Document to be discussed during the on-line Meeting with Sapienza Supervisory Board

Data: 19 ottobre 2015 11:47:01 CEST

A: Annamaria de Rosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Rispondi a: Aminat Ramazanova <amina-kh@mail.ru>

Dear Prof. Annamaria de Rosa,

I would like to give you my feedback concerning our online meeting.

I support your proposal to integrate a representative of the ESRs in the Supervisory Board composition. This integration will make a decision making process more open as R.E.A. suggests, as the ESRs' representative can actively take part in discussing and solving the problematic issues together with the SB.

As for the lab attendance time, I appreciate a lot the opportunity to work in the Lab with all the facilities that we have at our disposal. Having enough experience of work in academia to judge and compare, I can tell that. To my mind, it is better for the research we are carrying out to have these 2 days working at home as you suggest. These days I am going to concentrate on the creative part of writing the paper.

I'd like to specify that I have no intention to change my research topic, even if there was an attempt made by Agnese Pastorino asking EU commission to do it. I do not trust at all the fellow who carried out such actions speaking on my behalf even without informing me as the person involved. Especially that I decided to apply for the So.Re.Com. Joint-IDP, for the call gave as much information as I needed to get a full picture of the project and see if the topic I applied for was in accordance with my interests and my disciplinary background.

Concerning my career development plan I'd like to revise it, including, for example, attending some courses/ classes to develop my skills in using such software like IRAMUTEQ, SPSS, etc., which will help me to do proper analysis of the data collected for the thesis. I'll provide a detailed version of my career development plan in a due time.

As for the secondment period, I got a chance to carry out some research in China, collect the data for my thesis and exchange some experience with my colleagues at Nankai University and Tianjin University of Technology and Education, where I gave several lectures; and I also attended some scientific events and the 18th National Academic Congress of Psychology at Tianjin Normal University.

To my mind, introducing regular schedules for individual supervision is definitely a better way to

proceed with writing the thesis, as we'll have more time to consult on individual basis with the supervisors on research design, methodology, and methods to be used when analyzing the data, etc. Moreover, I consider individual supervision to be more productive when carrying out the research.

In this regard I also suggest presenting individually authored research papers at summer school or any other scientific event, for it is a more effective way to introduce the research results.

I'd like to add that I am very motivated to write a very good thesis on the topic that was assigned to me and get my PhD on Social Representations and Communication, as I see a high potential of the So.Re.Com. Joint-IDP, not to mention the possibilities that it gives each of us to enlarge our networking opportunities.

Best regards,

Aminat Ramazanova

BORJA DE MADARIA

Research Focus “Taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Social Representations and Environment”

Oggetto: Proposals after meeting with Sapienza Supervisory Board

Data: 09 novembre 2015 21:54:09 CET

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, Giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Elena Bocci <elena.bocci@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>
Cc: Ioana Guraliuc <ioana.guraliuc@uniroma1.it>, Marija Adela Gjorgjioska <marijaadela.gjorgjioska@uniroma1.it>, Maryia Kukharava <maryia.kukharava@uniroma1.it>, Laura Arhiri <laura.arhiri@uniroma1.it>, Agnese Pastorino <agnese.pastorino@uniroma1.it>, Anatomic 0909 <ana.tomicic@uniroma1.it>, Mihaela-Alexandra Gherman <mihaela-alexandra.gherman@uniroma1.it>, Teresa Forte <teresa.n.f@hotmail.com>, Amina Ramazanova <amina-kh@mail.ru>, Gabriela Monica Panzaru <gabrielamonica.panzaru@uniroma1.it>, Carlos Filiberto Miguel Aguilar <carlosfiliberto.miguelaguilar@uniroma1.it>, Filomena Berardi <filomena.berardi@uniroma1.it>, holman@psih.uaic.ro, Alain clémence <alain.clemence@unil.ch>, marada@fss.muni.cz, marthadealba_uami@yahoo.com.mx, lorena.gildemontes@ehu.eus, fabio.lorenzi-cioldi@unige.ch, lilian.negura@uottawa.ca, brigido.camargo@yahoo.com.br, nkguanjian@yahoo.com.cn, Erich Kirchler <Erich.kirchler@univie.ac.at>, seidmann@ub.edu.ar, Mariangeles Molpeceres <Angeles.Molpeceres@uv.es>

Dear Members of Sapienza Supervisory Board and all the rest of members of the network,

Attached to this mail is my letter of comments and proposals to the R.E.A. suggestions to improve the SoReCom Joint IDP Project.

Best regards.

--

borja de madaria

MY PROPOSALS IN ORDER TO ADDRESS THE R.E.A. SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE THE SoReCom JOINT IDP PROJECT.

Paris. November, 9th 2015

Dear members of Sapienza Supervisory Board,

I think it is time to react. After many days of being shocked because even the best valued project can be not very well valued in its management, it is time to say something. After many days of disappointment after discovering that, in my opinion, you were not really facing the R.E.A. suggestions, it is time for me to make my own proposals.

We all know (you may know it better than anyone because you are psychologist) that it is very easy to lose a good name or reputation due to wrong actions, even just one of them. And we all also know that it is very difficult to lose a bad name or reputation even with a lot of right actions. Right is not enough, we need the best. And I think that we have to locate the R.E.A.

suggestions in the search of the best for the project. They are not criticizing the goals of the project, its design, or its relevance. This part still remains highly valued. They are mainly asking the best possible training for each one of the 13 ESR, which is also in the contract. And the best means, in this case, individualization.

Individualization, in my opinion, does not mean that everyone can do what they want. Individualization means adapting the project to the specific characteristics of each researcher in order to take the best possible results. I think it is possible to reach an agreement between the goals of the project and the needs of those who carry it out. There is not any good project that does not take into account those who have to develop it. And, in my opinion, the REA suggestions are mainly focused on the management of the human capital you have selected. They made two types of suggestions, those related to training and those related to work schedule.

The REA suggestions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 (9 suggestions over 13) are related to our training, and they are focused on strengthening our initiative, our autonomy, our responsibility on the project, our judgement, our role, our needs, our opinions and so on. This means, in my opinion, that you are expected to really take us into account.

I think the most important suggestion (and the one you should, in my opinion, truly consider) is the 4th one, Personal Career Plans must be revised. I think that the individualization of the projects (suggestion 3) has to be individually agreed after discussions with each researcher in order to take the best outcome of everyone and consequently improve the goals and the scope of the common project. I think that the review of the secondment plans (suggestion 5) and the appointment of new second supervisors (suggestion 7) have to be fitted to each ESR and you are expected to respect and facilitate these changes and, even, new secondments for anyone who need it and ask for it in their Personal Career Plan. The same approach to individualization should be taken with the requirements for conference participation (suggestion 8), the increasing of contacts with private sector (suggestion 9), the strengthening of the interdisciplinary aspect of the training (suggestion 10), and the training in writing papers (suggestion 11).

I think the R.E.A. is asking for real and meaningful changes (and not only improvements as you suggested) in Personal Career Plans in order to be really personal in accordance with the global project. All these suggestions should be individually discussed with each ESR and included in their Personal Career Plans. Each ESR should be listened in order to decide the precise combination of all the other suggestions that better fits their needs, interests and background. All those specificities have to be written as a contract in our Personal Career Plans and we all are expected to respect them. You should realize that our personal success on achieving our personal goals is also the success of the training program. And the success of the training program is an important part of the success of the global project. I feel that the better way to show a real commitment with the REA suggestions asking for individualization is by facing seriously the issue of the individualization of Personal Career Plans.

On the other hand, suggestions 2 and 6 are related with work schedule. They are asking for more flexibility and the reduction of some tasks. I think that, on this issue, you are sending a contradictory message; and R.E.A. members, who I assume are intelligent, understood it immediately. You always speak about the project as the best. Its relevance, its excellence and its pioneering vision are always in your discourse. But, conversely, you are forcing your team to work in regular conditions with regular schedules and regular tasks, and monitoring and controlling them very closely. In my opinion this way of managing the work is clearly showing the lack of trust in the human team carrying out the project. And distrust in the team means distrust in the project itself. This is, in my opinion, the message you are sending to the reviewers. When you perceive you have the best and you believe in the skills, the commitment and the possibilities of the human capital under your supervision you are always open to their

suggestions in order to implement the adjustments that better fit with their needs, routines and way of working. I think that the kind of intellectual work we are doing is perfectly adapted to a flexible schedule without mandatory presence in the lab. As you could realize these months, our task is very well adapted to work by goals instead of by physical presence. In my opinion, presence in the lab should only be mandatory for common work on special days in the week. If we achieve the common goals, the more the project is adapted to personal requirements, the better the results will be.

If you treat your human capital as regular, you will obtain regular outcomes. But if you treat them as the best, you will have the best.

And the best is what we need now.

Yours faithfully.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive letter 'P' followed by a horizontal line that ends in a small arrowhead.

GABRIELA MONICA PANZARU

Research Focus “Taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Social Representations, Economy, Advertising, Marketing and Organizational Contexts”

Oggetto: Re: Revised and integrated version of the replies to 13 REA recommendations

Data: 09 novembre 2015 16:01:15 CET

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>, Bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, Giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>

Dear Prof. de Rosa and Members of the Supervisory Board,

I am writing this letter in a less formal manner in order to express my opinion regarding the way of addressing the REA suggestions and also the group dynamics surrounding these issues. In my opinion the REA suggestions have been properly addressed, successfully integrating (in my opinion, of course) everyone's wishes. As part of the group I expressed in several occasions the desire to carry on with my research and other tasks. However, I want to stress forward that the dynamics that followed the Mid-term review significantly slowed my work effectiveness. Therefore, perhaps some people might still have dissatisfactions which in my opinion are due to the lack of clarity about what is research, how is it done and also unrealistic expectations about it.

Publishing in peer-reviewed journals as well as ISI journals offered me the opportunity to experience the less pleasant part of scientific research. I have to say that research is not always fun and certainly is not like going on a trip or traveling (maybe it can be but in a metaphorical sense). I know that some people want that their job to be as pleasant as traveling but this is not the case of scientific research. In my opinion in our job the peaks of satisfaction and motivation are at the beginning, when you have the idea, and at the end when you finished and have in front of you the whole picture. In between it's a lot of laborious work, reading and discipline. Some people, like me for example, appreciate this type of work and some other people might prefer playing with toys instead, favor variety, or switching the task once at every five minutes, not caring whether finishing what they started or not. Also some people might hide behind the conflict in order to find pretext to escape doing their job, well in other words this is human nature probably. I sense that it is a widespread idea that being part of this project people have only rights and no obligations or responsibilities, and this takes us back to the lack of discipline argument.

I also have difficulties in understanding why there is so some much stubbornness in going to all the conferences in the world. There is a lot of sense in attending conferences if you have something to communicate. Let's be clear I am not denying at all the training component of this type of activity but I strongly think that in our group this particular component is highly overrated. In addition I also stress that conference attending have been encouraged.

All in all I truly hope that everything will work in our favor and everybody will be content. I like this program and I am looking forward to get back and do my research with maximum efficiency!

Sincerely,

Monica Panzaru

Oggetto: Feedback regarding the solutions proposed by the EuroPhd Supervisory Board

Data: 19 ottobre 2015 13:19:39 CEST

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Paola Passafaro <paola.passafaro@uniroma1.it>, Bruno Mazzara <bruno.mazzara@uniroma1.it>, Mauro Sarrica <mauro.sarrica@uniroma1.it>, Giovanna Leone <giovanna.leone@uniroma1.it>

Cc: Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear Prof. de Rosa and members of the Supervisory Board,

The purpose of this e-mail is to express my feedback about the recommendations made by REA after the Mid-Term review of the project, discussed on October 14th. Further on I will comment about the recommendations made as well as about the solutions proposed.

1. One of the most important solutions is the improvement in the decision-making process by including prof. Giovanna Leone as active part of the management. I am very pleased with this decision prof. Leone will be of great help in our group due her expertise. I rest assured that she will provide a good communication between us (as a group) and the Supervisory Board. Over the time prof. Leone has proven to be willing to help us with our research but nonetheless she is very diplomatic and solution oriented.

I find the idea of each of us having the chance to play an active role in the decision-making process (on a rotational basis) as being a great improvement in the management part of the project. In this way each of us will have the opportunity to mutually exchange information in a more open manner.

2. Now I will comment on what I call the most important improvement of the project. Having the opportunity to work two days per week from home will result in an increase of productivity in my case. Everyone one of us has its own rhythm when it comes to doing research. These two days per week will help us reach the maximum of productivity regarding our research. I think the proportions (the two days per week working from home and the other three working at the lab) are suitable for our needs. When will carry on with our activity at the Lab we will have the guidance of prof. de Rosa, prof. Leone and dr. Laura Dryjanska, they will meet our expectations in terms of research questions and other future inquiries. Also I would like to stress that working at the Lab will make possible the contact with my colleagues of whose knowledge I could profit since we have different backgrounds for example: Sociology, Anthropology etc. My background lacks this kind of training but the discussions with my colleagues could supplement that.

3. Taking into consideration the individualization of my research project I want to emphasize that I agree with this solution and also I was aware even before I filled the application for this PhD (from the Call for Fellowship) of the type of research that I have to complete. It was clear from the beginning that I will have to fulfill a systematic review of the literature on Social Representations Theory. In my opinion I found this type of research very challenging and I also think that after 50 years of research in the field of Social Representations Theory a rigorous review of the literature is needed and will be a great advancement in the field. I was also aware of the method used, the meta-theoretical analysis implies using qualitative and as well as quantitative methods in order to obtain clear understanding of the literature. I think by now everybody is familiar with the terms of narrative review or systematic review (as qualitative methods) as well as meta-analysis (as quantitative methods) and how these methods are deepening the knowledge in different fields.

Since my research focus is a thematic one, it involves Taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Social Representations, Economy, Marketing, Advertising and Organizational

Contexts and it includes an important number of empirical studies which will allow me to perform meta-analysis. I already formulated hypotheses and also I thought of ways through which I will individualize my research.

I agree with this solution and from later on this will be the next step in our research. The first step was gathering data (articles and other type of papers), as this type of research requires, since our participants are represented by the publication in our case we had to proceed carefully in this respect choosing the proper subjects for our research.

4. I want to mention that I've been discussing with my co-tutor from the University of Vienna, prof. Erich Kirchler, whom has been very helpful providing answers and insight about my research. Also I already participated in September at the IAREP-SABE Joint Conference, a international conference in Economic Psychology, one of the most important in this line of work. I participated at this conference with the paper called: **The Wide Diffusion of the Social Representations Theory in the Thematic Field of "Economics, Advertising, Marketing and Organisational Context"**. The participation at this Conference was highly important for my training since it was the first time when I presented a paper in at a International Conference. Also my career plan includes future participation and communications at this Conference. To summarize I already reviewed my Career Development Plan together with my supervisors and it is in line with my needs and background. Another important topic in my Career Development Plan is finishing this PhD, as scheduled, in three years.

5. My secondment destination is very well chosen. My research focus includes taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Social Representations of Economy, Marketing, Advertising and Organizational Contexts and my secondment is as I mentioned before at the University of Vienna, the department of Economic Psychology. The professors from this University have contributed significantly to the thematic filed of Social Representations of Economy and in the present moment this secondment gives me the opportunity to interact with them, attend seminars and improve my knowledge in this respect. In conclusion, my secondment is going very well and I could say without exaggerating that it has fulfilled my highest expectations.

6. Working on the electronic library it was a huge help in gathering data about our participants, which are as I mentioned before, publications. All the other types of research similar with ours (narrative, systematic or thematic review) implies gathering data about the publications. Also the online platform will be a great help in carrying on statistical analysis on the data.

7. My supervisor is showing a great support in line with the research project and I am very happy for having the opportunity to work with him.

8. As I mentioned before, my participation and communication at an international conference was approved and more than that was encouraged. Prof. de Rosa as well as dr. Laura Dryjanska showed great support during this process, this attendance deepened my knowledge in the field by learning about new statistical procedures that I could use during my research.

9. We are constantly in contact with people from the private sector. We had several communications during which they presented various strategies and effectively shared their experience. Also I could notice the change in their discourse and way of acting in comparison with the academia.

10. I agree with the further developing of the interdisciplinary training but also I would like to mention that this already happened in various occasions during Summer Schools, Spring and

Winter Sessions.

11. I agree with the training in writing scientific papers. During my secondment I will attend the Scientific Writing Seminar at the University of Vienna in order to improve my writing skills.

12. I agree with presenting individual papers as we did every Summer School.

13. Here I want to mention that so far I didn't encounter any problems in accessing online the lectures.

In conclusion I want to state that I am pleased with the solutions proposed and also what is more important, I knew from the beginning before applying (from the Call for Fellowship) what kind of research I have to develop. Actually that was what convinced me to apply, doing systematic review and thematic review is very important and doing it well is a challenge. This project received very good reviews and personally I think that the difficulties that exist are not because of the project and way it has been conducted. I think that the emotions in this case have to be put aside and managed in some other way, in other context not through official channels.

I also want to highlight that is crucial for me to finish this PhD in 3 years. I could say that this will be added as a must in my Career Development Plan.

Regards,

Monica Panzaru

CARLOS FILIBERTO MIGUEL AGUILAR

Research Focus “Taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Social Representations, Community & Health”

Oggetto: suggestions and comments to improve the SoReCom-Joint-IDP Project

Data: 19 ottobre 2015 08:30:52 CEST

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>

Cc: Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear Professor Annamaria,

I send my comments and suggestions, point-by-point

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 1

I agree with that it is including a Program Coordinator and is Professor Giovanna Leona. I hope that we can have meeting with the Professor Giovanna Leona so that we can know your point of view and know how we work according to his new position.

For the election of representative of the ERS's, would be great that we could choose two people, so when one of them unable to attend meetings or activities of the ESR's, other person could replace it.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 2

The plan to work pre-defined 2 days a week outside the lab, seems to me an excellent choice. In my case, in addition to the research activities that must be performed, I would be very helpful so that I can attend English classes at times more flexible, with these schedules can take classes in any school of languages and not private lessons.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 3

I agree that the methodology cannot be changed now or approach of the project since the essence of it would be lost, but I do believe that I could supplement and include some other types of analysis, methodology or scientific approach with the meta-theoretically analyzed, which can meet each of the individual projects and approaches.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 4

I agree with the decisions taken by Supervisors Board on the care plan, but I also think that it is good to return to make a revision of the care plan where we can include a review of the co-tutores, supervisors and considering the new changes in the project.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 5

My secondment plan is in agreement with what is planned, as well as having the support and constant supervision. I would propose plan a joint work on a project of the co-tutor connected with our approach to research, this would be of much experience and we would know other job prospects in the host institutions.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 6

I understand the importance of the activity of the ESRs dedicated to the control of quality of data and metadata, and the importance of completing this part of the work, we have worked hard for a year and I think it is important to continue. But I also believe that it is important to implement

more activities intellectual extras that help complement the work and take us out of the monotony.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 7

As I've mentioned above, I agree to the inclusion of a new supervisor and hope more contact and have another guide in our academic development.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 8

I agree with the guidelines that has been taken for the Congress participation, although it would be nice to have guidelines to take some seminars or academic workshops at the University of Sapienza that are consistent with our projects and needs.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 9

I believe that the involvement of the partners non-academic can improve, since in addition to participating in the Conference also would include direct training activities with ERS's in order to maximize the benefits.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 10

I agree to the proposal to invite academics and professionals from diverse backgrounds to present their research at the network of scheduled training events.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 11

In addition to the activities proposed by the Supervisors Board, we can plan any external training for the presentation of scientific articles for publication, for example: by Elsevier, this would be very productive.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 12

The Supervisors Board spoke about this, there are "individual" presentations by the ESR's, in schools of summer, winter, and spring, in meetings of the lab and ESR's will continue with presentations at the following scheduled events.

R.E.A. Suggestion n° 13

At conferences has been requested in advance the papers to the guest lecturers and the dissemination of papers has been made through the institutional page. I've been helping in the coordination of conferences and I think is good idea requires all papers ready with two weeks in advance, since it also gives us the opportunity to know the subject of the researchers before your presentation.

I am convinced that the decisions you make will be for the good of the project and everyone involved. I'm optimistic and I hope good results of this joint work.

Best regards

--

CARLOS FILIBERTO MIGUEL AGUILAR

FILOMENA BERARDI

Research Focus “Taking stock of the literature in the thematic field of Social Representations & Politics: Multidimensional identities, intergroup relations, social movements and active minorities”

Oggetto: feed back

Data: 09 novembre 2015 18:37:18 CET

A: Annamaria Derosa <annamaria.derosa@uniroma1.it>, Laura Dryjanska <laura.dryjanska@uniroma1.it>

Dear Professor de Rosa,

following our consultation, attached you can find my personal comments to the replies to R.E.A. recommendations. I am waiting for the material you mentioned before which might help for ISPP abstract's elaboration. I wish you a nice working week,

Filomena Berardi

Valencia, 9th November.

Personal feedback elaborated by Berardi Filomena.

Following the R.E.A.'s recommendations and the SoReCom-Join-IDP Sapienza Supervisory Board's reply, I hereby express my agreement with Sapienza Supervisory Board's elaborations in this respect. Behind the reply there is a cooperative effort among SB members for formulating a response that might bring benefits to the whole group, whose members are very diverse and express different needs. To this regards, individualization of each project represents the common need shared by each ESR, and it is a fundamental key which need dedicated time, intellectual curiosity, and an awareness of a global vision of the project itself imbued with the previous backgrounds. However, given the very articulated nature of this unified research project, individualizing each research project still means considering a common theoretical framework as a main scientific reference point. I express my willingness to work on the direction the theoretical framework's enlargement for the benefit of the project itself and for advancing my contribution in the development of the meta-theoretical analysis. I believe that the meta-theoretical analysis is an important tool for looking once again to Social Representations theory in a manner that can give maximum emphasis to its future development. I am confident that this effort can now be pursued in a collaborative manner in respect of both the project and each ESR's need.