



The Editors' Page

This is the first issue of the IUPsyS Newsletter for 2012. As we describe below, it presents reports of IUPsyS activities together with articles on broader topical issues. We hope that these will be of considerable interest to our National Member and to members of related organizations.

Report from the President of IUPsyS

The Report of the President of IUPsyS, Rainer K Silbereisen, focuses particularly on recent and forthcoming capacity-building activities of IUPsyS, as well as looking forward to the 30th International Congress of Psychology to be held in Cape Town, South Africa, in July.

International Psychology: Where from, where to?

Professor Dr Kurt Pawlik is Professor Emeritus of the Department of Psychology of the University of Hamburg. His service as an Officer of IUPsyS spans four decades: Deputy Secretary-General (1978-84), Secretary-General (1984-92), President (1992-96), Past President (1996-2000), and he was made a lifetime Honorary Member of Executive Committee in 2000. In addition to his plethora of research publications, among them 17 books and presentations at many congresses, he has been member of the Executive Committee (1986-90), Vice-President (1996-98), President (1998-2002), and Past-President (2002-04) of the International Social Science Council. His honors include Member of the European Academy of Sciences, the Austrian Cross of Honors for Science and Arts, Honorary Member of the German Society of Psychology, Fellow of the Chinese Psychological Society, Honorary Member of Hamburg Academy of Sciences, Member of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts, and Fellow of the American Association for Psychological Science.



James Georgas



Nick Hammond

In this issue:

Editors' page 01

**Report from the President
Rainer K Silbereisen 03**

**International Psychology:
Where from, where to?
Kurt Pawlik 08**

**The European Federation
of Psychologists'
Associations
Robert A Roe 11**

**Differences between tight
and loose cultures: A
33-nation study
Michele J Gelfand 14**

**Report of IUPsyS capacity-
building workshop on
bereavement: Advanced
in-field training and
curriculum
development 16**

In this article, Pawlik describes significant periods in the history of IUPsyS. He emphasizes that while the traditional purpose of psychological science is to conceive of individual human behavior within a framework of universal “laws” or regularities, it must also take into consideration the variability of behavior within and between cultures. Pawlik’s reference to indigenous or “folk” psychology is reminiscent perhaps of Wundt’s metamorphosis from a strict experimental psychologist to his later writings in folk psychology. Thus, Pawlik states unequivocally that the internationalization of psychology by IUPsyS, together with international associations such as IAAP and IACCP, is necessary to combine both the search for universal laws in psychology, while also grounding its research in the traditions and needs of cultures. Pawlik proposes that the future of international psychology should emphasize its introduction into general education at secondary school levels, in international capacity building, and in maintaining psychology as a distinct scientific discipline.

The European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations

Professor Dr Robert Roe is President of the European Federation of Psychologists Associations, Emeritus Professor of Organisational Theory and Organisational Behaviour at Maastricht University (The Netherlands), and visiting professor at the University of Valencia (Spain), the University of Trento (Italy), the University of Leipzig (Germany), and the University of British Columbia (Canada). He has been Professor of Work and Organisational Psychology at the Dutch universities of Delft, Tilburg and Nijmegen, as well as director of the Work and Organization Research Center in Tilburg and the Netherlands Aeromedical Institute. He was founding president of the European Association of Work and Organisational Psychology (1991). His publications cover a broad range of topics, including motivation and performance, assessment and selection, leadership and teams, organizational culture and change, and research methodology. In his recent work, the emphasis is on temporal facets of behavioral and

organizational phenomena and on the interface between psychology and other disciplines.

The article describes the history and recent development of the European Federation of Psychologists’ Associations (EFPA). In 1981, 12 member associations established EFPA. In 2011, its 30th anniversary, EFPA has 35 country associations representing over 300,000 psychologists. Roe describes the important developments during this period. This includes the institution of a code of professional ethics of psychologists, standards and training of professional psychologists throughout Europe incorporated through the EuroPsy certificate, and specialist certificates in psychotherapy, work and organizational psychology and the areas of professional psychology. EFPA also supports biennial European Congresses of Psychology and other activities. Roe discusses future goals of EFPA which include outreach programs directed toward psychological issues of societies, closer links with EU policy makers and national governments, and closer cooperation with European psychological associations in various areas of psychology.

Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33–nation study

Michele J. Gelfand received her PhD in Social/Organizational Psychology from the University of Illinois. Michele received the Ernest J. McCormick Award for Early Career Contributions from the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology and the L.L. Cummings Scholar Award from the Organizational Behavior of the Academy of Management. She is the Past President of the International Association of Conflict Management, Past Division Chair of the Conflict Management Division of the Academy of Management, and Past Treasurer of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology. She is currently the Principal Investigator on a multi-university research initiative to study culture and negotiation in the Middle East. She is the co-editor of *The Handbook of Negotiation and Culture* and of *The Psychology of Conflict and Conflict Management in Organizations*, and is the

founding co-editor of the *Advances in Culture and Psychology* series and *Frontiers of Culture and Psychology* series (www.oup.com/us/cultureandpsychology). She serves on numerous editorial boards in social and organizational psychology, is a past Associate Editor of *Applied Psychology: An International Review* and is currently an Associate Editor of *Social Psychology and Personality Science*. Her work explores cultural influences on conflict, negotiation, justice and revenge; workplace diversity and discrimination; and theory and methods in cross-cultural psychology.

Not many articles on the subject of international or cross-cultural psychologists are published in *Science*. In this article, in a world of increasing global opportunities as well as global threats, there is a critical need to better understand cultural differences. Gelfand and colleagues identified a fundamental psychological divide that exists across cultures today—contrasting nations that have a strong emphasis on order and constraint versus those that promote permissiveness and latitude—or what is referred to as differences between tight and loose cultures. Anthropologists in the late 60s showed that this was an important distinction in traditional societies. This research, *Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study*, published in *Science* was conducted on approximately 7000 people across 33 nations, and shows that the distinction is critical in modern

nations. This research is critical for expanding cultural and cross-cultural psychology, which has to date been focused largely on differences in values, but also for helping to train people to understand how to traverse the tight-loose divide.

Capacity-building workshop on bereavement: Advanced in-field training and curriculum development

Following the 2008 Russian–Georgian armed conflict and the request from the Georgian Psychological Society for psychologists world-wide to provide support for Georgian psychologists' work with internally displaced persons, the President of IUPsyS, Rainer K. Silbereisen, submitted a proposal to the German Exchange Service (DAAD) for funding to hold a series of three capacity-building workshops as part of its "Conflict Prevention in the South Caucasus Region". The workshop series was to focus on "Bereavement, Research and Practice" and to include psychologists from Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. This report covers the third workshop in this series, which was held in Tbilisi, Georgia, in October 2011 and focused on "Advanced In-field Training and Curriculum Development".

James Georgas and Nick Hammond

The Editors

Report from the President

Rainer K Silbereisen



As I write, I am happy to say that spring has arrived at last after what has been a long and exceptionally cold winter: persistent temperatures minus 20 degrees Celsius, and lower, are unusual even for the colder regions of Europe. The warmer, longer days seem to bring out the best

in nature, and in my experience also often in people, bringing a feeling of new beginnings and a time to look forward.

For me, 2012 is certainly a time to look forward. My term as President of IUPsyS is nearing its close in early summer and I am, of course, wondering to whom I will hand over and with whom I will work for the next four years when I assume the role of Past President. Whoever has the honor to be elected, I think they will find the Union in particularly good shape, thanks to the great team of officers I have had the good fortune to work with, and the support of a hardworking

and conscientious Executive Committee. I am particularly very happy with the way in which we have been able to broaden and expand our capacity building activities (in large part funded from outside resources that we gained competitively), with their success, and with the wide appreciation that these events have evoked. They have certainly expanded and enhanced the Union's reputation and have fulfilled a major part of our strategic plan. This is one of the areas that will continue to have a strong focus as we develop the next strategic plan (a task of the outgoing officers and executive committee, as is also usual in other learned societies in order to maintain continuity and to enable the new team to begin with their work swiftly), and one of the main issues I would like to cover in this short report.

Looking at the capacity building activities in more detail, you may remember that in my end of year letter, which you can find by going to

the Union website at www.iupsys.net/images/announcements/end_year_letter_president_2011.pdf, I commented on the very successful and highly rewarding third Caucasus Workshop that was held in Tbilisi, Georgia, in October last year. This workshop took place thanks to major funding from the DAAD (the German Academic Exchange Service), as well as support from the Union and the University of Jena. A report of this workshop is included elsewhere in this Newsletter.

The same organizational formula used for this workshop and the others in the Caucasus workshop series (you can read about these from the workshop reports on the Union website, www.iupsys.net/index.php/capacity-building/other-activities) was adopted for another capacity building workshop aimed at developing the capacity of researchers, educators and practitioners in the Asia and Pacific Region to deal with the mental health consequences



Some of the participants in the workshop on Psychological Intervention after Disasters

of regional disasters. The workshop on Psychological Intervention after Disasters in the Asia and Pacific Region was a joint IUPsyS-Chinese Academy of Science event and was held in Beijing in February this year. As with the Caucasus workshops, we were able to undertake this project due to our having received additional external funding. This was secured by Union officers writing a successful grant proposal to the International Council for Science (ICSU), which is a non-governmental organization with a global membership of national scientific bodies (120 Members, representing 140 countries) and International Scientific Unions (31 Members) and of which IUPsyS is a member. The workshop was organized and led by Vice President Kan Zhang, with assistance from colleagues in Beijing, and from the Jena office.

Like the Caucasus series, this workshop was very successful. Participants (20 in total) were drawn from across the region, coming from India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, New Zealand, and China, and represented a wide range of professional expertise and experience in the field. Invited faculty members were: Joop T. de Jong, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands; Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota, USA; Marinus H. van IJzendoorn, Leiden University, the Netherlands; and Shu Li, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.

The workshop culminated in a Round Table event that took Recognizing National Needs: The Case of Capacity Building for Disasters and Bereavement as its focus for presentations and discussion. Round Table invited guests were: Mohd. Nordin Hasan, Director of ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific; Jane E. Rovins, Executive Director of Integrated Research on Disaster Risk; Bondan Sikoki, Director of SurveyMeter, Indonesia; and Zhao Yufang, Vice-Dean, School of Psychology, Southwest University, China. Presentations by the invited guests were followed by comments by the faculty members present and then by a general question and answer session, which was open to all. This was a particularly lively session with the participants fully engaging with the invited guests and faculty concerning their work and experience in the field. As with the Caucasus

workshops, a full pre and post workshop evaluation was carried out. However, many participants took the occasion of the Round Table to thank the organizers and faculty publically for making the workshop possible and it was made very clear how important the opportunity to meet and interact with fellow scientists from other countries had been for them. Indeed, we were left in no doubt whatsoever of the value of this and similar events, but also of the need for follow-up work that can build on the energy and drive generated among the participants during the workshop.

In this regard, we were lucky to have the participation of Nordin Hasan throughout the Asia and Pacific workshop. He was so impressed by the work that I was able to explore with him how IUPsyS might cooperate with ICSU to take the work further. ICSU is not a general source of funding, but it can help by putting us in contact with other agencies. More importantly, perhaps, it was also suggested and offered that ICSU would host a web platform for the workshop group to maintain contact and to develop their collective efforts further. I am very happy to say that this has already happened and I have high hopes for this burgeoning network. I also think this is something we should consider developing for other regions, such as the Caucasus, following capacity building exercises.

Another area where we are planning a capacity building event is in Central Asia. Following a grant proposal I wrote together with colleagues in the Jena office, we have received funding (again from the DAAD) for another workshop focusing on Psychological Intervention following Disasters, this time aimed at countries in the central Asian region: this will in many ways be a follow-on to the Caucasus workshop series. It is designed to target young scientists, but will also include more senior members of further education institutions. With the help of our colleagues in Georgia, and particularly of a Russian member of my department, we have established contacts in the target countries, which are Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. This has not been an easy task – primarily due to language difficulties and in some cases not

very well developed technology concerning the availability of information on institutions and organizations. I am confident, however, that with the contacts we now have in each country, the workshop will succeed. I expect the workshop to take place at the end of this year, but as yet we are not fully certain exactly where this will happen.

Finally, in May this year, another important workshop - this time on Psychology Education and Training (PET) - will take place in a wonderful conference centre set in a medieval castle owned by the University of Jena. This event is related to the Workgroup on Education for Psychologists. The group has been very active over the past few years and is a wonderful example of how workgroups can operate. Chaired by Janak Pandey, India, the group has collected data worldwide on how and with what scientific content the education and training of psychologists is organized in order to achieve different levels of qualifications; a database as background for further activities is the ultimate goal. At the workshop, the results of data collection to date, as well as a large range of other PET-related topics, will be presented and discussed by 20 high-ranking international scientists in the field: their presentations and commentaries will ultimately form the basis of a book planned to be published by Psychology Press in our IUPsyS series. The workshop also aims to conclude with a session on Planning for Coordinated Action, which I hope will inform both the future work of the workgroup and the Union's new strategic plan.

The workshops I have mentioned above are, of course, not the only capacity building events we undertake. As I mentioned in my end of year letter, the ARTS program, which provides training opportunities for scholars from low-income countries and promotes attendance at the international congresses of its sponsoring organizations (see www.iupsys.net/index.php/capacity-building/arts) is a highlight of the Union's efforts.

The work of Pam Maras, Chair of the Workgroup on Development of National Organizations is also very important. She organizes capacity-

building workshops in the context of our RCPs (Regional Conference of Psychology). A good example of this is the national and regional capacity building pre-conference workshop, which she co-chaired with Ava Thompson (Chair of the RCP 2011 Conference Organizing Committee), held on the occasion of this RCP in Nassau, the Bahamas, November 2011 on Psychological Science and Well-being: Building Bridges for Tomorrow. As a report notes, the theme reflected on an appreciation for psychological science as a critical instrument for building bridges across time, disciplines, regions, research areas, and communities; through policy, advocacy, education, publication, and teaching; and for change, development and empowerment of individuals and communities. Here I would also like to mention the extremely helpful work of Merry Bullock (our former Deputy Secretary-General), who was the IUPsyS liaison person to the CRCP2011, in the success of this RCP. For more information and a report of the conference, go to www.caribbeanpsychology.org/. In all, I think you will agree that the Union has been exceptionally busy and successful with regard to fulfilling its aims concerning capacity building.

In terms of forthcoming and long awaited events, the main Union event of 2012 will be, of course, the 30th International Congress of Psychology (ICP) held in Cape Town, South Africa, July 22-27, 2012. As anyone who has ever been involved in the organization of such an event will know, it is a very long process, taking about eight years from the idea to submit a bid to the actual event taking place. At first, things move quite slowly, but as the congress draws near, activities increase apace. This is certainly true of the 2012 ICP and I really have the feeling that the countdown to the opening ceremony has already begun. Indeed, submissions and registrations are well underway (see www.icp2012.com) and those who like to be well prepared are already booking hotels and signing up for tours in order to get the best deals. The last figures I received from Saths Cooper, our Congress President, was in the order of 6000 presentations and already about 4500 registrations as early as at the beginning of April. I have to say, I am really looking forward to being in South Africa again and I hope that I

will have the opportunity to meet many of you there. I say this, not simply because this will be my last opportunity to make your acquaintance as President, but mainly because I am certain that the scientific program, the social agenda, the amazing city of Cape Town, and the possibility to explore this region of South Africa, make this ICP an opportunity not to be missed.

While on the subject of the upcoming ICP, I would like to mention the Jacobs Foundation and offer them heartfelt thanks, both personally and on behalf of the Union, for all they have done, and for all they are about to do, to support the work of IUPsyS. You may remember that they supported various activities related to the last ICP in Berlin in 2008, including a Forum on Youth, an Expert Workshop on Quality of Life in Old Age, and a series of Controversial Debates, as well as a program of events for Young Scientists. It was also money remaining from this grant that we were able to use in support of the 2010 ARTS program in Melbourne. They have most generously agreed to fund a similar series of activities in relation to the 2012 ICP, and following ideas very close to my heart, and to the focus of the Jacob Foundation's *raison d'être*, these activities will have a special emphasis on young scientists and development in childhood and youth. Most excitingly, as well as again supporting an emerging scholars' program with travel stipends; a lecture series on "translational research," which will look at how well-founded empirical findings of basic or applied science can be translated into policy and practice related to the development of children and youth; more Controversial Debates, whereby a current "hot topic" is debated between two renowned protagonists and moderated by another highly visible scientist in front of a general audience; in 2012 the Jacobs Foundation is sponsoring a number of Change Fellowship Awards that will have a special emphasis on young researchers (post-doc and higher) from Sub-Saharan Africa. The initiative, which is also supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa, aims to encourage these young researchers to conceive and carry out their own research programs that address the role of social change for individual behavior and development among young people in their country.

It is also at the 2012 ICP that the new IUPsyS-sponsored awards will be presented for the first time. There are three categories of awards: the Young Investigator Award, which recognizes young post-doctoral scientists who have already made a significant contribution to psychological science (there are two awards in this category: one for basic and one for applied science); the Achievement Against the Odds award, which honors a researcher or team of researchers who succeeded in conducting research under extremely difficult circumstances; and the Lifetime Career Award, which honors distinguished and enduring lifetime contributions to international cooperation and advancement of knowledge in the field of psychological science. The Mattei Dogan Prize, which recognizes a contribution that represents a major advancement in psychology by a scholar or team of scholars of high international reputation, will also be presented at the 2012 ICP. This will be the second time this prize has been awarded, the first being presented to Michael Posner of the University of Oregon, USA, at the Berlin ICP in 2008. A good number of nominations were received for each award and the award juries have completed their not-so-easy and very responsible task of selecting the recipients. The names of the 2012 award winners will be announced immediately prior to the start of the 2012 ICP – so as they say, "Watch this space" – there isn't long to go.

Indeed, we all know that as one gets older time seems to move with ever increasing speed, and it is hard to believe that the XXX ICP is soon to be upon us, but it is even harder to believe that plans for the 2016 ICP are already well under way. Earlier in the year, prior to the Beijing workshop, I again travelled to Japan in my capacity as liaison officer for the XXXI ICP that will take place in Yokohama, Japan. I had extended meetings with the organizing committee, chaired by Kazuo Shigemasu, concerning the contract and other matters that had to be finalized with some urgency. As always, I was very well received and looked after, and I came away with the feeling that everyone was more confident of their particular role, that the complex way in which the various tasks need to be orchestrated was

appreciated, and that the somewhat cautious attitudes of some ICP officers– understandable considering the possible impact of the recent events on the prosperity in Japan – were much diminished. I was also very happy to help in facilitating logistical communications between the organizers of the 2012 ICP and the 2016 team (many thanks to Ann Watts, our Deputy Secretary-General). This has been very helpful and much appreciated by the organizers in Japan. A full report of progress to date will be presented at the ICP meetings in July, where there will also be a reception and presentation by the future Yokohama hosts.

Before I close, I would just like to mention the meeting I had in January with the Secretary-General, Pierre Ritchie, when he visited Jena to work with me on a review of our current Strategic Plan and to discuss issues for the next. We also took the opportunity to progress plans for the Officers' meetings that took place in Marbach, Germany in April 2012, and Cape Town in July, as well as the 2012 EC meetings and the Assembly, which will involve the

election of a new President, Secretary General and other elected officers and Executive Committee (EC) members as appropriate. The Call for Nominations, which was posted by the Secretary-General on the Union website, has now closed - the deadline for submitting nominations was January 15, 2012. I also took the opportunity of the Secretary-General's visit to invite the President of the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP), José Maria Peiró and their Secretary-General, Janel Gauthier, for a general discussion about future cooperation and how to consolidate our approaches to existing joint projects, such as ARTS. This was very cordial, informative and productive. I will meet all the officers in Marbach for what will be our last meeting as a team before we meet in South Africa in July.

Finally, I hope that this finds you with your plans to attend the upcoming ICP firmly fixed, and that perhaps we may meet in person at one of the many wonderful and exciting symposia, lectures and social events that I know lie in store for us.

International Psychology: Where from, where to?

Kurt Pawlik



For a large part of its methodology and accumulated knowledge, its theoretical developments and professional competence, psychology is a science of individual behavior. So it could come as a surprise that, ever

since its early days, psychological science has been very open to the international dimension. Illustrious foreign doctoral students at the first Institute of Psychology, founded 1879 under Wilhelm Wundt at Leipzig University, are one often-quoted proof. Already ten years later, 1889, the 1st International Congress of Psychology met in Paris, in conjunction with the 1st International

Congress of Physiology. It gave rise to a permanent international committee for future international congresses and cooperation in psychology. Subsequent highlight events in the further development of international psychology included:

- the founding of the International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) in 1920 and of the International Union of Scientific Psychology (IUSP) in 1951 (today, the International Union of Psychological Science, IUPsyS);
- the role of the Union as a co-founder of the International Social Science Council (ISSC) in 1952;
- the admission of IUPsyS to membership in the International Council of Science (ICSU) in 1982¹.

From an initial assembly of seven founding national societies of psychology in 1951, IUPsyS has grown to a body of currently 73 national members (equivalent to 81% of the 90 full National Scientific Members of ICSU and to 38% of the 193 UN member states). The Union holds special consultative status with UN bodies² and it represents psychology in worldwide multi-disciplinary research initiatives and networks. With the 30th International Congress of Psychology in Cape Town just pending, these quadrennial congresses have become a representative world-platform of psychology, as a science and as a profession. This is further amplified by the Union's affiliation (or special liaison status, respectively) with 18 topical or regional international psychological associations.

What are driving forces, what are future prospects of this impressive development of international psychology? Over and above growing internationalization at large in the course of the last century, also in response to the tragedies and disasters of two World Wars, there seem to be factors specific to psychology³. In reviewing them, I will limit myself to three points:

1. One is the striving, on the part of psychological scientists and professionals, to conceive of individual human behavior within a framework of "universal" regularities of behavior, of behavioral "unity in diversity" emanating from culture and tradition.

Scientific psychological inquiry did not start out from behavior problems encountered in daily life or adjustment. Topics chosen for study by our forefathers, by Ebbinghaus, Fechner, Helmholtz, Mach, G.E.Müller or Wundt, rather came from long-standing queries about the human mind, inherited from physiology and philosophy (Pawlik & Rosenzweig, 2000). Small in number, first-generation experimental psychologists had to seek support from exchange beyond country borders (as is still the case for psychological capacity building in some regions). Furthermore, when testing for the

universality of laws of behavior one has to follow a universal approach, where researchers of diverse background will observe and analyze human behavior in diverse cultures. Psychology was well advised to rely on independent cross-laboratory replication of research results from early onwards. Here also international exchange becomes crucial.

2. Indigenous or "folk" psychology, as laid down (or hidden) in a natural language, can become both a source and a trap for psychological science.

Words like motive, intelligence, or drive can carry different connotations, if not even different denotative content, in different natural languages. Employing them as referents to theoretical concepts must face the risk of "importing" into a theory unintended connotations as they prevail in a culture. Physics could guard against such risk by adhering to strict operational definitions; in psychology this may not guarantee sufficient safeguard. An alternative approach, viz. inventing a completely novel, artificial terminology was chosen by Raymond B. Cattell for newly identified factor-analytic personality traits (Cattell, 1957). This has not found acceptability in psychology though. Here cross-cultural internationalization of psychology became an essential must.

On the other hand, indigenous psychology is a cross-generational depository of reflection about human nature and may serve as one source for psychological hypothesis development. The World Conference on Science, convened 1999 by ICSU in collaboration with UNESCO in Budapest⁴, drew far-reaching attention to this double role of indigenous thinking in the pursuit of the sciences, also cognizant of our responsibility towards society at large. Here too international platforms play a significant role in cross-cultural transfer (Pawlik & d'Ydewalle, 2006), also in professional practice.

3. Notwithstanding universal laws of human behavior, content, context and contingencies of behavior vary substantially between cultures and regions, as will priorities for psychological practice.

Under the heading "indigenization" requests to ground psychological science and practice also in the traditions and needs in a culture have received

¹ See Rosenzweig, Holtzman, Sabourin & Bélanger (2000) for an account of precursors and of the first 50 years in the history of IUPsyS.

² Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), UN Department of Information (DPI), UNESCO, World Health Organization (WHO).

³ See also Jing (2000), Pawlik (2006) and Pawlik & d'Ydewalle (1996).

⁴ For reference cf. the documentation in Nature: www.nature.com/supplements/collections/icsu/index.html

wide-spread attention in international psychology ever since the 1970s, also within the IUPsyS (Rosenzweig & Sinha, 1988; Sinha, 1981, 1986). In my term of office as President, the IUPsyS resolved to install the then novel Regional Psychological Conferences in cooperation with IAAP and the IACCP⁵ in order to better meet region-specific agenda in psychology (Pawlik, 1997). A first one took place 1995 in Guangzhou/PR China, and they are now convened every other year.

Another response to growing needs for regionalization in psychology led to research on large-scale problems like global environmental change, notably global climatic warming⁶. Through IUPsyS psychology was a participating discipline in the founding of the first worldwide social science program on human dimensions of global change (Jacobson & Price, 1990; Pawlik, 1992). Today it is in successful progress under the name "International Human Dimensions Program of Global Change" or IHDP⁷.

What may be priorities for international psychology in the future? Once more I will limit myself to three points:

1. To my knowledge, psychology is still not part of the concept of general education, still no obligatory school subject in many (if not most) countries.

When President of the International Social Science Council I took repeated initiative, also at UNESCO, to get best-practice model curricula for psychology developed for secondary school levels – with but rare success. This is a baffling paradox: We know so much about source and cure of aggression, about origins and treatment of anxiety, about psychological factors in aging and on how to cope with them - yet so little if any of this enters into general popular knowledge. Here the familiar plea for "giving psychology away" is still at miss. Psychology is an established profession, has found admission to national academies and international bodies of science, is sought after eagerly in multidisciplinary research – and still left out from general education. The "Report of the American Psychological Association 2009 Presidential Task Force on the Future of Psychology as a STEM Discipline" published in the Spring 2011 edition

of this Newsletter (Bray, 2011) pointed out need for change from a national perspective. It will be urgent also for international psychology to attend to this anachronism.

There is still a second side to this: a widespread under-representation of psychological expertise in national and international governance, also at the UN and its bodies, both in absolute numbers and by comparison with disciplines like geography or sociology. This was highlighted already in a trend-setting symposium on psychology and international diplomacy at the 27th International Congress of Psychology 2000 in Stockholm and it calls urgently for change to the better.

2. Together with its national members and international partners, the IUPsyS has been instrumental in international capacity building in psychology, from the individual level (as in the established Advanced Research Training Seminars ARTS) to the national and regional level (as for countries in transition). Achievements along this line include the advances, starting from Gauthier's early work "Towards a Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists" (Gauthier, 2003) and in collaboration with IAAP and IACCP, towards an International Code of Psychological Ethics⁸, and the strict pursuance by IUPsyS of the ICSU principles for free circulation and conduct of scientists⁹. May success continue to be with the Union in this important strive.
3. In closing I like to raise a topic which may call for international support in the future: maintaining psychology as one distinct scientific discipline. Fields of psychological science have let themselves become part of trendy (and powerful) mega-sciences, from cognitive to neuroscience. And we are sharing professional innovations liberally with competing professions, from psychological assessment to behavior therapy. Not to question need for and gain from interdisciplinarity, warning voices (like recently by Magnusson, 2012) should not be ignored. International psychology is in a top-most position to set models for preserving psychology as one scientific discipline.

⁵ International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

⁶ See International Geosphere-Biosphere Program (IGBP: www.igbp.net)

⁷ See www.ihdp.unu.edu

⁸ See Overmier (2008) and the IUPsyS website www.iupsys.net

⁹ See <http://www.icsu.org/about-icsu/structure/committees/freedom-responsibility>

References

- Cattell, R.B. (1957). Personality and motivation structure and measurement. Hudson, New York: World Book Company.
- Gauthier, J. (2003). Toward a universal declaration of ethical principles for psychologists. In J.B. Overmier & J.A. Overmier (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPSyS Global Resource*. (4th ed.) [CD-ROM]. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Jacobson, H.K. & Price, M.F. (1990). A Framework for Research on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change. Paris: International Social Science Council – Unesco.
- Magnusson, D. (2012). The human being in society. *Psychology as a scientific discipline*. *European Psychologist*, 17, 21-27.
- Overmier, J.B. (2008). Onward toward a Universal Declaration of Ethical Principles for Psychologists: Draft and Progress Report. In D. Wedding & M.J. Stevens (Eds.), *Psychology: IUPSyS Global Resource* (Edition 2008). [CD-ROM]. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Pawlik, K. (Ed.) (1992). Human cognition of and response to global environmental change. *International Journal of Psychology*, 27, 647-648.
- Pawlik, K. (1997). State and development of the IUPSyS: Report of the President. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, (3), 193-196.
- Pawlik, K. (2006). *Internationale Psychologie*. [International psychology.] In K. Pawlik (Ed.), *Handbuch Psychologie* [Handbook Psychology], p. 911-919. Heidelberg/Germany: Springer.
- Pawlik, K. & d'Ydewalle, G. (1996). Psychology and the global commons. *Perspectives of international psychology*. *American Psychologist*, 51, 448-495.
- Pawlik, K. & d'Ydewalle, G. (Eds.) (2006). *Psychological Concepts: An International Historical Perspective*. Hove, GB: Psychology Press.
- Pawlik, K. & Rosenzweig, M.R. (2000). Psychological science: Content, methodology, history, and profession. In K. Pawlik & M.R. Rosenzweig (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Psychology*, p. 3-19. London: SAGE.
- Jing, Q. (2000). International psychology. In K. Pawlik & M.R. Rosenzweig (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Psychology*, p. 570-584. London: SAGE.
- Rosenzweig, M.R., Holtzman, W.H., Sabourin, M. & Bélanger, D. (2000). *History of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPSyS)*. Hove/GB: Psychology Press.
- Rosenzweig, M.R. & Sinha, D. (1988). *La recherche en psychologie scientifique*. Paris: Unesco.
- Sinha, D. (1981). Non-Western perspectives in psychology: why, what, and whither? *Indian Journal of Psychology*, 3, 1-9.
- Sinha, D. (1986). *Psychology in a Third World Country: The Indian Experience*. Delhi: SAGE.

The European Federation of Psychologists' Associations

Robert A. Roe



We are writing the year 2012. The European leaders are still trying to find a solution to the crisis of the Euro, one of the many events that mark the progressive transformation of Europe - a process that in fact spans centuries. For those living in other continents it may be hard to understand the

changes taking place in Europe. A continent of 47 countries with a history of conflicts and alliances that is moving in the direction of greater unity and collaboration. Particularly significant are the changes in the European Union (EU), which unites 27 European countries with over 500

million citizens and generates 30% of the Gross World Product. Since the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) we see an increasing influence of the European Union on all virtually areas of life, ranging from the economy, transport, employment, and environment to citizens' rights, health, social integration, education, and culture. Leading are the principle of the internal market (characterized by free flow of goods, capital, services and people, i.e. "the four freedoms"), and the policies and legislative actions of the European commission, which need approval of the European Parliament and the Council of the EU.

In 2011 Europe's psychologists have celebrated the 30th anniversary of EFPA, the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (*www*.

efpa.eu). When EFPA was founded Europe was a different place, strictly divided in a Western and an Eastern part, and psychology was taught and practiced in national frameworks with substantial differences. The development



of EFPA mirrors the changes in the European environment, particularly since the breakdown of the Iron Curtain in 1989, and the integration that has occurred ever since. While EFPA started with 12 member associations, only one of which (Poland) was from the Eastern part, it now has 35 member associations covering over 300,000 psychologists. The countries involved are: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom.



Considering the diversity of these countries in terms of language, religion, education, law, and economy – all reflecting their different historical trajectories – the degree of collaboration within EFPA is truly amazing. The standards that EFPA has developed over the past 30 years, regarding professional ethics, the education and training of psychologists, the legal protection of the profession, etc. are subscribed to by all member associations. Particularly worth mentioning

is EuroPsy, the system for recognizing the professional qualifications of psychologists throughout Europe that was adopted in 2009 and that is currently being implemented. According to the standards of EuroPsy, psychologists must have at least five years of academic education, at least one year of supervised professional practice with an assessment of competences, subscribe to an ethical code and engage in continuous professional development. Those who meet the standards receive a certificate and are included in a public web-based register (www.europsy-efpa.eu/). The education standards include requirements concerning the scope and content of the academic curriculum. They follow the “Bologna system” adopted by the Ministers of Education of Europe in 1999, and have been recognized as “reference points” in the EU’s Tuning Project in 2011.



One of the key activities of EFPA is the bi-annual European Congress of Psychology. The 2011 congress took place in Istanbul, Turkey, the place where Europe meets Asia. The congress was organized by the Turkish Psychological Association. It was a unique opportunity for EFPA to welcome colleagues from countries in the Middle-East as well as other parts of the world to Europe. EFPA was honored with the presence of Rainer Silbereisen, the President of IUPsyS, and José-Maria Peiró, President of IAAP, and several other representatives of international psychology associations. At the start of the congress four outstanding scholars in psychology received a special award in recognition of their work. The Wilhelm Wundt - William James Award (on behalf of the American Psychological Foundation) was given to Arne Öhman (Sweden) for his research on fear; the Aristotle Prize as given to Marinus van IJzendoorn (Netherlands) for his research on attachment; and the Comenius Early Career Psychologist Award was given to Emily Holmes (United Kingdom) for her work on mental

imagery and Koen Luyckx (Belgium) for his work on identity formation.

EFPA took the occasion of its 30th anniversary to reflect on the past and future of the federation and to choose a new perspective for the years to come. At its General Assembly, which took place July 9-10, 2011, right after the congress in Istanbul, it unanimously decided for a new direction that gives priority to serving Europe. EFPA remains committed to the development of psychology as a profession, scientific discipline and field of education, but it will make greater efforts to put psychology at the service of society. To this purpose it will bundle the expertise from the various fields of psychology and make proposals for preventing mental illness, intolerance and conflict, social exclusion, and other societal problems, as well as for promoting wellbeing and socio-economic development. EFPA will devote more effort to establishing closer links with policy makers, both at the level of the EU and national governments. In addition, it will promote the collaboration between psychologists in the various specialties of psychology, and work together with other professions. EuroPsy will remain an important item on the agenda of EFPA. EuroPsy will be spread throughout Europe and be extended with specialist certificates, e.g. in psychotherapy, work & organizational psychology, and other areas of professional areas of psychology. EFPA strives to get EuroPsy accepted as the standard for psychologists in the context of the EU Directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications.

EFPA has also decided to change its organization. Standing Committees are now dealing with developments in various areas of psychology, such as psychology and health, school psychology, work & organizational psychology, psychology and ageing, traffic psychology, psychology of crisis intervention, and so on. Newly installed Boards are dealing



with overarching issues of scientific research, education, professional development, ethics, and psychological assessment, and prevention and intervention. New are Consultation Groups in which experts from all over Europe will be involved in generating advice on specific issues such as ADHD, depression, bullying, healthy eating, safe internet, children's rights, de-institutionalization, testing of car drivers, active ageing, and so on.

In all this, EFPA will closely collaborate with its national member associations. The activities of EFPA are supported and coordinated by the Head Office in Brussels, which has recently obtained new office space and is seeing a modest expansion of staff.

Contact information

EFPA (IVZW) - European Federation of Psychologists Associations
Grasmart 105/18, B-1000 Brussels - Belgium
Phone : +32 (0)2 5034953, Fax : +32 (0)2 5033067

headoffice@efpa.eu, www.efpa.eu, www.facebook.com/europeanpsychology

Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33–nation study

Michele J. Gelfand



Cross-cultural psychology has made great strides in advancing our understanding how values vary across national cultures. In recent research, *Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33 –nation study*, that we report in *Science*¹⁰, we complement this tradition by examining cultural variation in social

norms, and in particular differences between nations between nations that are “tight” —have strong norms and a low tolerance of deviant behavior—and those that are “loose” —have weak norms and a high tolerance of deviant behavior.

The idea that societies can vary on tightness-looseness dates back to early anthropological work by Pelto (1968). In his classic paper, *The difference between ‘tight’ and ‘loose’ societies*, Pelto showed that traditional societies varied widely on their expression of and adherence to social norms. Pelto (1968) described “tight” societies as those that were rigorously formal and disciplined, had clearly defined norms, and imposed severe sanctions on individuals who deviate from norms. By contrast, loose societies were described as those that had a lack of formality, regimentation and discipline, had norms expressed through a wide variety of alternative channels, and had a high tolerance for deviant behavior. Pelto rated 21 traditional societies on structure elements such as degree of political control, corporate ownership, theocracy, and legitimate use of force, to produce a tightness score for each society. Of the 21 sample societies rated, the Hutterites, Hanno communities, Lubara, and the Israeli Kibbutz were ranked as among the tightest societies, with

very strong norms and little tolerance for deviant behavior, whereas the Kung Bushman, Cubeo, and the Skolt Lapps were rated as the among loosest, with ambiguous norms and a high tolerance for deviant behavior. The construct was also elaborated upon by Berry and colleagues in their work in traditional societies (Berry, 1966; 1967; Witkin & Berry, 1975), and discussed as a neglected source of variation by Triandis (1989).

In the *Science* article, we sought to show tightness-looseness is an important cultural dimension that applies to modern societies, and that it can be reliably assessed, is distinct from other cultural dimensions, has predictable relationships with ecological variables, socio-political institutions, and is related to a wide range of societal attitudes and behaviors. We developed a new scale of tightness-looseness by asking approximately 7000 individuals across 33 nations to answer such items as: “There are many social norms that people are supposed to abide by in this country,” “In this country, if someone acts in an inappropriate way, others will strongly disapprove,” and “People in this country almost always comply with social norms”, among others. People agreed upon the general level of tightness-looseness and the measure correlated with expert ratings, data from the world value survey on social deviance, and other unobtrusive measures (accuracy of clocks, percentage of left hand writers, among other variables). The results showed that there was wide variation across societies in tightness-looseness. The tightest societies included Pakistan, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, and India, and the loosest countries included the Ukraine, Estonia, Hungary, Israel, the Netherlands, and Brazil (see Table 1, Gelfand *et al.*, 2011). As Harry Triandis predicted when I was a graduate student working with him (along with Carpenter’s 2000 work on traditional societies), tightness was only moderately

¹⁰ Alain Lempereur, Patricia Marquez, Rozhan Othman, Bert Overlaet, Penny Panagiotopoulou, Karl Peltzer, Lorena R. Perez-Florizno, Larisa Ponomarenko, Anu Realo, Vidar Schei, Manfred Schmitt, Peter B. Smith, Nazar Soomro, Erna Szabo, Naline Taveesin, Midori Toyama, Evert Van de Vliert, Naharika Vohra, Colleen Ward, Susumu Yamaguchi (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33 –nation study. *Science*, 332, 1100-1104.

correlated with collectivism and other cultural dimensions.

The results of our study showed that tightness-looseness is related to a broad array of ecological and human-made societal threats (or lack thereof) that nations have historically encountered. We reasoned that ecological and human-made threats increase the need for strong norms and sanctioning of deviant behavior in order for humans to coordinate their social action for survival. We examined numerous different threats, with different indicators, including population density (1500, and modern day), resource scarcity (such as food supply, food deprivation, percentage of farmland, access to water resources), natural disaster vulnerability, historical threats from one's neighbors, natural prevalence of pathogens, among other indicators. Across the board, and controlling for GNP, these indicators were related to tightness-looseness, with higher tightness being related to higher degrees of ecological and historical threats. At the macro level, tightness-looseness is also related to "narrow socialization" in institutions (Arnett, 1995); tight societies are more likely to have governments that are autocratic, media institutions with restricted content, higher police per capita, more strict punishments (e.g., the death penalty), and higher religiosity. There are also far fewer challenges to societal institutions in tight as compared to loose cultures.

An exciting finding from the research was also that tightness-looseness is related to the strength of social situations (Mischel, 1977). The nature of everyday social situations—public parks, classrooms, restaurants, libraries, the movies, among many other behavior settings—has received very little attention in cultural and cross-cultural psychology. We argued that everyday situations in tight societies would be stronger—that is they would restrict the range of behavior that is deemed appropriate—as compared to loose societies where everyday situations would be much weaker. In other words, while all cultures have strong and weak situations, tight and loose cultures were theorized to vary in the degree to which everyday recurring situations in general are strong versus weak. Drawing on Price & Bouffard (1974), we assessed

how appropriate 12 behaviors were across 15 situations across the 33 nations and created an index of situational strength. The results showed support that situations are stronger in tight as compared to loose situations. We also showed through hierarchical linear modeling that individuals who are embedded in nations with strong situations (and are continued faced with the subjective experience that their behavioral options are limited, their actions are subject to evaluation, and there are potential punishments based on these evaluations) would have self-guides that are more prevention-focused, will have higher self-regulatory strength (i.e., higher impulse control), a higher need for structure, and higher self-monitoring ability. Our HLM analyses supported these links, illustrating the central role of situations for explaining cultural differences in psychological processes. In all, the paper illustrates that tightness looseness is constituted through a system of interrelated distal and proximal factors across multiple levels of analysis; distal ecological, historical factors, and societal institutions, along with the strength of everyday situations and psychological attributes of citizens, all mutually reinforce each other.

We believe that understanding tightness-looseness is not only important for science but also for training. In this world of increasing interdependence, knowledge from this research could be of interest to diplomats and policy makers, global managers, immigrants, the military, and even travelers alike, who need to navigate the tight-loose divide. We hope that cross-cultural trainers will draw upon this work to help educate individuals around the globe about this dimension, why it arises, and its constitutive processes, which will enable individuals to better anticipate what they will experience when going from a tight to loose or loose to tight culture. Moreover, by understanding the factors that relate to tightness-looseness, and cultures evolve to be the way they are, it can help us be less judgmental. This is particularly important given that the dimension of tightness-looseness might be implicated in much cultural conflict across the globe. People in loose societies may view tight societies as being overly restrictive and immoral

and likewise, people from tight societies may view loose societies as overly permissive and equally immoral. In some of our recent work, we show that the extremes of the dimension are related to low satisfaction at the national level. In other words, tightness-looseness has a curvilinear relationship with life satisfaction, with extreme tightness and looseness both being related to lower satisfaction. We are also currently embarking on a number of projects to

extend the work, including using computational modeling to study tightness and looseness and culture change, examining regional variations in tightness-looseness in the United States and other countries, and testing our ideas from the field in the laboratory.

If you are interested in the dimension of tightness-looseness, please contact me at mjgelfand@gmail.com

Report of IUPsyS capacity-building workshop on bereavement: Advanced in-field training and curriculum development

The first workshop, “Bereavement Research and Practice” was held in Jena, Germany in 2009 and focused on the topic of bereavement from a theoretical perspective (including models and theories on bereavement after normal lifespan-related loss of family and friends, after loss due to accidents and natural catastrophes, and after loss caused by armed conflicts). The workshop was evaluated by the participants and faculty as very successful. The second workshop, which was also held in Jena, Germany in 2010, was entitled “Intervention following Bereavement: Application & Training”. This workshop focused on practical issues and their application in dealing with bereavement and trauma following disasters. Full reports on both workshops can be found at www.iupsys.net/index.php/capacity-building/other-activities

Over the three workshops in the series, the rationale for our workshops in the Caucasus region has not changed – the idea has been to pursue capacity building for individual scientists of the younger generation, but with an eye to strengthening the organizational structures of psychology in the region. The corner stone of our planning was the belief that psychology in emerging national states and societies should represent first class science, while at the same time recognizing that national needs require psychological knowledge and means of intervention. Certainly there are many unique needs in countries of the Caucasus region, often

related to the fragile political and economic background of nation building, including ethnic strife, but there are also commonalities with large segments of the globe; that is the high likelihood of disasters of various kinds, including warfare, natural catastrophes, technological failure, and pandemics. Natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods and storms affect large segments of entire populations, destroying infrastructure, causing human loss, and displacing people. The resulting deterioration of social capital and mental health requires responses, and psychology has a role to play in this. Given the rapid increase in the incidence of disasters - doubling over the last decade with more than 2 billion people affected - we at IUPsyS can attest to a dramatic mismatch between the need for expertise on psychological consequences of disasters and the representation of relevant scientific knowledge and modes of intervention at the mass population and individual level. All over the world, as our research has shown, curricula for psychology education and training in ordinary university programs are rare, and paradoxically this is particularly true for the countries and societies most affected by disasters.

Across the three workshops, topics and structure were chosen so that the young scientists from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia could learn in a step-like fashion: first gaining knowledge about theories related to the psychological

consequences of disasters; then learning about and experiencing types of interventions that can help people cope with consequences of disasters, such as grief, complicated bereavement, and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD); and finally, investigating academic program content and syllabi dealing with these issues, and debating and planning how such programs can be introduced.

Workshop Goals and Expected Outcomes

The third workshop was designed to build on and extend the training of ways to treat bereavement (theoretical orientation and hands-on practical training) started in Workshop 2. In addition, there was to be a special focus on curriculum development in the Caucasus region related to the causes and consequences of bereavement, including course implementation and evaluation. The terms of reference for the third workshop in the Caucasus series are given in the introduction and background sections of this report. With regard to specific goals for this workshop, these were:

1. To continue and extend the in-field training started in Workshop 2.
2. To address the issue of curriculum development with institutions of further education in the south Caucasus region.
3. To involve scientists from the Caucasus region in the planning and delivery of the workshop.

Expected outcomes centred mainly on developing the skills and awareness of psychologists from the three Caucasus countries involved (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan) concerning dealing with trauma in individuals following disasters, whether natural or the result of human action, such as war; on invoking curriculum change to increase future capacity in the region; and on establishing Georgia as the hub for future capacity-building - vis à vis the training of psychologists in handling trauma following disasters - within the Caucasus and Central Asia regions.

Implementation

Planning Group: As for the 2009 and 2010 workshops, the organising team for the

2011 Workshop was led by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen (as President of IUPsyS and Head of the Department of Developmental Psychology and Director of the Center for Applied Developmental Science, University of Jena, Germany) and Professor Wolfgang Miltner (Head of the Department of Clinical and Biological Psychology, University of Jena, Germany). Dr. Martin Obschonka (University of Jena, Germany) and Dr Verona Christmas-Best (University of Jena, Germany) made up the rest of the organising team in Germany. As this workshop was scheduled to be held in the Caucasus region (in Tbilisi, Georgia), we also had a local organizer, Professor Tea Gogotishvili from Tbilisi State University, Head, Psychological Counselling and Training Centre at the Patriarchate of Georgia, and Director of the D. Uznadze Georgian Psychological Society (www.geopsys.ge).

Recruitment of participants: As for the previous workshop, in order to identify participants for the new workshop we first informed former participants by sending them a letter of invitation giving an overview of the workshop and details of the target audience. In general, the workshop was seen as being of interest to doctoral students, post-docs, and more senior scientists involved in any academic psychology program, especially if it covered the topic of treatment of bereavement from a broad interventionist perspective, but of particular importance to those involved in clinical psychology and related fields, such as developmental and social psychology. Participants were expected to be normally resident in Georgia, Armenia or Azerbaijan, to be willing to attend and participate in the whole workshop, and to present a poster on their current research and empirical work to their fellow participants and faculty. They were also asked to forward the workshop information to other psychologists in their country working in the field of clinical psychology and related fields.

As this workshop also had the focus of curriculum development, the local organizer was asked to approach senior faculty and administrators of higher education institutions in the region with regard to participating in a

'Round Table' that would discuss the issue of curriculum change.

The applications received resulted in a database of well over 50 possible candidates from Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia working and/or studying in the field. Applications were only considered once a CV and abstract of their work had been received. It should be noted here that the deadline for receipt of applications had to be extended for one week, and reminders had to be sent concerning the deadline due to an initial slow response; most applications were received in the week following the first official deadline.

Selection was based on goodness of fit between an applicant's area of research interest and the aims of the workshop, as well as the quality and suitability of the abstract and CV. In total, the organizers invited 31 applicants to take part in the workshop. Selection also aimed at ensuring a balance across the three countries within the workshop with regard to number of participants from each country, to gender, and to academic status. Of the successful applicants, just over 42% (14) had not participated in either the first or second workshop.

Recruitment of faculty: As for previous workshops, faculty members were chosen for their international renown, this time as experts in the field of psychotherapy, clinical psychology, developmental psychology, public health, and curriculum development, including course evaluation. As always, not everyone invited initially was able to participate. At the end of the invitation process, the following agreed to participate as faculty: Andreas Beelman, University of Jena, Germany; Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota, USA; Elana Newman, University of Tulsa, USA; Susanne Schaal, University of Konstanz, Germany; Michael Stevens, Illinois State University, USA; Hansjörg Znoj, University of Bern, Switzerland.

Professors Rainer K. Silbereisen, University of Jena, Germany, Wolfgang Miltner, University of Jena, Germany, and Tea Gogotishvili, Tbilisi State University and the Patriarchate of Georgia, were also faculty members.

Financial resources: As for the two preceding workshops and as noted in the introduction, funding for this workshop was largely met by the German Exchange Service (DAAD) following a formal grant proposal submitted by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen in November, 2010 – directly following the second workshop. As the DAAD funds could only be used to support participants and faculty from the Caucasus region and from Germany, additional funding was again (as for previous workshops) requested from and granted by IUPsyS as part of its capacity-building program. The University of Jena also supported the organisation of the workshop by providing staff and office facilities in Jena, and the University of Tbilisi and the Patriarchate of Georgia provided local support though the services of Professor Tea Gogotishvili. The Georgian Psychological Society also aided the functioning of the workshop by setting up accounts and handling local expenditure.

Plans for evaluating activities: An evaluation procedure was built into the workshop. Upon acceptance of their application, participants were sent a specially designed pre-workshop evaluation questionnaire that endeavoured to capture individual expectations concerning workshop proceedings, content, delivery, and outcomes. This was returned to the Jena office, or handed in at the workshop location prior to the commencement of the workshop. Immediately following the end of the workshop, a post-workshop evaluation questionnaire, which included all items from the pre-workshop questionnaire, plus additional questions regarding participants' satisfaction in different domains and whether their goals and expectations had been fulfilled, was given to all participants. A summary of the evaluation findings is given towards the end of this report.

Difficulties encountered during planning: As this was the third workshop in the series, few difficulties were encountered concerning contacting potential participants and faculty. The location of the workshop in the region, and unfamiliarity with workshop requirements on the part of the conference centre where the workshop was to be held, did cause the Jena and local organisers some problems initially, such as

organising contracts with the hotel, arranging local transport etc., and did require a great deal more time and effort than was anticipated. However, the willingness and friendliness of all involved in Georgia meant that problems were overcome relatively easily and without any real difficulty.

Procedure

The workshop proper started on October 3, 2011 (arrival for participants was October 2; for organizers, October 1) and lasted until October 7 (departure October 8). Faculty members arrived and departed at various stages of the workshop, but the majority were in attendance from Day 1 through Day 3. It was for this reason that the poster presentations were all held either on Day 1 or Day 2 so that participants would have the benefit of feedback on their work from as many experts as possible (see workshop program attached). In all there were 30 participants from the Caucasus region, which was a substantial increase on the 24 of 2010; we had invited and expected 31, but one participant from Azerbaijan declined for family reasons shortly before the workshop took place.

Training Days: Each training day started with an introduction to the day's program and (when appropriate) a review of the previous day's proceedings. The days varied slightly depending on which faculty were present. As mentioned earlier, Days 1 and 2 were highly concentrated, each starting with a 45 minute presentation, followed by small group work on tasks set by the presenter/trainer, and concluding with poster presentations.

For the small group training sessions, participants were placed into 5 groups of 6 members based on a variety of grouping exercise to ensure random membership. In these smaller working groups, participants were asked to work on tasks, such as to evaluate a particular program or to

practice specific therapeutic methods, set by the faculty member who had acted as presenter. The working groups were joined by faculty members, although overall supervision was by the presenter/trainer. Group work was followed by a plenary session for groups to report back, present their experiences, and ask questions.

With regard to the poster presentations: overall there were four poster panels, organised as much as possible by area of research or work focus. Each participant presented their work and received feedback from the faculty member leading that session. Questions and comments were then invited from other faculty members and from other participants. The presentation of the participants' posters and the in-depth discussion their work was very well received by all involved, and the participants particularly seemed to value the advisory support that these sessions offered – so much so that all sessions overran.

On training Day 3 there were two presentations and two sessions of group work. This required an early start and resulted in a later than planned finish. However, Day 4 finished mid-afternoon to allow time for recovery and the chance to see something of the wonderful countryside and historic monuments of Georgia. Although the excursion was optional, all but a few participants



Presentation by Abigail Gewirtz, USA: Discussant, Rainer K. Silbereisen, Germany



Lilit Sargsyan, Armenia, presents her poster (Faculty members, Wolfgang Miltner, Germany, and Michael Stevens, USA, standing)

from Georgia attended. The morning of training Day 5 followed the usual schedule of presentation and group work. In the afternoon of Day 5, however, there was a complete change to normal procedure. The room layout was change from school-style to theatre-style layout in preparation for a Round Table event with invited speakers from local universities and NGOs.

Round Table

The aim here was for faculty and invited guests, who were in higher administrative positions in Georgian Universities and leading positions of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) concerned with the support of people following disasters, to present their ideas and comment on current psychology curricula needs in relation to the focus of the workshop. In particular, we wanted to hear from University administrators about the current situation in their organizations with regard to curricula provision, and about their perceived need and

willingness for change in this regard. In light of this aim, the following guests were invited to join faculty in making a short formal presentation on the theme of the Round Table, which was "The Adjustment of Psychology Curricula to Recognise National Needs: The Case of Capacity Building for Disasters and Bereavement": Alexandre Kvitashvili, Rector; Sergo Vardosanidze, Rector; Manana Gabashvili, Director; Tea Kacharava, Program Coordinator.

A number of guests were invited to comment on the presentations from the perspective of their own roles and experiences.

Unbeknown to the organisers of the workshop, or indeed to the hotel's conference organising team, plans were afoot for President Sarkozy of France to visit Georgia and to make a speech in Freedom Square, directly in front of the conference venue and at precisely the time of the Round Table. Security for the visit meant that the area for some considerable distance around the hotel was cordoned off so that our invited



Participants, Organizers and Faculty, Tbilisi

guests had great problems to access the meeting. The overall result was a delay in the start of the Round Table of almost one hour, and that two guests were unable to attend.

Following opening remarks by Rainer Silbereisen, the Rector of Tbilisi State University and the Vice Rector of St Andrew University expressed their thanks for the opportunity to participate in the Round Table discussion and highlighted their readiness to cooperate in fulfilling the aims for the workshop by reviewing and discussing the psychology curricula of their respective organisations, and by their willingness to support and be involved in post-workshop projects. They also emphasized that Georgia had made big strides over the past years and felt that it was now better able to respond positively to suggestions for change. The importance of developing psychology was recognised.

Tea Gogotishvili, the local workshop organizer, thanked the audience, the invited guests and the workshop participants, as well as IUPsyS and the DAAD for making the workshop and Round Table meeting possible. She emphasized the importance of the workshop in particular, and of capacity-building activities in general, for countries like Georgia, and stressed the extreme importance of the workshops for so many people in the Caucasus region. Particular reference was made to the opportunity the workshops had provided for meeting and working with international experts in the field, and for the feedback the participants had received regarding their own work and how to move forward. With regard to curriculum development, she felt that the workshops had provided access to examples of good practice and had raised awareness of international standards.

Other points raised by invited guests and faculty members echoed many of those already made, especially concerning the importance of meeting other

scientists and being able to talk about broadening programs related to psychosocial support for those damaged by disasters. The provision of help and support for refugees and displaced persons, including psychosocial rehabilitation, was seen as a basic right. The meeting was reminded of the importance of psychology and its potential for dealing with great problems; and of the need for strong education, which requires strong research basics that can lead to comparability and value among other scientific disciplines. Finally, there was a plea for the resources embodied in the incredibly motivated and interested young generation to be fully utilized and not neglected. The enthusiasm and engagement of the workshop participants was noted and commended by all faculty members.

In summing up before opening the discussion to the floor, Rainer Silbereisen noted that the meeting had wholeheartedly recognized the need for more qualified people with an academic background in psychological research. Turning to the young participants, he urged them to seize the rare opportunity to speak directly to the Rectors on the podium, not just for themselves but on behalf of all students. This was followed by an immediate response from the floor and an exchange with the Rector of Tbilisi State University, which lead to a



Round Table event showing invited presenters and faculty

discussion about increasing chances for exchange visits for students in MA studies involving Georgian and Armenian participants; about the involvement of psychologists from all over the world that helped Armenian psychologists after the 1988 earthquake and the desire for such quality cooperation to be reestablished in the region; and, with regard to Georgia, for the University hierarchies to raise ease of access to international research (here the absence of access to international databases, such as PsychLit and ERIC, was noted). One participant from Azerbaijan made a request for trained professionals to be sent from Tbilisi to Baku. This led to the suggestion that a summer school be organized by some of the Georgian participants, which would be a wonderful learning opportunity for them, and serve the needs of others, such as the Azerbaijan participants who had raised the issue. This idea was strongly endorsed by the Rector of TSU, who promised support if they followed up the idea with a firm proposal. Following this discussion and other comments from the audience, an interesting idea was proposed by a representative of Javakhishvili University: would the faculty participants of the Round Table agree to provide online lectures for the internet education of the university? The general agreement was that this and other similar ideas for further contact and cooperation should be followed up after the workshop.

The Round Table meeting was closed following a summary by the workshop organizers, Rainer Silbereisen and Wolfgang Miltner. Here the need for in-depth preparation by participants before research cooperation and study exchanges can take place, and for participants to have a similar background of knowledge and skills, was emphasized. But opportunities need to be created to enable young scientists in countries such as Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan to broaden their experiences and to prepare and train them for the growing challenges of psychology. Finally, it was noted that the task of any university is not to create small islands of additional education, but to develop general education to its broadest horizon, including ensuring that what it offers is methodologically up-to-date.

Evaluation

Before and after the workshop, a specially designed evaluation questionnaire that examined various aspects of the workshop experience was given to the participants. The response rate was very high: Before the workshop all participants (N = 30) filled out the questionnaire, after the workshop 96.7% of the participants (N = 29) completed the questionnaire.

Looking at the results of post-workshop evaluations we can conclude that, as was the case in the two former workshops of this series, the third workshop was very well received. All pre/post items were answered well above their respective scale mean. This applies especially to items referring to the quality of the presentations and presenters (e.g., "Instructors included recent developments in this field") and to a stimulating and supportive atmosphere (e.g., "Instructors encouraged question & discussion"). Regarding the additional items that were only included in the post-workshop evaluation, the high level of satisfaction with the workshop is again obvious. For example, participants were very satisfied with the supervised group activities, and also rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop as very high (M = 4.76). The excellent evaluation of the workshop is also reflected in the strong fulfilment of own expectations (M = 4.48).

From the open-ended items in the post-conference evaluation, it is evident that the practical training in small groups and the poster presentation sessions were deemed to be particular highlights of this year's workshop.

Publicity and Dissemination of Information concerning the Workshop

The proceedings of the workshop have been well documented and publicized quite widely. First, the DAAD interviewed Rainer K. Silbereisen about the workshop series in general and about the third workshop in particular. A transcript of this interview was published in the new DAAD brochure (in German) on its Conflict Prevention Program (more information on the DAAD, its mission and its work can be found at: www.daad.de/portrait/wer-wir-sind/kurzportrait/08940).

en.html) and an English translation of the article can be found on the IUPsyS website by going to www.iupsys.net/images/announcements/1101-daad-rks-interview.pdf. During the Round Table, both Georgian TV and newspapers were present, and the German Embassy in Tbilisi requested a short report for its 06/2011 Newsletter; a short report has also appeared in the Newsletter 04/2011 of the Jena Graduate School "Human Behaviour in Social and Economic Change" (GSBC). An interview between Rainer K. Silbereisen and the Press Office of the University of Jena concerning the IUPsyS capacity building workshops and the Caucasus region was also held in November and will be published early in the New Year.

Plans for Follow-up

A fourth workshop is planned. This aims to disseminate insights from the three capacity building workshops, 2009 – 2011, to countries in Central Asia that were not involved so far. Building on expertise gained, and supported by the long-term partnership (since 1966) of Tbilisi State University with the University of Jena, as well as by its membership of IUPsyS, the aim is for Georgia to act as regional hub for this and other subsequent capacity building activities in the region. A proposal for the workshop has been submitted to the DAAD. If funding is granted, it is anticipated that the workshop will take place in Tbilisi, Georgia in October 2012. Attempts to make contact in the region are already underway.
