

BUILDING INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY IN THE
ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

**Report on the
5th International Workshop on Psychological Intervention after Disasters**

Manila, The Philippines, November 14 – 17, 2016

Organized by

International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS)

ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ICSU ROAP)

Integrated Research on Disaster Risk, International Centre of Excellence (IRDR-ICoE)

Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Diliman

Center for Applied Developmental Science (CADS), University of Jena

Partners

Chinese Psychological Society (CPS)

United Nations University International Institute for Global Health (UNU-IIGH)



**INTERNATIONAL
COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE**
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC



IRDR ICoE
Integrated Research on Disaster Risk
International Centre of Excellence



CADS
CENTER FOR APPLIED DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE



中国心理学会
Chinese Psychological Society



**UNITED NATIONS
UNIVERSITY**
UNU-IIGH
International Institute
for Global Health

Peace and progress are two core elements for the sustainable development of the world and can be said to underpin the strategic plans of the International Union for Science (ICSU). A major target of such efforts of science and society are natural and human-induced disasters that have grown in frequency and impact worldwide. The International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS), an organization devoted to the development, representation and advancement of psychology as a basic and applied science nationally, regionally, and internationally, pursues the optimization of human potential by scientific research, evidence-based intervention, advice for social policy, and capacity building. Workshops to train academically qualified young scholars and practitioners to deal with the aftermath of such disasters have proven to be a worthwhile way to deal with the issue. The target group has an advanced degree (MA or PhD) in psychology or allied fields. Under the leadership of the Union's Past President, Rainer K. Silbereisen (University of Jena, Germany), the Union has already run four capacity building workshops in Asia beginning in 2012, supported by funds from the Chinese Association for Science and Technology (CAST) through the Chinese Psychological Society (CPS), ICSU and IUPsyS, and the Jacobs Foundation. In-kind support was provided by the Center for Applied Developmental Science (CADS), Friedrich-Schiller University, Jena and the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ICSU ROAP).

In November 2016, a fifth workshop in the series, titled Building Individual and Organizational Capacity for Psychological Intervention After Disasters in the Asia and Pacific Region, was held in Manila, Philippines. The Academy of Science located in Taipei provided the core funding for the workshop through its programme on Integrated Research on Disaster Risk at the International Center of Excellence which is housed at the Center for Sustainability Science. Additional support was provided by the United Nations University International Institute for Global Health (UNU-IIGH), and the Chinese Psychological Society. As in previous years, in-kind support was provided by ICSU ROAP and CADS. Obviously we were able to keep old supporters on board and to attract new sources of financial and in-kind support.



Background of the workshop

Following 4 successful workshops in 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015, which were held in Beijing and Mianyang, China, and Taipei, the 2016 workshop focused on young scientists and scientist-practitioners in psychology and allied fields from the Asia and Pacific region. The emphasis on Asia is based on several factors. First, the four billion people residing in the region form 60% of the world's population, and in the last decade alone, 41% of the natural disasters around the world occurred in this region, bringing severe and indescribable damage, loss of life, and hardship. Second, the majority of countries in this region lack advanced infrastructure or responsive rescue systems, meaning that help is typically concentrated on addressing physical and infrastructural devastation with less attention paid to effects on individuals, especially of psychological adversity. People impacted by disasters need help to deal with the traumatic experiences associated with the events, including, but not limited to the loss of close relatives, significant property and/or environmental loss, physical injury, displacement, and other stressors. The effects on psychological health, which can be long-lasting, are known to vary with age and other demographic characteristics, reflecting differences in cognitive capabilities and other resources to deal with the challenges of a disaster. Here the concept of resilience is a potentially powerful asset in understanding responses to disaster: the degree of resilience to stressors depends on both individual and social factors within a particular region, so that it is important to be mindful of the cultural and infrastructural context of disasters.

Focus of the Workshop. The workshop delivered international scientific and applied expertise to help researchers, educators and practitioners from Asia to have a better understanding of, and ability to respond to the mental health consequences of disasters in the region, based on recent scientific evidence on factors influencing the short and long-term psychosocial reactions. The focus was on events that have a tremendous negative impact on large sections of the population in the affected area, such as natural catastrophes, warfare or pandemics. The workshop also set out to address particular populations that have been relatively overlooked in this regard, namely, children and adolescents. As well as focusing on the science needed to enhance the relevance of psychological intervention, it also sought to increase the capacity for sustained theoretical and applied research in the Asia and Pacific regions. In summary, the workshop had the following aims:

1. Present participants with the most recent scientific and applied scientific knowledge and evidence relevant for psychological intervention after disasters;
2. Show the opportunities and constraints of working with particular target groups, such as children and adolescents;

3. Offer relevant knowledge for education and training in academic programs of psychology;
4. Help develop a regional network of researchers and practitioners to support continued scientific knowledge dissemination and training in mental health support following disaster.

Overall, the workshop set out to use existing IUPsyS experience and its access to international scientific and applied expertise on resilience in the face of stressful and traumatic events to help researchers, educators and practitioners in the Asia and the Pacific. The aim was to increase their ability to understand and develop response to mental health consequences of disasters.

Implementation

Planning Group

The workshop organizing team was led by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen (Past President of IUPsyS, Research Professor at the University of Jena, Germany), by Professor Mohd Nordin Hasan (Director at the International Council for Science Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific), and Professors Ly Sycip and Cecilia Conaco of the Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Diliman, and Professor Candice Lung (Director of International Programmes, Center for Sustainability Science, Academia Sinica). Colleagues from ICSU ROAP, IRDR-ICoE, the Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Diliman, the Chinese Psychological Society, and UNU-IIGH assisted in the conduct of the workshop.

Recruitment of participants

Calls for participation in the workshop were disseminated widely to IUPsyS National Members, ICSU National Members, regional psychological associations and university medical and psychological departments, and first authors of relevant scientific journal publications. The call described the workshop and provided logistics information that would enable potential participants to decide on its relevance to their work. The target groups of the workshop were

- (1) Researchers, educators, and practitioners with an academic background, primarily in psychology, who were interested and experienced in psychological work on disasters,
- (2) Psychologists who work with particular groups, such as children and adolescents,
- (3) Young and early career scientists from Asia-Pacific countries working in the field,
- (4) Select attendees of previous workshops. Only participants from Asia-Pacific were encouraged to apply, residency in a country of the region was expected.

Potential participants were asked to confirm their willingness to attend and participate in the entire workshop, and to present a poster on their current research or other related empirical work to fellow participants and workshop faculty.

Applications were received from 36 possible candidates from: Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Nepal, New Zealand, Philippines, and Sri Lanka. Applications were only considered once a CV, a completed application form and an abstract of the poster the potential participant would present at the workshop had been received. Selection was based on goodness of fit between an applicants' area of research/application interest and the aims of the workshop, suitability of their proposed poster presentation and their CV. Of those applicants shortlisted to be invited, 17 were selected and invited to participate while the remainder were kept in reserve. By special consideration, a participant from the Philippines who attended the workshop held in 2014 in Mianyang (China) accepted to attend the workshop. In addition to the participants selected, 6 observers from the psychological research and education community in the Philippines were invited as observers. They participated in all presentations and discussions but were not required to prepare and make a poster presentation. These observers were selected by the Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Diliman in association with the Psychological Association of the Philippines, and represented early career scientists most likely to benefit by attending the workshop

It was also expected that this workshop would further the longer-term plans of IUPsyS and its partners towards meeting the need for enhanced capacity for evidence-based planning and management of psychological intervention after disaster in Asia and in the establishment of a regional network of researchers.

Recruitment of faculty

As for previous workshops, faculty members were chosen based on their international reputation, as experts in the field of resilience, psychological and social impact of disaster, post-traumatic psychological studies and social science research methodology. At the end of the search process, the following scientists agreed to participate as core faculty:

Professor Klaus Boehnke, Jacobs University, Bremen, Germany

Professor Yiqun Gan, Peking University, Beijing, China

Professor Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota, USA

Professor Joop de Jong, VU University

Professor Douglas Paton, Charles Darwin University, Australia

Professor Motoaki Sugiura, Tohoku University, Japan

Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen. University of Jena, Germany, led the faculty as in the past

Professor Paton was unable to attend the workshop because of a last minute conflict in duties at Charles Darwin University. His presentation in the workshop in 2015 was used as replacement and the Q & A session was conducted via a Skype link with him in Australia.

Financial resources



The workshop was supported by core funding from the IRDR-ICoE Taipei, with funds received from IUPsyS and the UNU IIGH. The University of the Philippines provided some funds and in-kind support through the staff and students of its Department of Psychology. The Chinese Psychological Society provided travel grants for all participants from China. The Psychological Association of the Philippines also provided in-kind support to the workshop. ICSU ROAP provided overall management and operations of the workshop including the arrangement of international travel of all participants, accommodation arrangements and arrangement of logistic support for local travel and board. Further, funded by IUPsyS the CADS delegated a sociologist and specialist (Thomas Ritter, MA) to produce video documentaries on workshops and congresses. The aim was to develop educational and promotional materials based on the workshop series.

Evaluation of the workshop

As with past workshops, an explicit evaluation procedure was built into the workshop. Upon confirming their participation, 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 Organisers electronically, 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 full evaluation report can be found in Appendix 1.

Workshop Procedure

The workshop started on November 14 (arrival for participants was November 13) and lasted until November 17 (departure November 18). Each day started with an introduction to the day's program and (when appropriate) a review of the previous day's proceedings. Faculty members arrived and departed at various stages of the workshop, but the majority was in attendance from Day-1 through Day-4. Poster presentations of the participants were held on Days 1, 2 and 4. In this way, participants would have the benefit of feedback on their work from as many experts as possible. For full details of each day's schedule, see the workshop program attached (Appendix 2).



Professor Silbereisen was unable to participate in the workshop on short notice due to medical reasons. His role as workshop lead was subsumed by Professor Abigail Gewirtz.





In the opening session, Dr Margaret Helen Udarbe-Alvarez, President, Psychological Association of the Philippines welcomed participants on behalf of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS),



Dr Ying Chen Lin, Science Officer of International Programs, Center for Sustainability Science, The Academy in Taipei – Integrated Research on Disaster Risk Programme, International Centre of Excellence (IRDR ICoE- Taipei),



Professor Nordin Hasan, Director, International Council for Science Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ICSU ROAP),

Professor Grace Aguilung-Dalisay, Dean, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman, welcomed all faculty members and participants and spoke on behalf of the organizing and collaborating organizations.



The first presentation of Day 1 was by Professor de Jong on how we address the psychological needs of large populations exposed to severe traumatic stressors, utilizing a public mental health approach. He presented how a culturally responsive public mental health model may inform prevention and care with populations exposed to traumatic stressors, both in high-income countries (HIC) and in

low-income countries (LIC). Public mental health was defined as protecting, promoting and restoring

the mental health of a population rather than an individual. The principles of public mental health were explained in a series of steps. First, what kind of information does a post-disaster interventionist need to set up a mental health program? How does he or she select priorities in the field? How do these priorities lead to interventions aimed at prevention, resilience, and professional competencies? The lecture then explained that universal primary prevention has much to win by distilling and addressing key predictors of ill health that show striking similarity with the determinants of disaster and war including poverty and marginalization. He then gave an overview of the appalling state of affairs in global mental health. It mentioned several challenges that we have to overcome to improve this situation including:

- (1) Practice the primary care principles of Alma Ata by pooling and sharing resources instead of competing with other interventionists.
- (2) Shifting from individual psychological resilience to ecological resilience involving diverse actors at the level of the community.
- (3) Understand the cultural critique of PTSD versus the huge variety of other expressions of distress across the globe. Although PTSD construct has universal validity, it has limited ecological utility around the globe.
- (4) Learning to address the mental health gap after disasters including community, lay and healers' resources. This implies that psychologists become team players liaising with other professionals in health and education, economy, governance, military, and human rights.
- (5) How to learn to think in terms of health systems and their complexity after disasters.
- (6) How to develop additional competencies as psychologists that are important in post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction.
- (7) How to adapt our psychological stress models to the complexity of post-disaster settings taking for example daily stressors, family dysfunction, personal traits, social systems and parental mental health into account.



The second presentation of Day 1 by Professor Boehnke discussed first that from the point of view of study design, disasters are natural quasi-experiments because people who were not randomly assigned to a given treatment, namely the disaster. In order to assess the long-term consequences of such a treatment, it is necessary to compare victims before and after the

disaster, and compare them to non-victims from a similar context at a time before and after the disaster happened to victims. As contexts cannot be held constant in natural field experiments, their impact also needs to be assessed; bearing in mind that different contexts can change at a different pace and that victims and non-victims can be affected differentially at different individual ages and at different times in history. Based on these design considerations, he strongly advocated resorting to multi-site secondary data-analytic studies, because only studies that also include data from before the disasters will allow for an assessment of what was brought about by the disaster and what had other causes, or would have happened anyway. Randomized trials with multiple follow-ups that are organized with disaster victims only, are able to facilitate decisions on what helps disaster victims best, but they cannot assess, what are the long-term consequences of the disaster itself. Second, Boehnke used own data from an ongoing longitudinal study of peace movement activists and sympathizers first studied in the mid-1980s to illustrate statistical analyses of long-term longitudinal studies. He introduced workshop participants to latent growth modeling first with manifest variables and at the end very briefly with latent variables, something very rarely reported in the pertinent literature. In subsequent group work participants were motivated to brainstorm, where and how, in their countries and in other countries for comparison, they could obtain multiple individual-level repeated measures data from before and after a given disaster. School archives were identified as a powerful data source for this by several participants. Further, Boehnke re-convened participants in order to technically show them the use of latent growth modeling using AMOS under SPSS. Finally, he pledged availability for individual advice after the workshop.

On the second day, Professor Gewirtz gave Professor Silbereisen's talk. The history and aims of the workshop were described, and participants were provided information on the prevalence of natural hazards and disasters on a global scale. Core concepts used in disaster research and field work, such as hazard, exposure, and vulnerability were clarified. Information was provided on the role of social

and behavioural science in studying this field that is typically characterized by the effects of complex interactions between ecological and social challenges on human behaviour and psychosocial development. Recent theoretical concepts and empirical studies carried out by psychologists and allied researchers were highlighted which shed new light on the pathways through which natural hazards and disasters have short-term and long-term effects on behaviour and development of affected populations. This was illustrated with a few ‘hotspots’ of relevant research. Finally, exemplary lessons for adequate training and science communication were characterized which reflected the outline of the workshop activities.

International Union
of Psychological Science



CADS
Center for Applied Developmental Science

Disasters: Core Topics and Concepts of Psychological Research and Application

Rainer K. Silbereisen
University of Jena, Germany

5th International Workshop on Psychological Intervention after
Disasters

November 14-17, 2016, Manila, Philippines

www.iupsys.net



The presentation by Professor Abigail Gewirtz also on Day 2 provided an introduction to family-focused prevention and intervention research after disasters. She highlighted the importance of theory-based interventions, and the stages of prevention research, and reviewed research on theory-based, empirically-supported parenting programmes (Parent Management Training, Oregon Model) and its modification for families affected by traumatic stress. The development of a model to promote parenting in families affected by traumatic stress was described as a prototype for how to develop and test a theoretically- and empirically-based preventive intervention. Evidence for the effectiveness of the model with families affected by war and other disasters was presented, along with key elements of the programme, and efforts at widespread implementation around the world, in both developed and developing countries.



The presentation by Professor Gan on Day 3 reported a series of research on the endeavours to advance the model of meaning making, namely, on how to engage in an effective meaning making, which benefited more from meaning making, and what are the cognitive outcomes of meaning making, all with reference to coping with disasters. First, future focus and expressive suppression techniques were proved to be effective in enhancing meaning in life using experimental studies. Second, meaning making was demonstrated to be especially effective among individuals with low resilience in a longitudinal survey and candidate genes for resilience were proposed. Third, a directed-forgetting task and cognitive words in expressive writing were used to construct cognitive representations of the “meaning made”. Finally, these results were summarized by a protocol for group-based trauma interventions, which proved to be effective by a randomized control trial. The findings from China were discussed in terms of factors that facilitate meaning making and resilience in Eastern cultures, highlighting especially the effects of expressive suppression and to what extent resilience could be improved through interventions.



The video presentation by Professor Douglas Paton on Day 3 compared the social, community, psychological and societal perspectives on earthquake recovery between New Zealand and Taiwan. It drew on research conducted during the recovery phases of the 2011 Christchurch (New Zealand) earthquake and the 1999, 921-earthquake in Taiwan. By conducting research during periods when people were actively confronting recovery and reconstructions issues, it becomes possible to more clearly identify what peoples (individually and collectively) had to contend with and what helped or hindered their ability to do so. His presentation outlined how this work identified a need for readiness (preparedness/prevention) to be subdivided into functional categories and discussed how the different roles that personal, family, community, cultural and societal resources played in facilitating people’s ability to adapt to recovery and reconstruction issues. It also discussed how the opportunities this affords to assess the validity and

DRR readiness theories and how DRR warning and readiness strategies can be developed. It further drew on recent work on applying the “Build Back Better” (BBB) and “Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development” (LRRD) concepts to discuss ways of integrating disaster recovery and the development of community capacity.



The presentation by Professor Sugiura on Day 4 gave an overview of his research on "The power to live," - advantageous personal characteristics for survival in disasters. By summarizing the opinions of survivors of the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake disaster, the following eight major factors of the power to live were identified: leadership, problem solving ability, altruism, stubbornness, etiquette, emotional regulation, self-transcendence, and active well-being. In the workshop, potential application on the inventory in the cross-cultural setting and future research directions including neuroscience were discussed.

Following each presentation, the plenum of participants engaged in question and answer sessions with the presenters. It subsequently broke out into 3 groups of 4 to 5 participants to discuss 3 key questions about the subject posed by the presenters after the question and answer sessions. The break-out groups were joined by faculty members, although overall supervision was by the presenter/trainer. Group work was followed by a plenary session when groups presented their responses to the questions from the presenters. These discussions were especially lively because participants related the topics to their own professional experiences.





With regard to the poster presentations: overall there were 4 poster sessions, each session organized by area of research or work focus. Each participant presented their work and received feedback from fellow participants and the faculty member leading that session. Questions and comments were then invited from other faculty members and other participants. The presentation of the participants' posters, and the in-depth discussion of their work, was generally well received by all involved-

On the evening of the third day, Dr Regina Hechanova of Ateneo de Manila University gave a much appreciated invited lecture entitled Resistance, Resilience and Recovery: Southeast Asian Perspectives.



Future Directions

As in all prior workshops of this series the recruitment of the “right” participants was a real challenge. This time we approached the IUPsyS National Member organizations, academic and professional institutions of relevance in the target area, first authors of recent journal papers on disaster topics, and people individually known to the faculty in the role of multipliers. The target group of academically trained people at an early career stage with background in psychology and affiliated fields (either at universities and colleges with relevant programs or at institutions aiming at intervention related to disasters) was deliberately chosen and is part and parcel of the program. This

group as such is not large in the target region, and it becomes even smaller if one insists on a research orientation, either realized in past training and current activity, or at least as intention and opportunity. Further, such a target group cannot be homogeneous in academic and professional background, and is not equivalent to existing work groups.

From the perspective of research and intervention in the disaster field, the main issue addressed in the workshop series is the rather low level of knowledge, training and experience compared to the state of recent psychological science. Accepting better prepared participants reduced the number of participants from the target group but the outcome was more satisfying, with more robust discussion and learning experiences compared to some past workshop experiences. The participants have since established an electronic discussion group coordinated by the Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Diliman. The goals of the workshop were achieved in various ways, depending on the participants' background. In the past, some participants teamed up for further education and training with other more experienced participants as mentors (e.g., in PhD programs), other participants established shorter or longer advisory relationships with faculty (sometimes this turned into a symmetric research collaboration, sometimes it was restricted to debates about curriculum designs). At this time it is not yet known what exactly will happen after the 2016 workshop. The heterogeneity of the participants in academic and professional background, occupational position within their organization, and country of origin with its particular welfare system, actually represents strength of the workshop series due to the opportunities for learning from the diversity of experiences and challenges of disasters. On the other hand this same heterogeneity presents an obstacle to the development of a sustainable structure for exchange.

The aims of IUPsyS in the disaster field reflect its role as the international voice and organization of psychological science. Over many years, workshop offerings and sending of specialist advisors vis-à-vis disasters were funded (e.g., the 2004 South Asian tsunami or the 2013 Typhoon Yolanda in the Philippines), but there was no orchestrated effort like the current workshop series until 2009. The goal was capacity building with a special emphasis on the young generation of academically trained and research minded psychologist interested and/or working in the disaster field, by offering them unique opportunities to meet their peers in other countries and learn from interaction with international faculty specialized in innovative concepts and methodologies of disaster research and intervention. These measures were targeted to the individual participants. Although indirectly this also implied some organizational capacity building for their home organizations, the latter was not the main aim but a welcome side effect (IUPsyS offers other organizational capacity building measures, such as help in the development of regional psychology organizations, like CANPA, the Caribbean

Alliance of National Psychological Associations, formed after a 2011 Regional Conference under the auspices of IUPsyS).

The current leadership of IUPsyS has characterized this workshop series as a jewel among the offerings of IUPsyS to science and application, and there is certainly the will to go on with this or similar endeavours of science based training for research and application, for instance in fields that are covered by the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations. As a first step in further disseminating the results and making it broadly available, IUPsyS offers on its website (<http://www.iupsys.net/events/capacity-building-workshops/>) videos of all presentations of the Taipei and the Manila workshop, plus a promotional video that showcases the overarching aims, particular contributions, and organization of the workshop series, including some statements by participants on their experience. Plans exist to hold a final workshop in 2017, again utilizing the established collaboration, with the aim of bringing together select participants and faculty from all the workshops, offering them an update of recent research and application on the PIAD themes, and concluding this by a Special Section in the International Journal of Psychology and/or a book in an IUPsyS sponsored series.

Evaluation

Before and after the workshop, a specially designed quantitative evaluation questionnaire that examined various aspects of the workshop experience was given to the participants. In all, 16 participants filled out the pre- and post-workshop questionnaires. The pre-workshop questionnaire comprised 20 items to be answered on a 5-point Likert scale (1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”). Topics of the questionnaire were expectations regarding the various workshop objectives, the instructors and their presentations. All items from the pre-workshop questionnaire were used in the post-workshop questionnaire in addition to additional questions regarding the satisfaction in different domains and whether one’s goals and expectations were fulfilled. In total, the post-workshop questionnaire comprised 31 items. Note that we used slightly different wording with regard to the pre- and post-workshop questionnaires. Whereas the pre-workshop items dealt with the expectation and wishes of the participants (e.g., “Instructors should encourage differing points of view”), the post-workshop items dealt with the actual fulfilment of their wishes (e.g., “Instructors have encouraged differing points of view”). Please refer to Table 1 for an overview about the items used in the evaluation.

Judging by the mean levels of the pre-workshop items, the greatest expectations of the participants referred to opportunities for intensive learning and adequate communication at a high level (e.g., Lectures, discussion and activities relevant to workshop objectives; Instructors helped clarify difficult materials; Instructors encourage differing points of view; Instructors display a thorough knowledge of the subject matter). Taken together, all items were answered well above their scale mean and ranged between $M = 4.13$ and $M = 4.81$ indicating no great variation in the high expectations concerning specific workshop details.

From the results of post-workshop evaluations, we can conclude that the workshop was well received. As can be seen in Table 1, all pre/post items were again answered well above their respective scale mean, and often even higher. This applies especially to items referring to the intellectual input and atmosphere. Due to technical reasons (ceiling effect, regression toward the mean) the differences are overall small. None of the differences were statistically significant

Regarding the additional items that were only included in the post-workshop evaluation, the high level of satisfaction of the workshop is obvious. The participants rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop organization as quite high ($M = 4.63$). The judgment concerning the group work after faculty presentations was high throughout. Finally, the good reception of the workshop is also reflected in the strong fulfilment of own expectations ($M = 4.69$) and goals (4.56).

To conclude, the evaluation of the workshop indicates that the workshop was, in the eyes of the participants, very successful and effective in meeting their high expectations. This view applied to all previous workshops as well. These evaluation results thereby confirm the positive overall impressions of the organizing team and the faculty members.

Table 1

		<i>M (SD)</i> Pre (Expectations)	<i>M (SD)</i> Post (Evaluations)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Lectures, discussion and activities were relevant to workshop objectives	4.81(.40)	4.56(.51)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors displayed a thorough knowledge of the subject matter	4.56(.51)	4.69(.48)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors included recent developments in this field	4.75(.45)	4.63(.62)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors provided useful factual knowledge and demonstrate content competence	4.56(.51)	4.63(.50)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors related course material to practical situations	4.63(.50)	4.50(.63)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors discussed topic in sufficient depths	4.56(.63)	4.50(.52)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors demonstrated the significance of workshop topics	4.44(.73)	4.69(.48)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Workshop encouraged understanding of concepts and principles	4.69(.60)	4.81(.40)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors clarified the relationships among various topics covered in the workshop	4.44(.63)	4.50(.63)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors distinguished between major & minor topics	4.13(.72)	4.38(.72)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors related the subject matter to actual situations	4.63(.62)	4.56(.63)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors presented examples to clarify abstract concepts	4.38(.72)	4.38(.72)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors integrated lectures, break-out groups and other assignments	4.63(.62)	4.69(.48)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors used a variety of teaching techniques	4.38(.72)	4.06(.85)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors maintained an atmosphere which actively encouraged thinking and learning	4.63(.50)	4.75(.58)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors selected relevant examples	4.56(.51)	4.44(.63)

[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors communicated his/her subject matter well	4.56(.63)	4.69(.48)
e / Post] ¹	Instructors encouraged questions & discussion	4.63(.50)	4.75(.45)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors encouraged differing points of view	4.63(.50)	4.63(.72)
[Pre / Post] ¹	Instructors helped clarify difficult material	4.69(.48)	4.50(.52)
[Post]	Overall satisfaction with the group work after <u>Boehnke</u> talk	/	4.50(.63)
[Post]	Overall satisfaction with the group work after <u>Sugiura</u> talk	/	4.56(.63)
[Post]	Overall satisfaction with the group work after <u>Gewirtz</u> talk	/	4.63(.62)
[Post]	Overall satisfaction with the group work after <u>de Jong</u> talk	/	4.94(.25)
[Post]	Overall satisfaction with workshop organization	/	4.63(.62)
[Post]	The workshop met my expectation	/	4.69(.60)
[Post]	I learned things I did not expect to learn	/	4.50(.73)
[Post]	I learned a lot from other participants	/	4.50(.73)
[Post]	Everyone had a chance to participate	/	4.63(.50)
[Post]	I will be able to apply what I learned	/	4.56(.51)
[Post]	My personal goals of attending the workshop have been fulfilled	/	4.56(.63)

¹ wording for post-workshop evaluation shown; wording for pre-workshop same content but referring to expectations.

Note: *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation

Answering scales: Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, No opinion = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5

Appendix 2

Under separate cover.

WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

November 13 (Sunday): Arrivals

Evening	Registration at hotel lobby upon arrival until 19:00
---------	--

November 14 (Monday): Workshop Day 1

All Workshop Sessions at Hotel Jen Manila, Embassy Ballroom, Level 2

08:00 – 08:30	Registration at workshop venue
08:30 – 09:00	<p>Opening and Welcome Addresses</p> <p>Dr Margaret Helen Udarbe-Alvarez, President, Psychological Association of the Philippines on behalf of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS)</p> <p>Professor Nordin Hasan, Director, International Council for Science Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ICSU ROAP)</p> <p>Professor Grace Aguilng-Dalisay, Dean, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman</p>
09:00 – 09:15	Introduction to Day 1 : Professor Klaus Boehnke
09:15 – 10:00	<p>Presentation 1: Professor Joop de Jong <i>PUBLIC MENTAL HEALTH AS THE PARADIGM FOR MASS TRAUMA INTERVENTION</i></p>
10:00 – 10:30	Q&A, Discussion
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee/Tea/Refreshments
10:45 – 12:15	Breakout groups
12:15 – 12:45	Plenary – reporting back, discussion
12:45 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 14:45	<p>Presentation 2: Professor Klaus Boehnke <i>DISASTERS AS A SOURCE OF PERSONAL GROWTH? INSIGHTS FROM LONGITUDINAL RESEARCH</i></p>
14:45 – 15:15	Q&A, Discussion
15:15 – 16:45	Breakout groups

**5TH INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON
PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION AFTER DISASTERS**

16:45 – 17:15	Plenary – reporting back, discussion
17:15 – 18:15	Poster Presentations (Group A) [5 minute presentation of poster and 10 minutes discussion per poster]
18:15 – 18:30	Summary of Day 1: Professor Klaus Boehnke
19:30	Welcome Dinner hosted by the University of the Philippines, Diliman

November 15 (Tuesday): Workshop Day 2

09:00 – 09:15	Introduction to Day 2: Professor Motoaki Sugiura
09:15 – 10:00	IUPsyS Introduction to the workshop series – Professor Abigail Gewirtz on behalf of Professor Rainer Silbereisen DISASTERS: CORE TOPICS AND CONCEPTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND APPLICATION
10:00 – 10:30	Q&A, Discussion
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee/Tea/Refreshments
11:00 – 11:45	Presentation 3: Professor Abigail Gewirtz PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION RESEARCH WITH CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AFTER DISASTERS
11:45 – 12:15	Q&A, Discussion
12:15 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:30	Breakout groups
15:30 – 16:00	Plenary – reporting back, discussion
16:00 – 16:15	Coffee/Tea/Refreshments
16:15 – 17:45	Poster Presentations (Group B)
17:45 – 18:00	Summary of Day 2: Prof Motoaki Sugiura



November 16 (Wednesday): Workshop Day 3

09:00 – 09:15	Introduction to Day 3: Professor Abigail Gewirtz
09:15 – 10:00	Presentation 4: Professor Yiqun Gan <i>COPING WITH DISASTER BY ENHANCING MEANING IN LIFE AND RESILIENCE</i>
10:00 – 10:30	Q&A, Discussion
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee/Tea/Refreshments
10:45 – 12:15	Breakout groups
12:15 – 13:00	Plenary – reporting back, discussion
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 14:45	Presentation 5 (Video): Professor Douglas Paton <i>FROM DISASTER RECOVERY TO DISASTER RISK REDUCTION: SOME CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES</i>
14:45 – 15:15	Q&A, Discussion
15:15 – 16:45	Breakout Groups
16:45 – 17:30	Plenary – reporting back, discussion
17:30 – 18:10	Guest Lecture: Dr. Regina Hechanova, Ateneo de Manila University
18:10 – 18:30	Summary of Day 3 : Professor Abigail Gerwitz
19:30	Dinner hosted by ICSU ROAP

November 17 (Thursday): Workshop Day 4

09:00 – 09:15	Introduction to Day 4: Professor Joop de Jong
09:15 – 10:00	Presentation 6: Professor Motoaki Sugiura <i>EIGHT PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH THE POWER TO LIVE WITH DISASTERS AS INDICATED BY SURVIVORS OF THE 2011 GREAT EAST JAPAN EARTH-QUAKE DISASTER</i>
10:00 – 10:30	Q&A, Discussion
10:30 – 10:45	Coffee/Tea/Refreshments
10:45 – 12:15	Breakout groups
12:15 – 12:45	Plenary – reporting back, discussion

**5TH INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON
PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION AFTER DISASTERS**

12:45 – 14:00	Lunch
14:00 – 15:15	Poster Presentations (Group C)
15:15 – 15:30	Coffee/Tea/Refreshments
15:30 – 16:30	Poster Presentations (Group D)
16:30 – 17:00	Summing - up of Workshop: Professor Abigail Gewirtz
17:00 – 17:15	Closing Remarks Professor Nordin Hasan (ICSU ROAP) Professor Lynna Marie Y. SyCip (UP Diliman) Certificate Presentation and End of Workshop

November 18 (Friday): Departures

