

**Report of the IUPsyS Capacity Building Workshop on
Building Individual and Organizational Capacity for Psychological Intervention
after Disasters in the Asia and Pacific Region**

Beijing, China

October 11 – 14, 2013

Peace and progress are two main basic elements for the sustainable development of the World and can be said to underpin the strategic plans of ICSU. The realization of such plans and the effort of societies are, however, often hindered by natural and man-induced disasters. Based on recent practice of the International Union of Psychological Science, we can see that running capacity building workshops to train young psychologists to deal with the aftermath of such disasters in regularly affected areas is a worthwhile way to deal with the issue. 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 that focused on the Caucasus region and Central Asia, supported by funds from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the Union - as well as one workshop focusing on the Asian-Pacific area, with the support of the International Council for Science (ICSU) and the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, and from the Chinese Academy of Science and IUPsyS. In October 2013, the new workshop *Building Individual and Organizational Capacity for Psychological Intervention after Disasters in the Asia and Pacific Region* was held again in Beijing, China. An evaluation indicated that the workshop attained its proposed goals and outcomes.

Background to the workshop

This year's workshop was organized following the successful one of 2012, which was also held in Beijing. The focus on the Asia and Pacific region relates to two important facts: First, the four billion people residing in the region form 60% of the world's population, yet in the last decade, 41% of the natural disasters around the world occurred in this region, bringing untold damage, loss of life, and hardship. Second, the majority of countries in this region often lack an 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 on psychological adversity. For example, people need help to deal with problems arising from the loss of close relatives, from significant property and/or environmental loss, from the effects of physical injury, and from other stressors, including the overarching effects of displacement. 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.

Workshop Focus

The workshop used international scientific and applied expertise to help researchers, educators and practitioners from the Asia and Pacific region have a better understanding of, and ability to respond to the mental health consequences of regional disasters. 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, technological failure, warfare or pandemics. The workshop also set out to address a particular group that has been relatively overlooked in this regard, namely, children and adolescents. As well as focusing on the science needed to enhance the relevance of psychological interventions in the Asia-Pacific region, the workshop also sought to increase the capacity for sustained theoretical and applied research in the Asia and Pacific area. In sum, the workshop had the following aims:

1. To present participants with the most recent scientific and applied scientific knowledge and evidence relevant for psychological intervention after disasters;
2. To show the opportunities and constraints of working with particular target groups, such as children and adolescents;
3. To offer relevant knowledge provision, suitable for education and training in academic programs of psychology;
4. To help develop a regional network to support continuance in 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 region. The aim was to increase their understanding of, and ability to respond to the mental health consequences of regional disasters. It was also expected that this workshop would further the longer-term plans of IUPsyS and its partners towards meeting these aims, especially regarding the establishment of a regional network.

Implementation

Planning Group

The 2013 workshop organizing team was led by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen (Past President of IUPsyS, Research Professor at the University of Jena, Germany) and by Professor Kan Zhang (Past Vice President of IUPsyS and Past President of the Chinese Psychological Society, Professor of the Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China) and included Dr Verona Christmas-Best (University of Jena, Germany), Dr. Duan Huang (Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China), and other colleagues from Jena University (particularly, Katrin Müller) and from the Chinese Psychological Society.

Recruitment of participants

In order to identify participants for the new workshop, we first conducted a literature search to identify researchers in this field and their institutes in the Asia-Pacific region. We invited expressions of interest from those identified, as well as from institutions and organizations that had been involved in last year's and earlier workshops, and provided an overview of the workshop together with details of the target audience. In general, the target group of the workshop was (1) researchers, educators, and practitioners with an academic background, primarily in psychology, who were interested and experienced in work on disasters; (2) psychologists who work with particular target groups, such as children and adolescents; (3) young and early career scientists from Asia-Pacific countries working in the field; (4) attendees of previous workshops. Participants were targeted from the entire Asia-Pacific region plus Central Asia; residency in a country of the region was expected. Potential participants

were asked to confirm their willingness 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 related fields. The local organizer also asked relevant organizations for help in sending out the call for participation information to their members.

The applications received before the official deadline resulted in a database of around 40 possible candidates working in the field from China, India, Thailand, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. Applications were only considered once a CV, a completed application form and an abstract of the poster he/she would present at the workshop had been received. Applications received after the deadline were not considered. 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 their poster and CV. In total, the organizers invited 24 applicants to take part in the workshop. Selection also aimed at ensuring a balance across the countries within the workshop with regard to number of participants from each country, to gender, and to academic status.

Of the 24 participants who were invited and accepted to attend, only 2 (one from Indonesia, one from India) failed to join the workshop for private or visa reasons. Ultimately, therefore, the workshop had 22 participants from the Asia-Pacific region.

Recruitment of faculty

As for previous workshops, faculty members were chosen for their international reputation, this time as experts in the field of epigenetics, resilience, Narrative Exposure Therapy, PTSD, coping with trauma/disaster and networking after disaster/trauma. At the end of the invitation process, the following agreed to participate as faculty:

Professor Moshe Szyf, McGill University, Canada
Professor Joop T de Jong, VU University Medical Centre, Netherlands
Professor Li Wang, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
Professor Susanne Schaal, University of Ulm, Germany
Professor Sarb Johal, Massey University, New Zealand
Professor Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota, USA

The local organizers were also asked to approach administrators of local organizations and services related to work in the field of post-disaster support about participating in a 'Round Table Discussion'. The following guests were invited to attend the workshop and to join faculty members on the last day for a Round Table discussion:

Professor Buxin Han, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
Professor Yuqing Zhang, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
Kerry-Ann Morris, Junior Science Officer of Integrated Research on Disaster Risk IPO

Financial resources: The travelling expenses of participants and faculty members were covered jointly by IUPsyS and ICSU, who provided IUPsyS with a grant specifically for the workshop. The Chinese Psychological Society (CPS) covered all the local expenses with support from the Chinese Association for Science and Technology (CAST). The Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of

Sciences also supported the organization of the workshop by providing meeting rooms and office facilities in Beijing. The University of Jena, Germany, supported the organizing team in Germany through the provision of office space and facilities.

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 endeavored to capture individual expectations concerning workshop proceedings, content, delivery, and outcomes. This was returned to the Organizing Committee electronically, 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 short summary of the evaluation findings is provided towards the end of this report; a full evaluation report can be found in Appendix 1.

Difficulties encountered during planning: In general, as this was the second workshop focusing on the Asia and Pacific regions and held in Beijing, few difficulties were encountered concerning any aspect of the workshop. The recruitment of participants was much easier than for the 2012 workshop, and local arrangements, such as the preparation of the conference center, hotels and local transport etc were without incident.



Opening and welcome address by Jianxin Zhang,
on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Regional Committee of ICSU

Workshop Procedure

The workshop proper started on October 11, 2013 (arrival for participants was October 10) and lasted until October 14 (departure October 15). Each day started with an introduction to the day's program and (when appropriate) a review of the previous day's proceedings.



Introduction to Day 1 and the first presenter, Moshe Szyf, by Rainer K. Silbereisen

Faculty members arrived and departed at various stages of the workshop, but the majority was in attendance from Day1 through Day4. As almost all faculty members could be present at the beginning of the workshop, the poster presentations of the participants were held on Days 1, 2 and 3. In this way, participants would have the benefit of feedback on their work from as many experts as possible (see workshop program attached). The days varied slightly depending on which faculty members were present. For full details of each day's schedule, see the workshop program attached (Appendix 2).

In his introduction to the various themes of the workshop and their interrelatedness, Rainer K. Silbereisen started out with the need of a holistic approach when dealing with disasters. This means, first, to understand the embedding of individuals' response in their cultural frame. Second, the magnitude and quality of the response shows tremendous variation between individuals, and according to recent insights this variation is also a function of complex genome-environment interactions. Disasters have immediate material consequences, such as displacement, and these

challenges of the established person-environment fit have consequences on various levels of biopsychosocial functioning, including epigenetic processes of relevance for the physiological and neurological systems involved in stress processing. Depending on these processes and their interplay with the immediate contexts in which parents and their young children interact, more or less long-lasting effects on current and future adaptation develop. There is exciting new evidence on causal pathways of disaster response that also opens new vistas for prevention and intervention.

Faculty Members



Moshe Szyf, McGill University,
Canada

Presenter and facilitator on:
How do epigenetic processes mediate the long term impact of social experiences on behavior and mental health?

Joop T de Jong, VU University Medical
Centre, The Netherlands

Presenter and facilitator on:
Public mental health for adults and children in humanitarian emergencies





Li Wang, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Presenter and facilitator on:
The phenotypic model of PTSD symptoms

Susanne Schaal, University of Ulm, Germany

Presenter and facilitator on:
A Treatment Approach for Traumatized Children and Adults



Sarb Johal, Massey University, New Zealand

Presenter and facilitator on:
Perspectives on connectedness in disasters: Notes for planners, responders and survivors



Abigail Gewirtz, University of Minnesota,
USA

Presenter and facilitator on:

Moving research into practice: Testing the effectiveness and implementation of parenting interventions to promote children's resilience



The first presentation had been by Professor Moshe Szyf on how epigenetic processes mediate the long term impact of social experiences on behavior and mental health. This paper was not particularly on disaster but elicited the importance of the reciprocal interaction between genetic factors and environmental/social factors, genetic vulnerability to develop certain problems, and how disaster and/or traumatic experience can change the genetic expression.

The next presentation by Professor Li Wang introduced and discussed a phenotypic model of PTSD from a clinical perspective and addressed the individual difference and heterogeneous nature of the dysfunctional posttraumatic reactions. The presentations of Professor Susanne Schaal and Professor Abigail Gewirtz both addressed the importance to transferring research and theory to practical work. Professor Schaal talked about Narrative Exposure Therapy (NET), a treatment which integrates information process theory of PTSD and cognitive behavioral therapy, and its use with victims of repeated trauma. Professor Gewirtz talked about testing the effectiveness and implementation of parenting intervention. Both of which addressed the issue of resilience after experiencing trauma.

The workshop covered not only the individual aspect of the aftermath of trauma, but also the community and society level of psychological needs in emergency situations. The presentation by Professor Joop de Jong was on public mental health for adults and children in humanitarian emergencies, while Professor Sarb Johal addressed the importance of communication networks and public reaction during and immediately after a disaster; the presentation included notes for planners, responders and survivors.



Workshop participants during a presentation

Following each presentation, either whole class discussion or small group discussions were conducted based on the practical necessity of each faculty member. For the whole class discussion, all participants were involved in discussion of certain topics. For the small group sessions, participants were placed into four groups of 5 to 6 members using a variety of grouping exercises to ensure random group membership.



Small Group Work: Occupied with a task

In the smaller working groups, participants were asked to work on tasks set by the faculty member who had acted as presenter for that session. 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 4 poster panels, organized as far 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 of their work, was very well received by all involved.



Discussion after Poster Presentation

Future Directions

A presentation on “Pulling it all together: Future directions” was given by Rainer K. Silbereisen. This had the goal of reviewing what the workshop had brought to light and of considering the future of the group. Participants raised questions that referred to the linkage between the various workshop themes and their relationship to the everyday practice as researchers or practitioners. Faculty and participants gave answers and new input. As many challenges and weaknesses concerning work conditions and education and training in the countries represented came up, it was only natural to discuss subsequently the role of international organizations, such as IUPsyS, and more specifically what plans the organizers have to maintain the momentum and make some of the offers and results accessible to a broader audience.



Presentation and summing up by Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen

Based on earlier discussion within IUPsyS and among the workshop faculty, he announced plans for a special issue of the International Journal of Psychology, entailing an integrative review on psychological response to disaster as background, and six to eight research articles on various hot topics. In addition, a source book is considered as outcome of the entire disaster workshop series held over the last several years. He introduced the likely structure of the book in detail by characterizing each possible chapter and the reason for including such a chapter. The objective of the book is to become a reference not only for psychologists but also for governments and other agencies that are responsible for disaster relief. The book will propose structured strategies for a nation in dealing with mental health problems in times of emergencies, with a plea for cultural sensitivity. The book would not only cover theoretical and empirical evidence of posttraumatic responses and treatment, but also include methodological issues on what evidence is needed to establish proven effects and thereby convince authorities and the public of the value of scientifically based practice. The book would also devote a chapter to psychology education and training, with special emphasis on cost-efficient research. Finally, the book will also entail information on collaboration and funding opportunities, especially on how helpful local organizations can be located. Both the source book and special issue will be widely distributed once published.

In closing he underscored the importance of post-workshop networking organized by the participants. The likely products (special section, source book) coming out of the workshop should help, and first steps were already undertaken.

Round Table presentations

Following opening remarks by Rainer Silbereisen and Kan Zhang, Buxin Han presented “Bereavement in Chinese Culture”, which reviewed the theories of grief and the cultural difference in bereavement. He introduced the observations after the Wenchuan earthquake in 2008 on how different

groups react to the loss and their bereavement after trauma, and how individuals and communities cope with the grief. He also introduced the practice of Chinese philosophy and folk religion and showed how it helped people to cope with bereavement.



Introduction to the Round Table by Professor Kan Zhang



Invited Speaker: Professor Buxin Han



Invited Speaker: Professor Yuqing Zhang

Also from an indigenous psychological perspective, Yuqing Zhang addressed a positive aspect of posttraumatic reaction, the posttraumatic growth of Chinese victims in natural disasters, and introduced the development of a Chinese posttraumatic growth inventory. Both presenters stressed the importance of taking culture-specificity into consideration in dealing with disaster and in related capacity building.

Finally, all the participants thanked the organizers and faculty for the workshop, which they saw as fruitful, and expressed their willingness to establish a network and to continue collaboration.

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 majority of participants (N = 18) completed both questionnaires.

Looking at the results of post-workshop evaluations (see Appendix 1, Table 1), we can conclude that the 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 displayed a thorough knowledge of the subject; Instructors communicated his/her subject matter well”). Regarding the additional items that were only included in the post-workshop evaluation, the high level of satisfaction with the workshop is obvious. For example, participants were very satisfied with the supervised group activities, and also rated their overall satisfaction with the workshop as quite high (M = 4.33). The excellent evaluation of the workshop is also reflected in the strong fulfillment of own expectations (M = 4.44). From the open-ended items in the post-conference evaluation, it is evident that the group activities were deemed to be a particular highlight of the workshop.

Another indication of a positive evaluation is the fact that the ICSU Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, the ICSU IRDR office in Beijing, the Chinese Psychological Society, and IUPsyS all expressed a wish for more similar workshops to be run in the future. The possibility of support from a variety sources was discussed.

**Building Individual and Organizational Capacity for Psychological Intervention after Disasters in the Asia and Pacific Region
October 11–14, 2013 Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences Beijing, China**



Participants and Faculty, Beijing, 2013

+++++

Appendix 1

Workshop 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 of the pre-workshop questionnaire was 95%, 21 participants (N = 22) filled out the questionnaires. The response rate of the post-workshop questionnaire was 91%, 20 participants (N = 22) filled out the 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 workshop objectives, the instructors and their presentations. Furthermore, the questionnaire included two open-ended questions regarding the expectation and the topics the participants like to see covered in the workshop. 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 expectancies were fulfilled. In total, the post-workshop questionnaire comprised 34 items. Note that we used a 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 use* a variety of teaching techniques”), the post-workshop items dealt with the actual fulfillment of their wishes (e.g., “Instructors *have used* a variety of teaching techniques”). Please refer to Table 1 for an overview about the items used in the evaluation.

Judging by the mean levels of the pre-conference 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 were relevant to workshop objectives; Instructors should include recent developments in this field; Instructors should relate course material to practical situations; Instructors should encourage question & discussion; Instructors encouraged differing points of view”). Taken together, all items were answered well above their scale mean and ranged between $M = 3.90$ and $M = 4.71$ indicating no great variation in the high expectations concerning specific workshop details. Furthermore, in the answers to the open-ended question concerning the topics they would like to be covered in the workshop, many participants specified topics related to the content which would likely to be covered in the presentations of the faculty members, such as “Research related to resilience and other culturally relevant topics”; “Mental health interventions for children and adolescents”; “Networking”.

Looking at 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. This applies especially to items referring to the high quality of the presentations and presenters (e.g., “Instructors displayed a thorough knowledge of the subject”; “Instructors included recent developments in this field”). 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 as very high ($M = 4.70$). Finally, the good evaluation of the workshop is also reflected in the strong fulfillment of own expectations ($M = 4.55$).

Concerning open-ended items in the post-conference evaluation, the breakout group work was frequently named as a highlight of the workshop. Most appreciated the networking with other participants and instructors, as well as the academic atmosphere that encouraged questions and diverse points of view. Furthermore, we were interested in how to improve future workshops: Some participants suggested that the poster report might be changed to short oral presentation. Others suggested they would like to be divided into special groups based on different research interests. Furthermore, some of them would like to visit an example disaster area in China.

To conclude, the evaluation of the workshop indicates that the workshop was, in the eyes of the participants, highly successful and effective in meeting high expectations. These evaluation results thereby confirm the positive impressions of the organizing team and the faculty members.

Table 1: Overview about evaluation items (Means and Standard Deviations)

| | | <i>M (SD)</i> Pre (Expectations) | <i>M (SD)</i> Post (Evaluations) |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Lectures, discussion and activities were relevant to workshop objectives | 4.71(.46) | 4.60(.60) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors displayed a thorough knowledge of the subject matter | 4.52(.70) | 4.60(.60) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors included recent developments in this field | 4.67(.48) | 4.55(.60) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors provided useful factual knowledge and demonstrate content competence | 4.38(.59) | 4.40(.68) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors related course material to practical situations | 4.67(.48) | 4.20(.77) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors discussed topic in sufficient depths | 4.48(.51) | 4.45(.76) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors demonstrated the significance of workshop topics | 4.19(.81) | 4.45(.76) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Workshop encouraged understanding of concepts and principles | 4.29(.64) | 4.45(.69) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors clarified the relationships among various topics covered in the workshop | 4.24(.77) | 4.50(.61) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors distinguished between major & minor topics | 3.95(.74) | 4.05(.94) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors related the subject matter to actual situations | 3.90(.89) | 4.20(.95) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors presented examples to clarify abstract concepts | 4.29(.71) | 4.20(1.06) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors integrated lectures, break-out groups and other assignments | 4.24(.77) | 4.20(1.11) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors used a variety of teaching techniques | 4.38(.67) | 3.95(1.15) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors maintained an atmosphere which actively encouraged thinking and learning | 4.43(.75) | 4.25(.91) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors selected relevant examples | 4.48(.68) | 4.30(.66) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors communicated his/her subject matter | 4.48(.51) | 4.50(.69) |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------|------------|
| | well | | |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors encouraged questions & discussion | 4.48(.51) | 4.40(1.00) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors encouraged differing points of view | 4.48(.60) | 4.25(.97) |
| [Pre / Post] ¹ | Instructors helped clarify difficult material | 4.57(.51) | 4.40(.75) |
| [Post] | Overall satisfaction with the group work that at I participated in on Friday October 11 | / | 4.20(.77) |
| [Post] | Overall satisfaction with the group work that I participated in on Saturday October 12 | / | 4.10(.79) |
| [Post] | Overall satisfaction with the group work that I participated in on Sunday October 13 | / | 4.45(.67) |
| [Post] | Overall satisfaction with the group work that I participated in on Monday October 14 | / | 4.50(.51) |
| [Post] | Overall satisfaction with workshop organization | / | 4.70(.50) |
| [Post] | The workshop met my expectation | / | 4.55(.60) |
| [Post] | I learned things I did not expect to learn | / | 4.30(.73) |
| [Post] | I learned a lot from other participants | / | 4.55(.76) |
| [Post] | Everyone had a chance to participate | / | 4.45(1.05) |
| [Post] | I will be able to apply what I learned | / | 4.50(.61) |
| [Post] | My personal goals of attending the workshop have been fulfilled | / | 4.50(.61) |

¹ different wording for pre-workshop items.

Note:

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation;

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

Appendix 2

October 10 (Thursday): Arrival

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 09:00 – 19:30 | Registration, Best Western Olympic Hotel Lobby |
| 19:00 – 21:00 | Supper (Best Western Olympic Hotel) |

October 11 (Friday): Workshop Day 1

(The VIP meeting room, 1st floor, the South Building, Institute of Psychology, CAS)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 08:45 – 09:15 | <p>Opening & welcome address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor Rainer K Silbereisen, Past President of the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) • Professor Kan Zhang, Past Vice President of the IUPsyS, Past President of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CPS) • Professor Jianxin Zhang, Member of the Asia-Pacific Region Committee of International Council for Science (ICSU) <p>Introduction to the first speaker by Professor Rainer K Silbereisen</p> |
| 09:15 – 10:00 | <p>Presentation: Professor Moshe Szyf</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How do epigenetic processes mediate the long term impact of social experiences on behavior and mental health?</i></p> |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Q&A, Discussion |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Coffee |
| 10:45 – 12:15 | Breakout groups |
| 12:15 – 12:45 | Plenary – reporting back - discussion |
| 12:45 – 14:00 | Lunch at a nearby Café (and Group A set up posters) |
| 14:00 – 15:45 | Poster Presentations (Group A) |
| 15:45 – 16:00 | Coffee (and Group B set up posters) |
| 16:00 – 17:45 | Poster Presentations (Group B) |
| 17:45 – 18:00 | Summing up of Day 1 - Professor Joop de Jong |
| 19:00 – 21:00 | Welcome reception (Offered by CPS. 2 nd floor, the South Building, Institute of Psychology) |

October 12 (Saturday): Workshop day 2

(The VIP meeting room, 1st floor, the South Building, Institute of Psychology, CAS)

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 09:00 – 09:15 | Introduction to Day 2 and to the second speaker by Professor Susanne Schaal |
| 09:15 – 10:00 | <p>Presentation: Professor Joop de Jong</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Public mental health for adults and children in humanitarian emergencies</i></p> |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Q&A, Discussion |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Coffee |
| 10:45 – 12:15 | Breakout groups |
| 12:15 – 12:45 | Plenary – reporting back - discussion |
| 12:45 – 14:00 | Lunch at a nearby Café |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 14:00 – 14:05 | Introduction to the third speaker by Professor Kan Zhang |
| 14:00 – 14:50 | Presentation: Professor Li Wang <i>The phenotypic model of PTSD symptoms</i> |
| 14:50 – 15:20 | Q&A, Discussion |
| 15:20 – 15:40 | Coffee (and Group C set up posters) |
| 15:40 – 17:45 | Poster Presentations (Group C) |
| 17:45 – 18:00 | Summing up of Day 2 - Professor Sarb Johal |
| 19:00 – 21:00 | Dinner (Daqinghua Restaurant, all meet at 18:50 in hotel lobby) |

October 13 (Sunday): Workshop day 3

(The VIP meeting room, 1st floor, the South Building, Institute of Psychology, CAS)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 09:00 – 09:15 | Introduction to Day 3 and to the forth speaker by Professor Kan Zhang |
| 09:15 – 10:00 | Presentation: Professor Susanne Schaal <i>A Treatment Approach for Traumatized Children and Adults</i> |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Q&A, Discussion |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Coffee |
| 10:45 – 12:15 | Breakout groups |
| 12:15 – 12:45 | Plenary – reporting back - discussion |
| 12:45 – 14:00 | Lunch at a nearby Café |
| 14:00 – 14:05 | Introduction to the fifth speaker by Professor Kan Zhang |
| 14:05 – 14:50 | Presentation: Professor Sarb Johal <i>Perspectives on connectedness in disasters: Notes for planners, responders and survivors</i> |
| 14:50 – 15:20 | Q&A, Discussion |
| 15:20 – 16:00 | Breakout task related to networking |
| 16:00 – 16:15 | Coffee (and Group D set up posters) |
| 16:15 – 17:45 | Poster Presentations (Group D) |
| 17:45 – 18:00 | Summing up of Day 3 - Professor Abigail Gewirtz |
| 19:00 – 21:00 | Dinner (Dayali Restaurant, all meet at 18:50 in hotel lobby) |

October 14 (Monday): Workshop day 4

(Morning: The VIP meeting room, 1st floor, the South Building, Institute of Psychology, CAS)

(Afternoon: 9th floor meeting room, the South Building, Institute of Psychology, CAS)

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 09:00 – 09:15 | Introduction to Day 4 and to the sixth speaker by Professor Li Wang |
| 09:15 – 10:00 | Presentation: Professor Abigail Gewirtz <i>Moving research into practice: Testing the effectiveness and implementation of parenting interventions to promote children's resilience</i> |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Q&A, Discussion |
| 10:30 – 10:45 | Coffee |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 10:45 – 12:15 | Breakout groups |
| 12:15 – 12:45 | Plenary – reporting back - discussion |
| 12:45 – 14:00 | Lunch |
| 14:00 – 14:30 | ‘Pulling it all together: Future directions’ Professor Rainer K. Silbereisen |
| 14:30 – 15:15 | Concluding session – final comments from faculty members and invited guests Invited Speakers: Prof. Buxin Han, Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences Representation of Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) |
| 15:15 – 16:00 | Open discussion and feedback from participants |
| 16:00 – 16:15 | Coffee |
| 16:15 – 16:30 | Summing-up of Workshop - Professor Rainer K Silbereisen, Professor Kan Zhang |
| 19:00 – 21:00 | Farewell Dinner (Meizhou Dongpo, all meet at 18:50 in hotel lobby) |

October 15 (Tuesday): Departure