
Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin

Vol. 27, No.3, Autumn, 2001



AUTUMN 2001

IN THIS ISSUE

Feature Articles

2001 Presidential Address.....	Harvey	1
Pardon My Mess.....	Harris	6
Human Factors & Sustainable Design.....	Wise	7
Environmental Concerns & the Disadvantaged..	Burningham	8
The Future of the WTC Site.....	Various	9
<u>Division 34 Business</u>		9
<u>Announcements</u>		
Books.....		10
Symposia, Conferences, Calls for Papers.....		11
Researchers' & Authors' Queries.....		13

NEWSLETTER NEWS

PEPB is an unrefereed forum for sharing news, ideas and opinions in population and environmental psychology. Opinions are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy of Division 34 unless explicitly stated.

Call for Submissions

Winter 2002: *Understanding September 11th, 2001*
Deadline: January 15, 2002

Though it may not be immediately apparent, population and environmental psychologists can play a role in our understanding of the September 11th terrorist attacks. From research on disaster preparedness and studies of communal bereavement to discussions about the future of the WTC site, P&E psychologists can contribute both to our understanding of the consequences of September 11th and to our efforts to prevent future attacks.

To initiate this theme, I have reprinted some opinions from the October *Architectural Record* about what should be done with the WTC site. These (mostly) architects and engineers favour rebuilding the towers in some form, which is somewhat at odds with the American people, who are equally likely to prefer rebuilding the towers, building completely different buildings, and having a monument with no buildings (Khermouch, *Businessweek Online*, 10/1/01).

Please send commentaries, short research reports, abstracts and any other materials (announcements, teaching tips, laboratory assignments, etc.) to Russ Parsons at: rparsons@uiuc.edu.

FEATURE ARTICLES

2001 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Preventing HIV/STDs and Unintended Pregnancies: A Decade of Challenges

S. Marie Harvey, Ph.D.
University of Oregon, Eugene

As I began to contemplate this presidential address and what I might want to say, I found myself reflecting on my current program of research, and how it differs from my work in the early 1980s when I began my academic career. In that reflection, I realized that many population psychologists I know and collaborate with have also evolved along a similar path.

My academic/research career started later in my life and was a direct result of my earlier work as a social worker for the Los Angeles County Department of Social Services - DPSS. I worked in AFDC (Aid For Dependent Children). Observing and treating (and not necessarily well) the consequences of unwanted children inspired me to return to school in the field of public health and undertake a program of research with the goal of contributing to the prevention of unintended pregnancies. My focus at that time was limited to women and to the prevention of unwanted/mistimed pregnancy.

There were several reasons for my earlier focus on women at the exclusion of men. First, family planning has traditionally been considered a female-centered activity. In the United States, men's relative lack of involvement in preventing pregnancy can be traced to such factors as the development in the 1960's of modern female forms of contraception, including birth control pills and the IUD. Second, with the legalization of abortion in the 1970's, men assumed women could terminate an unwanted pregnancy, which consequently placed more responsibility for contraception on women. Finally, and very importantly, women bear the risks and burdens of pregnancy and childbirth, and therefore have the greatest stakes in protecting their own reproductive health.

However, the current epidemics of STDs, including HIV and what has been referred to as "the emerging female face in the U.S. epidemic," altered my program of research in the early 1990's. It became increasingly obvious to me that I must examine women's reproductive health issues using a new and expanded paradigm.

Engaging in unprotected sexual intercourse puts women at risk not only for unintended pregnancy but also for STDs including HIV. Conducting research and designing programs that addressed both pregnancy and disease prevention became of paramount importance and created new challenges for me as a researcher and a public health professional. Therefore, during the last decade I have developed with my colleagues a program of research that addresses both pregnancy and disease prevention among women. I will summarize these approaches in this presentation. More specifically, I will reflect on both the need for and the challenges to this more inclusive approach, dual protection, in my present program of research. In addition, I will provide preliminary findings from some formative research that examines the associations among relationship power, sexual decision-making, and condom use within a sample of women at risk of HIV/STDs.

The Need for a Focus on Pregnancy and Disease Prevention

An emerging public health priority is strengthening women's ability to protect themselves from HIV/STDs and to negotiate safer sex behaviors with their heterosexual partners. A focus on disease prevention among women is important for several reasons. First, the proportion of HIV and AIDS cases that are women is steadily increasing (CDC, 1999). Women represent 30% of new HIV infections and comprise 23% of new cases of AIDS. African Americans and Latinas account for 63% and 18%, respectively, of female cases of AIDS infection reported in 1999 (CDC, 1999). In addition, heterosexual transmission accounts for 40% of current AIDS cases among women and, in 1994, surpassed injecting drug use as the most common mode of HIV transmission to U.S. women (CDC, 1999).

Other STDs are also a major health problem for women. Many STDs are considerably more common than HIV, are initially asymptomatic, and can have serious health consequences (e.g., cancer, infertility) years later. Women are disproportionately affected by STDs because they are more biologically susceptible to some STDs than men, because STDs are less likely to be detected in women than men, and because STDs have more severe health effects for women than men (Eng & Butler, 1997).

We cannot, however, neglect the need to focus on pregnancy prevention as well. Despite the availability of highly effective methods of contraception, almost a third (30.8%) of births and one half of pregnancies in the United States are unintended (Henshaw, 1998).

Challenges To a More Inclusive Approach

Latex (male) condoms are currently the only widely available means for controlling the transmission of HIV and other STDs for sexually active couples. Since condoms are anatomically male-directed, use of this method requires male compliance and cooperation. The AIDS epidemic has placed men in the position of power presiding over the consequences of sexual behavior - women must rely on men's willingness to use condoms. The important point is that condom use is what Agnew (1999) refers to as an interdependent behavior because it requires the participation, or at least cooperation, of both members of a sexual dyad.

Issues of power and control are particularly important when considering interdependent behaviors. These issues pose several new and revive old challenges for behavioral scientists. First, the predominant theoretical models prevalent in understanding sexual risk behaviors have been justly criticized as being individualistic in their conceptualization (e.g., health belief model [Becker, 1974], theory of reasoned action [Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977], social cognitive theory [Bandura, 1994], transtheoretical stages of change model [Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983, 1984], AIDS risk reduction model [Catania, Kegeles, & Coates, 1992]). Their applications often ignore the social and cultural context of women's (and men's) sexual behaviors. They assume that the individual has total control over behavior and do not address the diverse contextual factors related to gender (e.g., power differentials, gender roles) that likely influence these behaviors (Amaro, 1995).

In the face of these theoretical shortcomings, we are challenged to expand our individualistic conceptualization of women's reproductive health to include the impact of relationship and contextual factors on safer sex behaviors. More specifically, we are challenged to develop theoretical frameworks that include couple interactions and couple dynamics as well as individual based factors (e.g., self-efficacy) that we know are critical to behavioral change. Interpersonal relationships have particular relevance in the areas of fertility and the prevention of STDs/HIV because the behaviors and outcomes of interest often, but not always, take place within the context of a relationship.

Second, we are challenged to move beyond including only women in our studies and to also examine men's involvement in sexual decision-making and sexual risk-taking. We need to know more about men's intentions, motivations and behaviors, and we need more data on men's influence on women's attitudes, motivations, decisions and behavior related to the prevention of HIV/STDs and unintended pregnancy. We must continue to build on the body of literature that presents clear evidence that men play important roles in fertility decisions, sexual behavior and contraception use.

Third, we are challenged to focus on and include couples in both our research and intervention studies. Fundamental to this concept is the simplistic idea that it takes *two to tango, two to prevent the transmission of STDs*, and only couple studies can fully address issues involved in understanding the relative influence of each member of a sexual dyad. Dyad-level models, with the couple as the unit of analysis, allow examination of these interdependent behaviors (Agnew, 1999). These analyses require, however, that data be collected from both members of a couple.

Despite the mounting evidence pointing to the importance of couple studies, most of the literature is based on studies of only one gender or unrelated groups of men and women. Because of their cost, complexity and difficulties only a few studies have investigated couples' decision-making and influence patterns concerning condom and contraceptive use. Moreover, the majority of the couples' studies conducted during the last 15 years have examined motivations, decisions and outcomes related to family size and pregnancy prevention, while neglecting disease prevention. They have also focused almost exclusively on married couples and individuals in

presumably stable relationships with long-term commitments between partners. As Larry Severy (1999) asks, "what are the implications when this level of selectivity is no longer imposed? What happens with the choice and the use of methods when the cohort reflects highly sexually active couples, but with relationships of varying quality?" In order to effectively evaluate the realities of relationships today, we need couple studies that include young individuals in diverse relationships and at high risk for STDs.

Despite the fact that it takes two to prevent the transmission of HIV/STD infections, prevention efforts and interventions among heterosexuals have also focused almost exclusively on women. Furthermore, the majority of these interventions are not designed to address issues involving people in relationships. Previous research indicates, however, that HIV risk behavior is especially prevalent among individuals in intimate relationships (Misovich, Fisher & Fisher, 1997). Findings from a 1998 (Becker & Robinson) review of reproductive health interventions in developed and developing countries indicated that reproductive health interventions targeted to couples were more effective than those targeted at only male or female partners. These data compel us to focus our efforts on the implementation of interventions that focus on changing sexual risk behavior within intact couples and to intervene with both members of a couple.

Fourth, in addition to including men and couples in our studies, we need more research that examines how relationship status and relationship characteristics influence sexual risk-taking. Common sense tells us that relationship type is associated with reproductive and sexual behaviors and outcomes. Conceptually, relationship status is an expansion of marital status that refers to a person's *current situation with regard to heterosexual relationships*. Your relationship status may include information about whether you are cohabiting, in a steady relationship, dating one person, have multiple partners, etc. Many words can be used to describe relationship status, such as married, unmarried, single, primary partner, secondary partner, main partner, casual partner, one-night stands, and flings.

In contrast, relationship characteristics describe *the qualities of a specific relationship*. For instance, knowing that a woman is committed to a particular partner, that she loves him and trusts him, that they have a sexual relationship, and that he acts as a father to her children tells us about her relationship with that partner.

We do have data from studies that buttress the argument that relationship status and characteristics influence sexual risk-taking. For example, we know that longer relationships are associated with less condom use, lower rates of condom use are found with steady or regular partners as compared to casual partners, and partners in committed relationships are less likely to use condoms. We also know that individuals who feel more positively about their partner are less likely to use condoms compared to people who feel less positively, and that women who report higher levels of love for their partners are less likely to request condom use than women with lower levels of love.

I would argue, however, that our understanding of how heterosexual relationships influence sexual behaviors is limited by the fact that the variables and measures we use to categorize

relationships do not capture the diversity of relationship types experienced by unmarried men and women at the beginning of the 21st century. "Marital status" and "cohabitation" are too simplistic. Thus, research that identifies and develops variables and measures that more accurately describe heterosexual relationships are needed.

In addition, we need to develop measures of relationship characteristics that have particular relevance for fertility-related topics. A vast literature on the topic of interpersonal relationships exists, including numerous studies of intimacy and close relationships, and several measures of relationship characteristics. We need to adapt these measures to make them more suitable for use in fertility-related and disease prevention studies.

Finally, and of tantamount importance, we are challenged to move beyond our focus on the male condom and examine factors which influence the acceptability and use of female-controlled methods for the prevention of HIV/STDs. There is a pressing need for a *range* of female-controlled methods for several reasons. Namely, at-risk women and their partners differ in their relationship dynamics and contraceptive preferences. Women also vary in their comfort with different types of vaginal products and in their willingness and ability to negotiate condom use with their male partners.

Building on This Mandate/Challenges

An important goal of my current research program is to build on these challenges and to conduct research that will contribute to products, programs, policies and services that will strengthen women's ability to protect themselves from HIV/STDs and unintended pregnancy. I address this mandate through what I call a two prong approach.

PARTNERS Project

The overall goal of the first body of work (which includes both research and intervention studies) is to encourage heterosexual couples to use the male condom for the prevention of HIV/STDs and unintended pregnancies. These studies examine couple dynamics in reproductive decision-making and condom use. The five year PARTNERS project, funded by the CDC, develops, implements and evaluates a couple-based intervention designed to reduce unprotected intercourse among sexually active women and their heterosexual partners. Although space does not allow me to discuss the intervention phase of this project, I will review findings from formative research we conducted to inform the design and curriculum of the intervention. More specifically, I will present findings from our work that examined the associations among relationship power, sexual decision-making, and condom use within a sample of women at risk of HIV/STDs (Harvey, Bird, Galavotti, Duncan & Greenberg, under review).

I. Introduction

Several researchers have suggested that women are likely to have difficulty in negotiating safer sex strategies with their male partners because of perceived imbalances in relationship power (e.g., Amaro & Gornemann, 1992; Amaro, 1995; Fullilove, Fullilove, Haynes & Gross, 1990; Gómez & Márin, 1996; Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, & DeJong, 2000; Wingood &

DiClemente, 1998, 2000; Wingood, Hunter-Gamble & DiClemente, 1993; Worth, 1989). Other studies suggest that women's lack of power in sexual relationships increases the likelihood that condoms will not be used (Gómez & Marín, 1996; Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, & DeJong, 2000; Wingood & DiClemente, 1998a, 1998b). The data I present here from our formative study will: 1) examine the association between relationship power and condom use; and 2) examine the relationship between decision-making dominance regarding condom use and condom use behavior (Harvey, Bird, Galavotti, Duncan & Greenberg, under review).

II. Methods

Data were collected in face-to-face interviews with 112 women who were recruited from clinics and community locations in 4 cities: Atlanta, Georgia; Los Angeles, California; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma and Portland, Oregon. Participants were screened to be at risk for HIV/STDs and unintended pregnancy, were 18-25 years of age and were primarily Hispanic (34.8%) and African American (54.5%).

The interview guide was developed specifically for this study. For these analyses, we examined responses to questions concerning relationship power, sexual and reproductive decision-making, and condom use. As a general measure of relationship power, we asked participants "In your relationship with [PARTNER'S NAME], in general who has more power?" The response categories were "I do," "we both do," and "my partner does." To examine decision-making dominance regarding condom use dominance, we asked participants who in their relationship decides whether or not to use a condom. Response categories were "me," "both of us," and "my partner." To measure condom use, we asked participants whether during the last three months they had used condoms with their partner at least once. We also asked how often they use condoms with their partner when they have vaginal sex. Response categories were "never," "rarely," "sometimes," "most of the time," and "always."

Because of the small sample size, in order to examine the relationships among variables, we collapsed some variables into fewer categories. We combined responses to questions regarding power and decision-making so that we measured whether or not the woman had or shared power in her relationship and whether or not she had any influence in sexual decision-making. More specifically, responses to the question "Who has more power?" were dichotomized into "I do or we both do" and "my partner does." Similarly, responses to the questions regarding sexual decision-making were dichotomized into "me or both of us" and "my partner."

III. Results

Results of the bivariate analyses of the relationship between who has power and actual condom use are presented in Table 1. For both measures of condom use, no significant differences were found between the "I/We" have more power and the "He" has more power groups. In other words, condom use among women who perceived that they have more power or share power did not differ from condom use among women who reported that their partners have more power.

TABLE 1. Association of relationship power and decision-making dominance to condom use (N=112)

	Who Has More Power		Who Decides Condom Use	
	I / We	He	I / We	He
Condom Used in Last 3 Months (%)				
Yes	60.9	66.7	69.1	41.4*
No	39.1	33.3	30.9	58.6

In contrast, decision-making dominance regarding condom use was significantly related to condom use behavior. A higher percentage of women who perceived that they decide to use condoms alone or with their partner, compared to those who said that their partner decides, reported having used condoms during the last three months.

In addition, women who said "I/We" decide reported using condoms with their partner during vaginal sex significantly more often than those who indicated that their partner dominated condom use decision-making.

We found that the relationships between decision-making dominance and the condom use measures were still significant when adjusted for perceived importance of condom use and selected demographic and relationship variables (education, marital status, length of relationship, cohabitation, whether participant has ever been told she had an STD, and relationship power).

IV. Discussion

Despite several limitations of our study including the small sample size, these findings are important for several reasons. First, they highlight the positive role women can play in condom decision-making and use and they make clear the value of both partners' participation in sexual decision-making and behavior. Several studies, including this one, now clearly demonstrate that women, at least, believe that they work these things out jointly with their partners, and share both responsibility and decision-making to a large degree. These data are consistent with findings from Browner (in press) which indicate that in regard to reproductive activities women are neither "agents acting solely on their own free will or completely constrained by the actions of men."

Second, they underscore the value of using both direct and domain specific assessments of relationship power and decision-making. Our specific measure of condom use decision-making predicted condom use, whereas a general measure of power in the relationship did not. Several direct and specific measures of power in relationships and sexual decision-making dominance now exist (e.g., Pulerwitz, Gortmaker & DeJong, 2000) and should be used in future research.

Third, women who decided or shared condom use decision-making were not only more likely to report use, they used condoms more frequently than women who said their partners made that decision. This finding suggests that joint

decision-making may increase overall condom use as well as consistency of condom use. When combined with the overall finding that both men and women are involved in joint decision-making regarding sexual issues, this finding makes a strong case for intervening with couples. Because of these results and additional findings from our formative study, we are implementing an intervention that includes both members of a sexually active couple.

Women's Acceptability of the Vaginal Diaphragm

The goal of the second body of work is to improve understanding of women's acceptability of the vaginal diaphragm for the prevention of HIV/STDs. This three year study funded by NICHD has just begun.

Of particular importance are female-controlled methods that can be used without the male partner's knowledge and cooperation. These methods are not intended to replace the male condom, but rather to provide women with an alternative method of protection if condoms are not an option. Microbicides are one potential method of HIV/STD prevention that is female-controlled, and numerous compounds and products are currently in various stages of development (Heise, 1999). It may, however, be years before microbicides are available for use in the U.S.

In the short term, the acceptability and efficacy for HIV/STD prevention of existing contraceptive methods must be investigated. Research on the vaginal diaphragm, a method of contraception that is currently available, suggests that this method is effective in preventing some STDs and has advantages over other female-controlled methods. In addition, there is increasing interest in the vaginal diaphragm as a device for holding microbicidal products in place.

We are conducting two studies to examine the acceptability of the diaphragm for the prevention of HIV/STD. In Study 1, we are collecting data from a large sample of current diaphragm users, former diaphragm users, and women using other contraceptive methods at an HMO. In Study 2, we propose collecting data from young college women who are at risk for HIV/STDs and who have never used the diaphragm.

Diaphragm use is currently quite low nationally (less than 2%). In order to identify factors that influence women's adoption, use, and discontinuation of the diaphragm, we need to study diaphragm users (Study 1). Diaphragm users, however, are generally not the women at greatest risk for HIV/STDs. Consequently, we also need to identify factors that may enhance or deter diaphragm use among high risk groups (Study 2). The two studies are both necessary and a complementary. We are hopeful that findings from this research will inform the development of new female-controlled barrier methods that have characteristics similar to the diaphragm, stimulate research on the efficacy of the diaphragm for HIV prevention, and suggest strategies to improve the acceptability of the diaphragm among high risk women.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I want to bring us back to Division 34, Population and Environmental Psychology, and to the definition of Population Psychology. I take my definition from Joe Rogers who wrote, "Population psychology is the

application of theory and methods from psychology to study population change" (PEPB, Summer 1995). My question to you, the members of our Division, does this definition adequately reflect who we are and the research we do? If not, my challenge to you is to find new words to describe our scope of work. Finally, I end with a Islamic saying that I believe captures many of the challenges I addressed here in this column:

You think you understand *Two*
Because you understand *One* and *One*...
But you must also understand *And*
-Sufi saying

References

- Azjen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*, 888-918.
- Amaro, H. (1995). Love, sex, and power: Considering women's realities in HIV prevention. *American Psychologist*, *50*, 437-443.
- Amaro, H. & Gornemann, I. (1992). *HIV/AIDS related knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and behaviors among Hispanics: Report of findings and recommendations.*
- Agnew, C.R. (1999). Power over interdependent behavior within the dyad: Who decides what a couple does? In L. Severy & W. Miller (Eds.), *Advances in population: Psychosocial Perspectives*, Vol 3 (pp. 163-188). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Social cognitive theory and exercise of control over HIV infection. In R.J. DiClemente and J. Peterson (Eds.), *Preventing AIDS: Theories and Methods of Behavioral Interventions* (pp. 25-59). New York: Plenum Publishing Corp.
- Becker, M.H. (1974). The health belief model and personal health behavior. *Health Education Monographs*, *2*, 324-508.
- Becker, S., & Robinson, C. (1998) Reproductive health care: Services oriented to couples. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, *61*, 275 - 281.
- Browner, C.H. (In press). Situating women's reproductive activities. *American Anthropologist*.
- Catania, J.A., Kegeles, S.M. & Coates, T.J. (1992). Towards an understanding of risk behavior: An AIDS risk reduction model (ARRM). *Health Education Quarterly*, *17*(1), 53-72.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1999). *HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report*, *11*(2), 5, 14, & 29.
- Eng, T. & Butler, W. T. (1997). *The Hidden Epidemic: Effective Contraception and Disease Prevention*. Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Family Health International.
- Fullilove, M.T, Fullilove, R.E., Haynes, K. & Gross, S. (1990). Black women and AIDS prevention: A view towards understanding the gender rules. *Journal of Sex Research*, *27*(1), 47-64.
- Gómez, C. A., & Marín, B. V. (1996). Gender, culture, and power: Barriers to HIV-prevention strategies for women. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *33*, 355-362.

Harvey, S.M., Bird, S.T., Galavotti, C., Duncan, E.A. & Greenberg, D. (Under review). Relationship power, sexual decision-making and condom use among women at risk for HIV/STDs. *Women & Health*.

Heise, L. (1999). Topical Microbicides: New Hope for STI/HIV Prevention. Tacoma Park, MD: Center for Health and Gender Equity.

Henshaw, S. K. (1998). Unintended Pregnancy in the United States. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 30(1), 24-29 & 46.

Misovich, S.J., Fisher, J.D. & Fisher, W.A. (1997). Close relationships and elevated HIV risk behavior: Evidence and possible underlying psychological processes. *Review of General Psychology*, 1(1), 72-107.

Prochaska, J.O. & DiClemente, C.C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 51, 390-395.

Prochaska, J.O. & DiClemente, C.C. (1984). *The Transtheoretical Approach: Crossing the Traditional Boundaries of Therapy*. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones/Irwin.

Pulerwitz, J., Gortmaker, S. L., & DeJong, W. (2000). Measuring sexual relationship power in HIV/STD research. *Sex Roles*, 42, 637-660.

Severy, L. (1999). Acceptability as a critical component of clinical trials. In L.J. Severy & W. Miller (Eds.), *Advances in Population: Psychosocial Perspectives, Vol 3* (pp. 103 - 122). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Wingood, G. M., & DiClemente, R. J. (1998a). Partner influences and gender-related factors associated with noncondom use among young adult African American women. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26, 29-51.

Wingood, G. M., & DiClemente, R. J. (1998b). Gender-related correlates and predictors of consistent condom use among young adult African-American women: A prospective analysis. *International Journal of STD & AIDS*, 9, 139-145.

Wingood, G. M., & DiClemente, R. J. (2000). Application of the Theory of Gender and Power to examine HIV-related exposures, risk factors, and effective interventions for women. *Health Education & Behavior*, 27, 539-565.

Wingood, G. M., Hunter-Gamble, D., & DiClemente, R. J. (1993). A pilot study of sexual communication and negotiation among young African American women: Implications for HIV prevention. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 19, 190-203.

Worth, D. (1989). Sexual decision-making and AIDS: Why condom promotion among vulnerable women is likely to fail. *Studies in Family Planning*, 20, 297-307.

exert a powerful influence on how we form impressions of others. For example, Asch (1946) told one group of participants that an individual was "intelligent, skillful, industrious, warm, determined, practical, and cautious." He gave a second group of participants an identical list of characteristics, only he replaced the trait "warm" with "cold." Based on this change of a single central trait, participants developed very different theories about the personality of the individual described.

Research on the use of central traits in forming impressions of others has focused on individual characteristics (e.g., warm/cold) rather than environmental characteristics. However, there is evidence that aspects of resident identity may be communicated through home environments, including socio-economic status (Lauman & House, 1972), materialistic values (Weisner & Weibel, 1981), ethnic identity (Arreola, 1981; Greenbaum & Greenbaum, 1981), feelings of connection with neighbors (Galster & Hesser, 1982; Brown & Werner, 1985; Oxley et al., 1986), and commitment to academic settings (Vinsel et al., 1980). There is also evidence that observers sometimes use this environmental information to form impressions about others, including judgments about personality (Sadalla et al., 1980), friendliness towards neighbors (Werner et al., 1989), and feelings of commitment to the home and neighborhood (Harris & Brown, 1996).

In a recent study (Harris et al., in press) my colleagues and I discovered that one of the major environmental features attended to by inpatients in hospital rooms was housekeeping. This made intuitive sense since cleanliness is an environmental characteristic that is immediately evident when entering any built environment. Returning to home environments, consider the amount of time and money you spend on cleaning house. Consider the effort you put toward housekeeping when you are expecting guests. Consider the excuses you offer so readily when someone sees your home in disarray. Think of the cultural values we place on keeping a clean home. Because of the importance of housekeeping in our culture and our daily lives, I expected that I would find a literature on the topic while investigating the results of our hospital study. However, I was wrong. Apparently scholars have found research on housekeeping about as appealing a task as itself! There is very little empirical work on this topic.

Is housekeeping a central trait? If so, what personality characteristics do people associate with good housekeepers and what characteristics do they associate with poor housekeepers? We have asked undergraduate psychology students (47 females and 18 males so far) to read a one-page story about "John" or "Jane", describing each character's morning routine from waking up to attending a meeting at work. The stories are identical except for the gender of the characters and a single paragraph that describes their apartments as being either messy (e.g., "... a landscape populated by papers, magazines, abandoned laundry, and the occasional dust bunny") or clean (e.g., "... a landscape of clean surfaces, unmarred by clutter, dust or debris, and interrupted only occasionally by an outcropping of tastefully arranged magazines and neatly stacked papers"). After reading the short story, participants rated the characters on 40 personality dimensions.

The resulting design is a 2 (gender of participant) x 2

Pardon My Mess: Preliminary Findings on the Role of Housekeeping in Impression Formation

Paul B. Harris
Rollins College

Work by Solomon Asch (1946) and others (Bruner & Taguiuri, 1954; Kelly, 1950; Reeder, 1993; Reeder & Brewer, 1979; Schneider, 1973; Sedikides & Anderson, 1994) suggests that certain personality characteristics, or "central traits," may

(gender of character) x 2 (messy or clean apartment) factorial. Unfortunately, we cannot draw any conclusions about gender of participant until we have collected more data from males. A preliminary set of analyses including the other two variables yielded no main effects or interactions for gender of character. However, there are significant differences between poor and good housekeepers on 17 of the 40 personality dimensions.

Are you a good housekeeper? If so, you may be more likely to be viewed as competent, efficient, organized, responsible, hard working, anxious, conservative, careful, formal, disciplined, a person who does things her or his own way, inflexible, reserved, sober, irritable, and a person with no sense of humor. Our results also indicate that you will be seen as more feminine, regardless of your gender. And what of us poor housekeepers? We are more likely to be viewed as incompetent, inefficient, disorganized, irresponsible, lazy, calm, liberal, careless, informal, impulsive, open to suggestions, flexible, affectionate, fun-loving, good natured, and having a good sense of humor. We are also more likely to be seen as more masculine, regardless of our gender.

Again, these are preliminary results. As we collect more data from males, we may find interactions with gender of participants as well as with the gender of the character in the story. We are also planning follow up research using visual information (e.g., pictures of settings) rather than stories. Although research is ongoing, initial analyses support housekeeping as a central trait that may influence implicit personality theories. Do other environmental behaviors, such as recycling, have the same impact on impressions? Does cleanliness of other locations, such as the office, result in a similar array of judgments? Until I have more data, I'll have to ask you to pardon the mess, it's usually much cleaner than this....

References

- Arreola, D. D. (1981). Fences and landscape taste: Tucson's barrios. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, 2, 96-105.
- Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 41, 258-290.
- Brown, B. B., & Werner, C. M. (1985). Social cohesiveness, territoriality, and holiday decorations: The influence of cul-de-sacs. *Environment and Behavior*, 17, 539-565.
- Bruner, J. S., & Taguiri, R. (1954). Person perception. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 634-654). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Galster, G. C., & Hesser, G. W. (1982). The social neighborhood: An unspecified factor in homeowner maintenance? *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 18, 235-254.
- Greenbaum, P. E., & Greenbaum, S. D. (1981). Territorial personalization: Group identity and social interaction in a Slavic-American neighborhood. *Environment and Behavior*, 13, 574-589.
- Harris, P. B., & Brown, B. B. (1996). The home and identity display: Interpreting resident territoriality from home exteriors. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 16, 187-203.
- Harris, P., McBride, G., Ross, C., & Curtis, L. (In Press). A place to heal: Environmental sources of satisfaction among hospital patients. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.
- Kelley, H. H. (1950). The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. *Journal of Personality*, 18, 431-439.
- Lauman, E., & House, J. (1972). Living room styles and social attributions: Patterning of material artifacts in an urban community. In Lauman, Siegal, & Hodges (Eds.), *The logic of social hierarchies* (pp. 189-203). Chicago: Markham.
- Oxley, D., Haggard, L., Werner, C. M., & Altman, I. (1986). Transactional qualities of neighborhood social networks: A case study of 'Christmas Street'. *Environment and Behavior*, 18, 640-677.
- Reeder, G. D. (1993). Trait-behavior relations and dispositional inference. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 586-593.
- Reeder, G. D., & Brewer, M. B. (1979). A schematic model of dispositional attribution in interpersonal perception. *Psychological Review*, 86, 61-79.
- Sadalla, E. K., Burroughs, J., & Quaid, M. (1980). House form and social identity: A validity study. In R. Stough (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 11th International Meeting of the Environmental Design Research Association* (pp. 201-206). Washington, D. C.: Environmental Design Research Association.
- Schneider, D. J. (1973). Implicit personality theory: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 294-309.
- Sedikides, C., & Anderson, C. A. (1994). Causal perceptions of intertrait relations: The glue that holds person types together. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 294-302.
- Vinsel, A., Brown, B. B., Altman, I., & Foss, C. (1980). Privacy regulation, territorial displays, and the effectiveness of individual functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 1104-1115.
- Weisner, T. S., & Weibel, J. C. (1981). Home environments and family lifestyles in California. *Environment and Behavior*, 13, 417-460.
- Werner, C. M., Peterson-Lewis, S., & Brown, B. B. (1989). Inferences about homeowners' sociability: Impact of Christmas decorations and other cues. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 9, 279-296.

Human Factors and the Sustainable Design of Built Environments

Panel Chair: James A. Wise, *Environmental Sciences & Regional Planning Program, WSU-TC, and Eco•Integrations, Inc. Richland, Washington*

This Panel examines the emerging relations between practice and principles of Human Factors and sustainable building design. Panelists assess the recent history of Sustainability and its impacts on Human Factors Engineering, and provide an exemplar of how Human Factors has already been included in the Minnesota Sustainable Design Guide. They examine 'ergo vs. eco' design to show that human and environmental design goals are more compatible than competitive. And they will show how human factors and sustainability may finally be the

'magic' combination of design philosophies needed to create buildings worthy of a 21st century high technology civilization.

Sustainability and Human Factors

James A. Wise, CEO, Eco•Integrations, Inc.

Human Factors has remained relatively absent from the paradigmatic revolution of Sustainability which is currently overhauling the 21st century world. Since the modern reincarnation of Sustainability lies in predominant environmental concerns, it is most

The Minnesota Sustainable Design Guide

John Carmody, Director, Center for Sustainable Building Research, College of Architecture & Landscape Architecture, The University of Minnesota

The Minnesota Sustainable Design Guide is an open source web-based guide used to learn about sustainability, manage design decisions, and integrate sustainable design into the building design and operation processes for new and renovated facilities. It can be used to define sustainable design priorities and goals; to develop appropriate sustainable design strategies; and to determine performance standards to guide design decision-making. <www.sustainabledesignguide.umn.edu>

Ergo versus Eco: A Tale of Two Centricities in Design

Jack Elliott, Dept of Design & Environmental Analysis, Cornell University

Human Factors is founded on a human-centered or anthropocentric worldview whereas ecological design is based on a life-centered or bio-centric worldview. The anthropocentric view puts humankind at the center of considerations while the bio-centric worldview understands that natural processes, such as the capturing of solar energy and the purification of air and water, are essential to maintaining human life. Yet a closer examination of both shows how implementations of their relative design goals dovetail nicely in concerns for environmental conditions like IAQ, product and building longevity, and design for deconstruction. The disciplines and the worldviews have much to offer each other.

Ergotecture: A Refocus of Environmental Ergonomics on the Total Environmental Picture

Alan Hedge, Dept of Design & Environmental Analysis, Cornell University

As laudable as the recent conversion of many designers has been to "green" design, it misses the essential point that how well an environment works depends solely on the design of all aspects of what the person experiences in that setting. A poorly designed environment for a person remains one, whether constructed of eco-friendly materials or not. The concept of 'Ergotecture' offers one approach to combining human and eco-centered design. Ergotecture is an 'inside-out' design process that integrates information from the micro level of human requirements through to the macro level of societal responsibility. Ergotecture works in the opposite direction from

the standard 'outside-in' or large to small-scale approach of architecture in building design.

Summary

Human Factors and Sustainable Design and Development are "made for each other", although devotees of each may not be completely aware of it yet.

- Sustainable design needs to emphasize the occupant benefits achievable with many environmentally conscious design strategies.
- Human Factors needs to leverage its long call for a human-centered design ethic, and eco-centered design produces the requisite lever and biosphere rationale.
- Ergo and eco-centered design are not inherently incompatible, and have assisted each other in real design decision making. They produce better designs for both people and planet.
- A shift in thinking from 'what' we design to 'how' we design would enrich both fields.
- The concept of 'Ergotecture' is a process-oriented approach that refocuses Human Factors on the entire environmental picture to make HF more useable, valuable, and liable to be incorporated by sustainability designers.

Panel Presentation by the Technical Group on Environmental Design of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, 45th Annual Meeting, Oct. 12, 2001, Minneapolis, MN.

The Environmental Concerns of Disadvantaged Groups

Kate Burningham & Diana Thrush
University of Surrey

People on low incomes are often those worst affected by environmental problems and environmental policies sometimes conflict with their social and economic well-being. Little is known, however, about their environmental views and priorities. A report by Kate Burningham and Diana Thrush at the University of Surrey explored the environmental concerns of members of disadvantaged groups in four settings: a deprived urban neighbourhood; a deprived urban estate where people live close to busy roads; an ex-mining village where people live close to a chemical factory; and a rural area within a National Park. The study found that:

- Interviewees' environmental concerns focused on the impact of local problems on health and well-being.
- Issues such as pollution, which appear most problematic from an external viewpoint, were not necessarily those of most concern at a local level. 'Minor' problems, such as dog fouling and litter, often received more attention.
- Residents emphasised positive aspects of their homes and were troubled by outsiders' perceptions of their neighbourhoods as polluted, derelict or dirty.
- Participants were largely unfamiliar with the language of environmentalism and commented on the lack of locally

accessible information. Some individuals, however, demonstrated an understanding of and concern for the wider environment.

- Practical and financial considerations were prime motivators for individual environmental action. Many participants recycled household waste. However, some were unable to do so as facilities were inaccessible or homes lacked storage space. Although saving energy was widely recognised as beneficial, it was irrelevant for those individuals who were unable to afford sufficient energy to heat their damp and draughty homes.
- In the three run-down neighbourhoods, social, economic and environmental goals were often inextricably linked. For people in the attractive rural locality, conflicts between environmental and socio-economic demands were evident.

The full report, "Rainforests are a long way from here": The environmental concerns of disadvantaged groups, is published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, and can be obtained here: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/911.asp>

Opinions on The Future of the WTC Site

Editor's note: This sampling of opinions is drawn from those published in the October issue of Architectural Record: http://www.archrecord.com/NEWS/ARTICLES/WTC_news/skyscrapers.asp

"It would be entirely appropriate to have the Trade Center reproduced at this site. If we turn the site into a memorial, in a way, it would be a monument to the success of terrorism."
—Henry Guthard, Senior VP with Minoru Yamasaki & Associates, and a member of the original WTC design team

"They ought to rebuild the [WTC] buildings, but not necessarily as targets. I don't think Americans should be swayed by what those bastards did."
—Bruce Graham, FAIA, SOM lead architect for Chicago's John Hancock Center and Sears Tower

"Rebuilding the WTC as it was would be showing nostalgia for a world that doesn't exist. What has happened with the media coverage shows we don't need monuments. Buildings no longer contain memory. The media contains that memory. So we need to build again with the understanding that we don't want to build the same buildings."
—Peter Eisenman, FAIA

"I don't know that the twin towers should be rebuilt. Perhaps an even more spectacular skyscraper with its own distinct form would be better. On the other hand, there is much to commend in rebuilding Yamasaki's building."
—Robert A.M. Stern, FAIA

"There will certainly be a memorial planned for the site. I think the most eloquent one might be two squares, each an acre of grass marking the footprint of the former towers. But respecting

their absence, we should also assert a positive plan to rebuild 12 million square feet of mixed-use and commercial space on the site."

—Carol Willis, director of the Skyscraper Museum, new home to be built near the WTC site

"The site has to be rebuilt. Economics will dictate what goes there."

—Carol Ross Barney, FAIA, principal, Ross Barney + Jankowski, architect of the GSA's new Federal campus in Oklahoma City

"The only way to demonstrate our strength would be to build two towers of similar size. I don't see why we should capitulate to a group of criminals."

—Cesar Pelli, FAIA, architect of the nearby World Financial Center at Battery Park City

"I hope that they rebuild, whether they rebuild that exact structure or not. To turn it into a park does not capture the essence of what New York is. It's about density and bustling sidewalks, and that's the nature of the city."

—Kenneth T. Jackson, editor of The Encyclopedia of New York

"It was a great symbol. I'll be very disappointed if we end up with a park on that site. There should be something as dramatic built—tall or even taller. Something has to rise on that site. I'm still very optimistic on building tall buildings."

—John Sheehy, FAIA, RIBA, president of Architecture International and a member of the SOM design team for Chicago's Hancock Center

"We may take a break from building such giants, but given their symbolic value and given time to regain our confidence, I think skyscrapers will inevitably remain a sign of the achievement of our civilization."

—Edward A. Feiner, FAIA

Division 34 Executive Committee and Business Meeting Minutes August 2001

Margaret Topf, Ph.D., Secretary

Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin (PEPB)

PEPB costs members \$1050.00 per year, according to Treasurer Pete Walker. There was discussion of limiting mailed copies of the *Bulletin* to members who do not have WWW access as a cost savings strategy. A motion was made and passed to raise dues \$3.00 a year for APA and non-APA Division members to help with the expense of the *Bulletin*. This will be effective with Dues Statements mailed for 2003.

Efficacy of the First Year Free Program

The effectiveness of the first year free recruitment strategy was discussed. The primary concern was the number of renewals when 2nd year dues statements were sent to non-APA members of Division 34. Thirty-four of these members were

sent dues statements. Twelve (35%) paid 2001 dues. A motion was made and approved to continue to monitor the success of the first year free program for another year.

Timing of APA Convention

It was noted that the timing of the APA Convention conflicts with course schedules at many universities. A motion was made and passed to ask the Division President to write to APA Executive Officer Ray Fowler to request an earlier date for the convention.

New Business

Joe Juhasz is interested in hearing from members on the present size of APA conventions.

Pete Walker would like to hear from members interested in forming a committee or task force on ecopsychology and conservation psychology.

It was suggested that the current description of Division 34 needs to be updated/revised. Comments by members should be sent to Joe Juhasz at juhaszj@stripe.colorado.edu. The current description follows:

Division 34 represents psychologists who are concerned about population and environmental issues. Human behavior is the root cause of many environmental and population problems, and psychologists in our division make important contributions to understanding and solving these problems. Issues we address include contraceptive behavior, family planning, prevention of unintended pregnancy and HIV/STDs, crowding, protecting environmental resources, the urban environment, building design, energy conservation, environmental toxins, global degradation, and many others. We publish a newsletter, organize an APA program, publicize research activities and employment opportunities, provide communication concerning policy developments and promote research collaboration.

Last, President S. Marie Harvey passed the gavel to Joseph Juhasz, incoming President of Division 34. Larry Severy is President-Elect, John-Paul Mulilis is the new Treasurer, Gary Gottfredson is Member at Large, Bruce Walsh, is Division 34 APA Representative, and Russ Parsons is the new *PEPB* editor.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Books

Ecological Psychology in Context: James Gibson, Roger Barker, and the Legacy of William James's Radical Empiricism. by Harry Heft (2001). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum (ISBN: 0-8058-2350-6). <http://www.erlbaum.com/>

In this latest book in the Resources for Ecological Psychology Series, Harry Heft examines the historical and theoretical foundations of James J. Gibson's ecological psychology in 20th century thought, and in turn, integrates ecological psychology and analyses of sociocultural processes. A thesis of the book is that knowing is rooted in the direct experience of meaningful environmental objects and events present in individual-

environment processes and at the level of collective, social settings. *Ecological Psychology in Context:*

- traces the primary lineage of Gibson's ecological approach to William James's philosophy of radical empiricism,
- illuminates how the work of James's student and Gibson's mentor, E.B. Holt, served as a catalyst for the development of Gibson's framework and as a bridge to James's work,
- reveals how ecological psychology reciprocally can advance Jamesian studies by resolving some of the theoretical difficulties that kept James from fully realizing a realist philosophy,
- broadens the scope of Gibson's framework by proposing a synthesis between it and the ecological program of Roger Barker, who discovered complex systems operating at the level of collective, social processes,
- demonstrates ways in which the psychological domain can be extended to properties of the environment rendering its features meaningful, publicly accessible, and distributed across person-environment processes, and
- shows how Gibson's work points the way toward overcoming the gap between experimental psychology and the humanities. Intended for scholars and students in the areas of ecological and environmental psychology, theoretical and historical psychology, cognitive science, developmental psychology, anthropology, and philosophy.

Environmental Psychology: Principles and Practice (3rd Ed.) by Robert Gifford (2002). Colville, WA: Optimal Books. (ISBN: 0-9688543-0-3) <http://www.optimalenvironments.com/index.htm>

- The most up-to-date textbook available, with hundreds of new references from the last five years
- Familiar chapter structure retained from the second edition
- Instructor's Manual: booklet and disk (PC and Mac) versions, including essay and multiple choice questions
- Laboratory Manual, with over 30 labs, in booklet or disk versions

Author: Dr. Gifford is Professor of Psychology at the University of Victoria, Past President of APA Division 34 (Population and Environment), and Fellow of the American Psychological Association and the Canadian Psychological Association.

A Practical Guide to Behavioral Research: Tools and Techniques (5th Ed.) by Robert Sommer and Barbara Sommer (2001). New York: Oxford University Press. <http://www.oup-usa.org/>

This new edition of Robert Sommer and Barbara Sommer's successful book *A Practical Guide to Behavioral Research* continues to emphasize a hands-on, multimethod, and interdisciplinary approach to behavioral research in psychology, sociology, and anthropology. It expands the fourth edition's coverage of computer-related research methods and

employs an international perspective, presenting general principles and their practical applications. Like previous editions, *A Practical Guide to Behavioral Research, Fifth Edition*, covers the four major approaches to behavioral research (experimentation, observation, questionnaire, interview) and examines other important methods, including attitude and rating scales, the case study, semantic differential, unobtrusive measures, and the use of personal documents. It provides particularly strong treatment of observational approaches, behavior and cognitive mapping, electronic searches and Internet research, and action research. This revision includes two new chapters stimulated by student interest: Chapter 14, "Action Research," addresses the gap between doing research and having it applied; Chapter 15, "The Big Fuzzies," describes techniques for researching important concepts that are difficult to define and measure.

Mind and Maze: Spatial Cognition and Environmental Behavior by Ann Sloan Devlin (2001). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers (ISBN: 0275967840).
<http://auburnhouse.com/praefer.htm>

In *Mind and Maze: Spatial Cognition and Environmental Behavior*, Ann Sloan Devlin takes the reader on a journey from the crib to the city, examining at each life phase the development of how we know where we are in space and our appreciation of spatial relationships. The author explores gender differences in spatial cognition, the parts of the brain that handle spatial relationships, and the principles that mapmakers and others use to create navigational aids, all in an effort to better identify the connection between certain behaviors and their relevance to real-world tasks. This book offers students, researchers, architects, and policy makers a fuller appreciation of spatial cognition and its impact on society.

Symposia, Conferences, Calls for Papers

The 9th International Symposium on
Society and Resource Management

*Choices and Consequences:
Resources and Societal Decision Making*

June 2-5, 2002, Indiana University, Bloomington Indiana

The International Symposium on Society and Resource Management has brought natural resource professionals, university researchers, non-government agencies, private sector organizations, students, and other parties concerned with management of our natural resources, together on a biennial basis since 1986.

These symposia provide a unique venue to focus on the contributions of the social sciences to better understand resource management issues. A major premise of the 9th symposium is that complex natural resource issues are societal

problems and thus must be addressed through an interdisciplinary social science perspective that includes decision-making within multidimensional social and cultural frameworks.

To provide an organizing framework for the Symposium, the following sub-themes were selected:

- Natural Resources Conflict: Identification, Management, and Resolution
- Capacity Management: Models, Measurement, and Public Participation
- Managing Current and Emerging Natural Resources Issues
- Integrating Natural Resources Management Within a Framework of Public Norms, Expectations, and Managerial Systems

Presentation Format:

- *Paper Presentation*: 20 minute presentation, 10 minute discussion period. Send a summary/abstract, not to exceed 300 words, describing the objectives and theme of the presentation.
- *Poster Presentation*: Describe in 300 words, or less, the purpose and strategy of the presentation. Poster sessions are on Monday, June 2. Two poster boards will be provided.
- *Dialogue Session*: Organizers of dialogue sessions will send a 300-word summary describing the topic, how it will be introduced, its relation ship to Symposium themes, and how the audience will be involved. Each session will consist of 30 minutes formal presentation, and 30 minutes public discourse and/or participation, via debates and "cross-fire" exchanges.
- *Panel Session*: Panels will be comprised of 3 or 4 persons and a session Chair. Each panelist will make a 10 minute opening statement on a topic related to Symposium themes, after which the Chair will facilitate interaction among the panelists for the remaining 20-30 minutes. Each Chair will submit a 300-word, or less, overview of the panel session.

Deadline for submission of proposals: 1/15/02

Conference web site: <http://www.indiana.edu/~issrm/index.htm>

 17th Conference of the International Association for
People-Environment Studies (IAPS-2002)

*Culture, Quality of Life and Globalization:
Problems and Challenges for the New Millenium*

July 23-27, 2002, A Coruña, Spain

In 2002, the 17th Conference of the International Association for People-Environment Studies will take place in A Coruña, Galicia, North-Western Spain. The IAPS conference is celebrated every two years and is an international reference for research on the interaction among people and the environment.

The latter half of the 20th century saw an increasing tension between the forces of globalization as exemplified by international fast-food chains, ubiquitous architectural styles and the introduction of the Euro currency on the one hand, and efforts to ensure local and regional identity and distinctiveness through planning controls, sustainability philosophy and even war on the other. Such tensions are no less apparent in Galicia than they are in other parts of Europe and the world. How will these tensions be resolved in the first decade of the 21st century? What are the implications for the quality of life? What will be the impact of global cultures on local cultures? What role can psychologists, sociologists, geographers, anthropologists, and other social scientists, as well as architects, planners, and the design professions play in this process? How can they collaborate with each other, as well as economists and environmental scientists?

The conference theme will focus on the tension between the local and the global culture as expressed and understood through research on architecture, design, planning, environmental sustainability and all the other policy and practice areas where environment-behaviour researchers are active.

Papers, workshops, symposia, poster and video sessions will be welcome on all aspects of this theme. Furthermore, the theme will be reinforced by the conference organizers through special presentations on how these tensions manifest themselves in Galician culture through fieldtrips and visits, and by the conference social programme.

Deadline for submission of abstracts and symposia: 11/2/01.

Please direct questions about the conference to:
iaps2002@udc.es

Conference web site: <http://www.udc.es/dep/ps/>

CALL FOR PAPERS

Journal of Management Education

Teaching About the Natural Environment in Management Education

Carolyn Egri (Simon Fraser University) and Kate Rogers (Pitzer College), Guest Editors

The Journal of Management Education invites submissions for a special issue on "Teaching About the Natural Environment in Management Education." We invite conceptual and empirical articles that explore teaching and learning about environmental sustainability in modern society and organizations. Possible topics to be addressed include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Is environmental sustainability relevant or irrelevant to management education?

- What role(s) does environmental education have in the undergraduate business curriculum? in the MBA curriculum? in executive education?
- How should environmental sustainability be addressed in business school curricula? as specialized programs, required courses, elective courses, and/or integrated into other business courses?
- What has been the experience of instructors who have introduced environmental sustainability topics in their courses and/or their business schools? Have they encountered unique pedagogical and institutional challenges? And if so, how have these been dealt with? Which strategies have proven to be most effective?
- What are the essential environmental topics that business students need to learn about? What theories, concepts and models are relevant for understanding environmental problems and issues? How do the topics or theories employed to teach environmental sustainability support, challenge, or modify perspectives in other areas of management education?
- Which pedagogical approaches/techniques have proven most effective in enhancing student knowledge about environmental issues and solutions? In influencing students' environmental attitudes and behaviors?

One important purpose of this special issue will be to provide an environmental education tool kit for both experienced and new instructors. Therefore, we welcome submissions that provide innovative pedagogical approaches, exercises, activities, and simulations, as well as reviews of environmental education instructional resources and materials (textbooks, cases, videos, etc.).

Deadlines and Submission Instructions: The deadline for submission of papers is April 22/15, 2002. Please prepare the manuscript following *Journal of Management Education* guidelines. Address any substantive questions to Carolyn Egri (carolyn_egri@sfu.ca) or Kate Rogers (kate_rogers@pitzer.edu). All manuscripts will be subject to a double-blind review process.

Please send four copies of the manuscript as well as an electronic version on computer diskette (save documents in Microsoft Word format) to the JME editor: Dale Fitzgibbons, Editor, Journal of Management Education, Illinois State University, 125 Williams Hall, Campus Box 5580, Normal, Illinois, 61790-5580.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Environmental Justice and Global Citizenship

February 14-16, 2002, Copenhagen, Denmark

This inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary conference project aims to explore the role of ecology and environmental ideas in the context of contemporary society and international

politics, and assess the implications for our understandings of fairness, justice and global citizenship.

The first in an annual series, the conference project will develop a focus on four interlocking areas:

Area 1 will examine the changing relationship between nature, culture, and society and will look at the impact of environmental thinking and ethics on issues such as animal/species welfare and rights, conservation and preservation, sustainable resources, food and feeding, space and air space, present and future needs, human 'rights', and our obligations to future generations.

Area 2 will examine the ethical and political impact of environmental thinking, looking at its emergence and role in political contexts, the factors which influence the formation of environmental policy, what (if any) is the place of economic methods and considerations, differing perspectives on the interpretation of scientific data, and the ability of national and international communities to successfully implement environmental policies.

Area 3 will examine the international nature of environmental issues and look at the problem solving processes which are or might be employed particularly in light of globalisation. Specific examples and case studies can be used to highlight the rise to international political prominence of ecological and environmental concerns, how environmental negotiation works in the context of international relations, the responsibilities of multinational companies, the feasibility of establishing environmental 'laws', and the future of ecological 'business'.

Area 4 will explicitly examine the themes of justice, community and citizenship, looking at the tensions present in ecological debates, the influence of cultural values, the meaning of ethical business practice, the assessment of what counts as environmental equality, inequality, and justice, and our responsibilities toward the world in which we live. The translation of statistics to individual faces, numbers and the people they represent, questions about what we must do, and the role of protest groups will also be considered.

Perspectives are sought from:

- People engaged in agriculture and agricultural economics, city and regional planning, conflict resolution and mediation, environmental studies, human development and ecology, industrial relations and design, philosophy and ethics, political science and international affairs, public policy and advising, social sciences, theology, urban studies, western European studies
- People in the public and private sectors who are involved in planning and project development, policy-making and implementation, and negotiation and mediation at national and international levels
- People in Governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, voluntary sector bodies,

environmental charities and groups, business and professional associations.

Papers will be considered on any related theme. 300 word abstracts should be submitted by Wednesday 28th November 2001. Full draft papers should be submitted by Thursday 17th January 2002.

The conference is the first in an annual series of research projects, run under the general banner 'Probing the Boundaries'. It aims to create working 'encounter' groups between people of differing perspectives, disciplines, professions, and contexts. The project is to be supported by an e-mail discussion group, resource website, ISSN e-journal, and dedicated ISBN eBook series.

Conference website: <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/e1.htm> or contact Dr Rob Fisher at rf@inter-disciplinary.net

Researchers' & Authors' Queries

Children's Environmental Attitudes

We are developing an instrument to measure the development of children's environmental attitudes and behaviors. I am looking for leads on networks to locate environmental activists and/or individuals living in environmentally intentional communities. One of the questions we wish to examine is how children in families of the above develop vis a vis the general population.

Thank you.

Gary Evans
Departments of Design and Environmental Analysis
and of Human Development
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-4401 gwe1@cornell.edu

POE Instruments for Office Environments

I'm an environmental psychologist and researcher and presently working on a research proposal concerning the development of an integrative and validated POE instrument/methodology for both new and traditional office environments focusing on the utility of and satisfaction with various facility management services. I'm looking for (preferably validated) POE instruments and methodologies for office environments that could be used by facility managers. I'd also be very grateful to receive any recent references of articles discussing ideas and developments in this direction or a framework to start from, or names of people with similar interests.

Thanks and greetings,

Yvonne A.W. Slangen - de Kort, Ph.D. MSc. Environmental psychology (y.a.w.d.kort@tm.tue.nl)
Eindhoven University of Technology

Faculty of Technology Management
Human Technology Interaction
PO box 513
5600 MB Eindhoven
The Netherlands

Perceived Safety of Urban Spaces

Is anyone out there aware of any work that is going on (or has previously), looking into perceptions of safety, etc. in underground public spaces (e.g. tunnels under roads). Also, any references you might have about perceptions of other urban connections (such as alleyways, paths, etc..) would be useful.

Cheers, Tony

Anthony Craig
Scottish Centre for Environmental Design Research
The Scott Sutherland School
The Robert Gordon University
Aberdeen
AB10 7QB
tel: 01224 263542
Email: a.craig@rgu.ac.uk

Children's Use of Open Spaces

I would be grateful for any references to studies on children's use of open spaces in cities differentiating between children native to the places and children having settled there from other cultures.

Thank you very much. Maria Nordström and Ulla Berglund

Human Geography Department Stockholm University SE-106
91 Stockholm Sweden tel +46 8 16 48 39 email:
maria.nordstrom@mail.humangeo.su.se

Evaluation of Environmental Education Programs

I would like to make a small collection of evaluation reports on environmental education programs. I have in mind not so much published peer-reviewed research (such as reviewed in Leeming et al, 1993, JEE 24(4): 8-21) as much as the kind of document that is produced internally or by a consultant for an EE program's evaluation needs (whether summative or formative). Reports should be based on empirical data, and written up. This is the kind of document that's not generally available usually except through the authors or sponsors.

I am looking for this kind of document for teaching purposes. One publication, available from NAAEE, is Holloweg's *Are we making a difference?* It's one great resource that traces the whole course of evaluating the VINE program. I want more examples of this sort, albeit unpublished ones, to use as teaching tools.

I am interested not just in "exemplary" reports, but also methodologically flawed ones, as well as ones that didn't find what was hoped for. Reports that were more qualitative or exploratory are of interest as well as more quantitative ones. "Outcomes" based reports are of interest, but so too are other kinds of approaches. I am interested in the full range of audiences, settings and program types/goals. All may be of potential use for teaching.

If you have, or know of, such reports, please contact me. I would be willing to cover costs to get copies if they are of interest.

Many thanks, Gene

Gene (Olin E.Jr.) Myers, Ph.D.
Huxley College of Environmental Studies
Western Washington University
Bellingham, WA 98225-9085
ph 360.650.4775 fax 360.650.7702
email: gmyers@cc.wvu.edu

Recycling and Perception of Resources

I am interested in how recycling policies affect the perception of resources. Right now I'm looking for existing scales, indices, or other research instruments that attempt to measure how people perceive resources. I am having difficulty finding related literature - so far I just have some simple ideas to make an item list and ask people to describe them as resource or not, which apparently is a dichotomous concept. Therefore I would like to hear from others who know of published or unpublished scales, theories, or empirical studies about it.

I've read many studies about how to promote recycling behaviors, but not enough about how to measure people's perception toward resources. If you have, or know of, such studies, please contact me. Thanks very much!

Tsai-shiou Hsieh
tsaishiou@hotmail.com
Ph.D. Program in Environmental Psychology
City University of New York, Graduate Center
365 Fifth Ave
New York, NY 10016

**NEW POSITION IN ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH BEHAVIOR AND HEALTH
EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

The Department of Health Behavior and Health Education at the School of Public Health at the University of Michigan is seeking candidates for a tenure-track position at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor. The focus of this position is on examining and addressing the predictors of behavioral, social, and physical aspects of environmental health. Candidates with expertise in health behavior and health education intervention and research are especially encouraged to apply. Collaboration is encouraged with existing departments, Centers, and initiatives at the School of Public Health and the University.

Responsibilities: Design, implement, and evaluate interventions and/or research on the predictors of behavioral, social, and physical aspects of environmental health. Teach department graduate-level courses, and advise master's/doctoral students. Develop/maintain programs of externally-funded research, and collaborative ties at the University. **Qualifications:** Earned doctorate with appropriate background, training, and research experience. Strong record of peer-reviewed publications and external funding, commensurate with rank. Strong record of teaching excellence, commensurate with rank. **Start Date:** No later than September 2002. **Salary:** Negotiable, commensurate with qualifications/experience. **Send** letter stating research and teaching interests and accomplishments, curriculum vitae, selected reprints, the names and addresses of three references (no letters), and e-mail address to: Chair, Search Committee, Dept. of HBHE, University of Michigan School of Public Health, 1420 Washington Hts, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2029. *The University of Michigan is a Non-Discriminatory/Affirmative Action employer.*

**The University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign**

School of Architecture and Department of
Landscape Architecture

offers the **Doctor of Philosophy** degree
in

**Architecture and Landscape
Architecture**

with concentrations in either

History & Theory or Behavioral & Cultural
Factors in Design

Robert B. Riley, Coordinator
Architecture/Landscape Architecture

Ph.D. Degree Program
101 Temple Buell Hall
611 E. Lorado Taft Drive
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

r-riley@uiuc.edu

<http://www.faa.uiuc.edu/LA-ArchPhD/>

BRING A FRIEND INTO DIVISION 34!!

Population and Environmental Psychology

Members of Division 34 receive this newsletter three times a year. You're probably a member, if you received this issue by mail -- but maybe you have friends and colleagues who are not members. Professionals who are members of related organizations can join the Division even if not members of the American Psychological Association. Our dues are only US\$9.00, with the first year FREE. We encourage students to join as student affiliates. All members, associates, and affiliates are eligible to vote and to hold office in Division 34.

To join, complete this form and mail to: Margaret Topf, Ph.D., Secretary, 4800 Hale Parkway #602, Denver, CO 80220.

I wish to join APA Division 34:

Name: _____

Address: _____

E-mail: _____

Circle one: I wish to join as: APA Member APA Fellow APA Associate
 Student Affiliate Non APA Member

Circle all that apply: I am also a member of: EDRA PAA APHA AMA IAPS MERA

Other associations: _____



NONPROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
WASHINGTON, D.C.
PERMIT NO. 6348

DIVISION 34
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
750 FIRST ST., N.E.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4242 USA



Printed on recycled paper made from 100% post-consumer fiber