



Term Times

TERM: Tackling Environmental Resource Management

The newsletter of the TERM social science research programme

April 2000

5

Editorial

Contents

New projects awarded under the TERM-II 2000 Round
p. 2

Communications on projects awarded in the TERM-II 1999 Round
p. 7

Steering Committee
p. 11

Call for Proposals 2000
p. 12

TERM II has entered its second year, generating activities among researchers in Environmental Resource Management issues all over Europe. The three projects awarded in the 1998 round have organised their (first) events, while the Steering Committee has selected six new projects in 1999.

The Consumption, Everyday Life and Sustainability summer school was held in Lancaster (UK) between 21 and 26 August 1999. Its group spirit marked it. The participants (including sociologists, anthropologists, designers, psychologists, engineers, environmental scientists) remained strongly involved for the full week. This clearly was the result of a well-balanced programme, geared towards 'real' science in the morning, and 'applied' science in the afternoon and social activities in the evenings. Themes were introduced through presentations by senior scientists and followed by group discussions. In the afternoons, exercises in applied science were undertaken, mostly as a practical illustration of issues discussed in the morning. The summer school generated a spin-off, in terms of an (awarded) proposal for a workshop in the second round of TERM II.

The first Environmental Policy, Agriculture and Biotechnology workshop took place on 7 May in London. Around twenty researchers from all over Europe combined their diverse disciplinary backgrounds in natural, agricultural and social sciences to approach the problem of managing the potentials and impacts of biotechnologies in this explorative workshop. Leading questions and scientific approaches were presented effectively and discussed in

terms of interlinkages and policy aspects. This workshop produced a comprehensive working programme for the follow-up workshop on biotechnology management, in April 2000 in Rome.

The first Social Psychology and Economics in Environmental Research meeting, held from 26 to 28 August in Gothenburg involved two days of presentations and plenary and 'break-out' discussions on issues regarding the (possible) linkages between social psychology and economy. Given the nature of this first workshop, most presentations were based on specific theoretical elements of both sciences, often illustrated by cases. Interestingly, social psychology seems to focus more on processes, whereas economics focuses on outcomes. This invites investigation into the interaction of process and outcome. This issue, among others, will be subject to further scrutiny at a second workshop, in Cambridge at the end of March 2000.

At its traditional autumn meeting in September, this time in Monopoli in the south of Italy, the Steering Committee awarded six new proposals. Under TERM-theme A (*The comparative dynamics of consumption and production processes*), the workshop proposals Infrastructures of Consumption and the Environment and Environmental Policy and Endogenous Technological Change were agreed. A workshop on Environmental Discourses and Perceptions in Northern and Southern Europe combines issues under theme C (*Forms of international environmental cooperation and their development*) with those under theme D (*Perception, communication and the social*

representation of environmental change). Theme D also covers the projects network for Research into the Construction of Environmental Risk, Environmental Socialisation within the European News Media, and the workshop Dealing with Uncertainty in Environmental Management. The latter project also addresses issues under theme B (*Environmental management and policy instruments under uncertainty*).

This issue of *TERM Times* presents short communications on current as well as new projects. It can be observed that without exception the themes for research are approached from a multidisciplinary angle. It can also be observed that this interesting development raises the important

question as to what extent the disciplines involved can be (and are) actually connected in their analysis of those themes, in terms of theories and methodologies. Some projects already underway address this issue more or less explicitly. Keeping in mind the fundamental character of TERM, the Steering Committee would encourage the submission of proposals that devote due attention to the factual multidisciplinary integration of theoretical, methodological and empirical issues around Environmental Resource Management themes.

Dr. Aad Correljé
Scientific Coordinator
of the TERM programme and
TERM Times Editor

New projects awarded under the TERM-II 2000 Round

Workshop: Dealing with Uncertainty in Environmental Management

Maastricht, the Netherlands, 13-15 September 2000

Dealing with uncertainty is at the core of environmental assessment and management. However, approaches currently available suffer from the following disadvantages:

- there is no generic framework available to characterise and communicate the types and sources of uncertainty;
- the methods do not allow the most salient uncertainties to be addressed in a systematic and transparent way;
- the associated uncertainty measures are not understandable to non-scientists in general and decision-makers in particular, so communication about uncertainty fails.

As a consequence, uncertainty is usually treated as a technical issue, addressed by statistical and mathematical means.

In social sciences, however, uncertainty is discussed from a completely different point of view. It is addressed in relation to perceptions and social construction. Efforts have been made to use social scientific evidence, insights and theorising to improve the environmental

assessment practice. Therefore, social science has something to offer to research institutes and agencies involved in environmental assessment.

By informing other European and national research groups directly or indirectly involved in the issue of uncertainty and environmental management, and by upgrading national research efforts to a European level, the workshop aims to enhance European collaboration. This will provide added value over the longer term, both in terms of scientific benefits as well as benefits for the user groups (i.e. environmental agencies and policy makers). The expected scientific added value will involve: a state-of-the-art review of social science approaches to uncertainty in environmental assessment and management; a research agenda that can guide multidisciplinary research on this issue; and an extensive scientific review of a particular approach.

The workshop explicitly aims to involve more social scientists in research on environmental issues, by engaging them

via an issue that is central to social science epistemology, philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, policy sciences and economics. In this way, the workshop aims to broaden the basis for research on environmental assessment management and to stimulate multidisciplinary research in

the social sciences, and between social and natural sciences. It furthermore aims to build a bridge between social scientists and user groups in environmental management, i.e. environmental agencies and policy makers.

Project: Network for Research into the Construction of Environmental Risk (NRCER)

The purpose of this project is to create a network of researchers from five European universities, who have all been studying the social construction of environmental risk and carried out fieldwork. The experience of the research group covers a broad array of settings and situations in different countries, thus providing an excellent basis for the development of comparative insights. This comparative approach allows for the development of a badly needed social theory on risk, founded in empiricism.

In order to obtain a common ground for the delimitation of risk we consider it useful to define the concept of 'situated risk'. By this notion we imply that risks are always embedded in a specific time and place. This means that there are no free-floating abstract, disinterested risks, disassociated from time and space or without social meanings. Having analysed different risk situations such as dams, tunnels and other infrastructure constructions, industrial hazards, nuclear power stations and volcanic eruptions, this seems a logical assumption.

Our goal is to develop a theoretical approach to the phenomenon of 'situated risk', that may be helpful in:

- providing conceptual clarity and precision;
- establishing of a sample of risk types suited for further investigation;
- describing the materialisation in society of 'situated risk';
- analysing its influence on social movements and coverage by mass media; and
- determining the institutional contexts of 'situated risk'. Such an approach may facilitate the further development of a methodology for the research of risk; the analysis of the communication of risk and of issues pertaining to risk management in a democracy.

Two workshops are planned in September 2000 and May 2001. The first workshop will invite researchers to present their work, with written papers sent to discussants. We will establish an email discussion list, so that those involved can continue the discussions. The second workshop aims at achieving a synthesis of the different insights generated by the work of the participants, the discussions in the first workshop and the email list. A tangible output will ensure that the outcomes of the workshops will become available to the wider research community and that they contribute to widening the debate on the issue of environmental risk management.

Project: Environmental Socialisation within the European News Media

The media play a key role in influencing the public perception of environmental problems. Frequently, researchers assume a direct causal relationship between media coverage and public opinion. Media coverage, however, often follows from public attention to environmental issues. Indeed, the literature suggests that the media are highly selective in their coverage of

environmental issues. The reason for this is that processes of meaning-making and attitude-shaping do not happen within a vacuum. Economic and technological factors combine with cultural criteria in shaping ideological meanings and messages.

Recent studies highlight the complex manner in which individuals and

Information can be obtained from:

Marjolein van Asselt,
ICIS, University of
Maastricht,
PO Box 616,
6200 MD Maastricht,
the Netherlands.
Tel: +31 43 388 2662
Fax: +31 43 321 0541
Email:
S.Pittie@ICIS.UNIMAAS.NL

Information can be obtained from:

Raquel Santiso,
Departamento de
Psicología y
Sociología, Facultad
de Económicas,
C/Dr. Cerrada 1,
50005 Zaragoza,
Spain.
Tel: +34 97 67 62 001
Fax: +34 97 67 62 003
Email:
nrcer@posta.unizar.es
Web site:
www.unizar.es/risk

different social groups make sense of environmental issues as presented in the media. It is suggested that, in order to understand how and why particular messages are sent and how meanings are produced, it will be necessary to consider institutional and infrastructural frameworks, in conjunction with media representation, within a given cultural context. So far, this reciprocal transfer between institutional and infrastructural frameworks and environmental socialisation via the media has not been analysed systematically. Nor has there been systematic cross-cultural analysis of media presentation of environmental issues within Europe. Study of these issues may, for example, help to explain the well-known fact that individuals' actual behaviour is not always consistent with their environmentally friendly attitudes, but related to non-ecological motivations, such as infrastructural aspects, consumer situations and lifestyles.

Due to differing base-line situations and cultural differences, this project is not aimed at producing a European-wide solution to promote environmentally friendly behaviour. Instead, we intend to stimulate a cross-fertilisation between countries, in terms of an informed

evaluation of what kind of media approach works and what does not. This evaluation will be based on knowledge of the specific circumstances and cultural context, which will be provided by the members of the research team. Successful concepts can then be modified accordingly and applied elsewhere.

In order to assess the reciprocal transfer between the institutional/infrastructural framework and environmental socialisation via the media, this project will characterise how the existing infrastructure facilitates, or hinders, environmentally friendly behaviour in eight European countries (Italy, Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, UK, Denmark, France and Spain). It will also produce a preliminary inventory of how environmental issues are presented in the mass media. Data on infomercials, commercials and environmental campaigns will be collected by sampling major TV channels and selected newspapers. The methods of data analysis will draw upon genre analysis combined with symbolic, semiotic and narrative approaches. The results of the study will provide the necessary groundwork for outlining an elaborate research plan for a large-scale follow-up study.

Information can be obtained from:

Susanne Friese,
Copenhagen Business
School, Department of
Marketing Research
Group: Consumption,
Environment and
Culture, Solbjergs
Plads 3,
Frederiksberg,
Denmark.
Tel: +45 3815 2159
Fax: +45 3815 2101
Email:
sf.marktg@cbs.dk

Workshop: Economic Modelling of Environmental Policy and Endogenous Technological Change

Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 16-17 November 2000

Damages to the environment such as an anthropogenic change of our global climate, resulting from an excessive use of fossil energy resources, are likely to have, sooner or later, pervasive economic consequences. Environmental policy instruments are being designed to mitigate existing and potential future conflicts between economic growth and environmental quality. In the past, economists have focused predominantly on the efficiency of such instruments, by examining how environmental policies affect various macroeconomic variables. Their analysis is often based on models that presume a given level of the available technologies or, alternatively, a deterministic exogenous evolution of the technological state of the art. It is known,

however, that technological change can alter fundamentally the nature of trade-offs between economic performance and environmental quality. Therefore, the effect of public policies on the development and spread of new technologies is among one of the crucial determinants of the success or failure of environmental management. The current policy debate on climate change is well aware of this, showing an increasing attention to the relation between climate-change measures and innovation.

Recently, a new class of models of economic growth and technological change has emerged in which technology is treated as an endogenous variable. Currently, economists are applying this

approach to environmental issues. Results of both theoretical and empirical modelling suggest that recognising the endogenous nature of technological innovation modifies the anticipated impact of environmental policies. Ignoring induced technological progress produces a biased picture of the interdependency between environmental policy and economic growth. It thus might lead to biased policy recommendations designed, for example, for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

The aim of the workshop Economic Modelling of Environmental Policy and Endogenous Technological Change is to understand how environmental policies affect the development of economic and environmental variables, through a shift in the rate of technological change. The three specific topics covered by the workshop are: endogenous economic growth and sustainable development; induced technological change; energy modelling and environmental policies.

Workshop: Infrastructures of Consumption and the Environment

Wageningen University, the Netherlands, 25-27 November 2000

Utility infrastructures and institutions are undergoing rapid reconfiguration across Europe, fuelling widespread interest in the processes of change and igniting debates over the environmental and consumer issues at stake. The workshop *Infrastructures of Consumption and the Environment* addresses the following questions: How is the everyday provision of energy, water, waste or transport services being transformed? How are ordinary users of utility systems involved in such processes of reorganisation? What are the roles of new technologies in influencing changing service regimes? Do these new arrangements offer any opportunities for more sustainable consumption?

The workshop will be organised around four cross-cutting sessions. Each session will investigate an aspect of changing utility provision and the implications for ordinary consumption practices, with a focus on empirical examples from a range of national energy, water, waste and transport sectors.

Endogenous economic models still need major development to allow their full use in the analysis of environmental policies and technological transitions. One can distinguish macroeconomic models that focus on economic growth and usually specify one aggregate sector, on the one hand, and microeconomic technology models that allow analysing innovations related to a specific environmental issue, on the other hand. Both macroeconomic endogenous growth models and microeconomic scenario optimisation models have their specific merits and inconveniences. The workshop discusses both the advantages and deficiencies of macroeconomic endogenous growth models and microeconomic scenario optimisation models. One explicit objective of the workshop is to develop policy recommendations on climate change, in relation to the question of how the world can provide itself with energy without provoking undue global warming.

Information can be obtained from:

Reyer Gerlagh, Peter Mulder and Bob van der Zwaan, Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, De Boelelaan 1115, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
Tel: +31 20 4449 555
Fax: +31 20 4449 553
Email: secr@ivm.vu.nl

Session 1 deals with *Differentiation*: As utility markets have liberalised and fragmented, differentiated products (e.g. waste recycling bins) and tariffs (e.g. green energy tariffs) have emerged. How might these new service options influence the activities of different social groups? What is the relationship between pre-defined 'green' user roles and actual consumer practices?

Session 2 deals with *Monitoring and Visibility*: Utility networks increasingly incorporate new monitoring and feedback systems (e.g. interactive energy meters), which promise to 'make visible' previously inconspicuous consumption practices. But what exactly do these monitors reveal and what remains hidden? What parts can utilities and users play in configuring monitoring devices and in shaping sustainable consumption activities?

Session 3 deals with *Scales of Provision*: With the opening-up of utility markets new scales of provision have emerged;

decentralised systems are one example (e.g. individual solar panels or neighbourhood composting). What will such localisation mean for consumer roles in utility management? What opportunities for sustainable provision might divergent scales of operation offer?

Session 4 deals with *Storage, Time and Consumption*: The schedules and regimes of utility management are shifting as new commercial and environmental imperatives emerge (saving water, storing energy, reducing demand). How are infrastructure schedules becoming 'scripted' in storage devices on utility networks (e.g. bins, tanks and batteries) and to what extent can these new timetables of provision be re-set to meet diverse consumer requirements?

During the Closing Session *Outcomes and Future Visions* policy-makers and utility representatives will comment on the outcomes from each session and suggest ways of reconnecting these to the practices of infrastructure management.

Workshop: Environmental Discourses and Perceptions in Northern and Southern Europe **Bogaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey, September 2000**

What makes us, or deters us from actively protecting the environment? Is it, as suggested by realist theories, a function of how threatening our physical environment is and how much we value nature? Or is it, as suggested by discourse theory, a function of how relationships between nature and society and the state of the environment are constructed politically, socially and culturally? What is the impact of the different cultural contexts and economic conditions in Europe in shaping these constructions? These will be the themes of this workshop.

The workshop will seek to identify which perceptions, by whom, and what discourses dominate the shaping of environmental policy in different regions of Europe. To what degree are business and science driving agents, as suggested

Sessions will include contributions from invited speakers including: Elizabeth Shove, Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster University, UK; Gert Spaargaren, Department of Sociology, Wageningen University, the Netherlands; Simon Marvin, Chair of Utilities, University of Salford, UK; Karl Steininger, Department of Economics, University of Graz, Austria; Maarten Wolsink, Faculty of Spatial Sciences, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands; Alan Warde, Centre for Research on Innovation and Competition, Manchester University, UK; Bernhard Truffer, Federal Institute for Environmental Science and Technology, Switzerland.

The meeting will be held in Wageningen University, the Netherlands, from 25 to 27 November 2000, bringing together participants from across Europe, including invited experts, young researchers, utility providers and policy professionals to tackle some critical questions. Twenty places will be available for young researchers, policy makers and utility managers.

Information can be obtained from:

Heather Chappells,
Centre for Science
Studies, Bowland
Tower South, Lancaster
University, Lancaster LA1
4YT, United Kingdom.
Email:
h.chappells@lancaster.ac.uk

Bas van Vliet, Dept of
Social Sciences,
Wageningen University,
Hollandseweg 1,
6706 KN Wageningen,
the Netherlands.
Email:
bas.vanvliet@alg.swg.wau.nl

in the eco-modernistic literature? To what degree are environmental groups, consumers and other civil society actors playing a leading role, as suggested in the risk society literature? And to what degree do national governments remain the key agent in environmental policy-making? What is the relation between the socio-political context and the way in which those actors influence policy-making on different environmental issues. The workshop will contrast different theoretical approaches to environmental policy and action, with a particular emphasis on waste management and genetic engineering.

This workshop will concentrate on theories and methods that might bridge the micro-macro gap, paying attention specifically to discourse analysis. At the macrolevel, discourse analysis focuses on the question of how an issue is framed,

interpreted and given meaning; at the microlevel it enquires how the various actors, given a specific framing of issues, act towards this issue. Through theory-based discourse analysis of how 'nature' and 'environmental problems' associated with waste disposal and genetic engineering are constructed in the political realm and the media, we intend to further investigate the observable differences

between the North and the South of Europe. This will contribute to a deeper understanding of the North-South schism in environmental policy in Europe. It is also the aim of the seminar to encourage a debate on the relative merits of modernist and post-modernist approaches to understanding environmental policy.

Information can be obtained from:
Fatos Göksen,
Assistant Professor Koç
University, School of Arts
and Sciences,
Department of
Sociology, Çayir Cad.,
No 5 Istinye 80860,
Istanbul, Turkey.
Tel: +90 212 229 3006
ext.311
Fax: +90 212 229 0680
Email:
fgoksen@ku.edu.tr

Communications on projects awarded in the TERM-II 1999 Round

Workshop: Environmental Policy, Agriculture and Biotechnology

London, United Kingdom, 7 May 1999

The School of Public Policy and the Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE) of University College, London, hosted the first of two TERM workshops on Environmental Policy, Agriculture and Biotechnology on 7 May 1999 in London. Twenty-one researchers from eight European countries brought their diverse scientific expertise in the natural, agricultural and social sciences to bear on the problem of managing the potentials and impacts of the introduction of biotechnologies over the course of a day-long workshop.

The workshop successfully fulfilled its exploratory objective, which was to provide the initiative and framework for developing biotechnology management. The immediate goal is to create the knowledge base that is required for regulating the diffusion of novel technologies within agriculture.

The format of the workshop provided for a balanced mixture of invited presentations on the state of the art in environmental policy analysis and follow-on discussions of the issues and ideas implicated in those analyses. The morning was entirely dedicated to the analysis of impacts of technologies in agriculture: biological, environmental and socioeconomic. The afternoon focused on the valuation and the

management of genetic resources and the management of biotechnological applications.

In response to the morning presentations, the participants rapidly identified issues critical to the determination of the impact of biotechnologies. At the biological level, concerns of reversibility and feedback effects (pathogens to technologies) were pre-eminent. At the environmental level, the primary concerns were the scale of the effects and the responsiveness of other species, such as wildlife. At the social level, the concerns focused on the impacts of new technologies on the developing world, and the poorest peoples within the various regions.

Will the impacts of spreading biotechnology on the biological, environmental and socioeconomic system substantially affect global welfare? How should society value these induced changes when measured against the attendant benefits of technology diffusion? The workshop addressed these questions during the afternoon session. Attention focused on the problems of valuing those parts of ecosystems that require a more sophisticated understanding of their role in maintaining the biological and environmental systems, such as non-target species (e.g. birds), genetic

diversity or epidemiological buffer zones. The research agenda will have to move forward on assessing these more complex, but increasingly more important ecosystem components.

In keeping with the general objective of the workshop, both the analysis of impacts and the question of valuation were consistently framed in the context of their policy relevance and the scope and design of regulatory instruments. The valuation of impacts on dependent species was a focus of these discussions. Another fundamental issue concerns the uncertainty emanating from the phased introduction of new technologies, its valuation and management.

Finally the workshop raised and surveyed the issues concerning the valuation and management of genetic resources in agriculture. These issues raise the policy questions concerning *ex*

situ (gene bank) management, and its effectiveness in conserving resources and managing values. The values emanating from conserving and managing resources *in situ* were developed and contrasted, including the epidemiological values discussed at the beginning of the day.

The second workshop, featuring presentations of research stimulated by the first workshop, will take place in Rome in April 2000. A general Call for Papers is announced for presentations in Rome. In addition, a small workshop was held at the international conference on Global Change and Terrestrial Ecology, Reading University in September 1999 on the specific issue of genetic resource management and development. The group coordinator is also in discussions for developing a transatlantic approach to these issues in concert with the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Information can be obtained from:

Professor Tim Swanson, Department of Economics and CSERGE, University College London.
Email: Tim.Swanson@ucl.ac.uk

Summer school: Consumption, Everyday Life and Sustainability

Lancaster, United Kingdom, 21-26 August 1999

Coordinated by Elizabeth Shove, Heather Chappells and Dale Sourtherton, with Mika Pantzar, Gert Spaargaren and Hal Wilhite

Most years the rabbits have free range of Lancaster University's campus during late August but 1999 was an exception. Travelling from more than a dozen countries and bringing with them the expertise of over twenty different disciplines, as well as from industry and policy, the thirty participants of an ESF-funded summer school on Consumption, Everyday Life and Sustainability upset the normal pattern. During the week-long summer school, a number of other conventions were also overturned.

The organisers' rather ambitious aim was to involve a very diverse collection of participants in a sustained and concentrated programme of activities designed to develop understanding of the dynamics of consumption and production and explore their implications for environmental sustainability.

Formal presentations provided a common point of reference. Invited speakers presented contrasting theories and offered a range of perspectives on

core themes of choice, change, and the co-evolution of demand. The history of air conditioning in the USA provided a telling illustration of the escalation of increasingly unsustainable concepts of comfort. On the other hand, analyses of water-saving devices showed how consumers might be configured to adopt more sustainable ways of life. We talked about low energy light bulbs, bath tubs, kitchen knives, car sharing, night storage heaters, convenience food and fridge-freezers. We considered competing explanations for the speeding up of daily life, and reflected on the environmental implications of what have become routine and habitual practices. Systems of provision and macrolevel infrastructural change were part of the picture too. Day after day, theoretical positions jostled alongside a host of empirical examples.

But this was just the start, for the afternoons held new surprises. Unsuspecting participants found themselves engrossed in a series of practical research exercises – having got

the bus into Lancaster they spread out in all directions: conducting instant ethnographies in peoples' homes, undertaking comparative cultural research in freezer showrooms, and checking out the latest thing in kitchen design. Making use of pictures and photographs of their own lives and homes, rapidly formed research teams generated new visions of the future; they concocted revealing analyses of each others' habits; and saw the consumption patterns of 1999 through new eyes.

This combination of theory and practice and this mixture of academic papers and challenging exercises was stimulating, exhausting and enjoyable. Looking back,

it also represented a landmark in the field of consumption research and environmental social science. This event proved, beyond doubt, that there is a body of empirically grounded, theoretically informed social scientific research on the systems, structures, and cultural characteristics of consumption.

Such work promises to re-shape the terms of environmental policy, going beyond the limited study of individual belief, action and behaviour and providing the intellectual fuel for a significantly new agenda encompassing themes of consumption, sustainability and everyday life.

Information can be obtained from:

Elizabeth Shove, Centre for Science Studies, University of Lancaster, Bowland Tower South, Lancaster, LA1 4YT, United Kingdom.

Tel: + 44 1524 594610

Email:

e.shove@lancaster.ac.uk

Workshop: Social Psychology and Economics in Environmental Research (SPEER)

Gothenburg, 26–28 August 1999

The Gothenburg workshop brought together twenty-two participants from nine European countries working in the fields of psychology, economics, philosophy, human ecology and environmental management. Most hold senior positions in academic or governmental institutions. Only a few had met previously, so the workshop participants made good use of familiarising themselves with each other's research and institutions. The context of the workshop was set by a short presentation from the SPEER coordinator Clive Spash, the workshop host Anders Biel, and from the ESF-TERM Scientific coordinator Aad Correljé. The workshop focused on two broad themes: (i) environmental values and attitudes (four papers presented; plus small group discussion) and (ii) social dilemmas and environmental regulation (three papers presented; plus small group discussion).

The presentations and discussions covered a considerable range of issues but some of those which were regarded as key to the aims of SPEER are noted below. Some of these are intended for further exploration in the second workshop. While there was often disagreement on the points raised, the thrust of the main viewpoints and concerns expressed can be summarised as follows:

Environmental values and attitude

The fact that different disciplines foster different understandings of issues became apparent. Thus different conceptions of 'environmental problems' and the way various disciplines frame them result in different approaches to the study of environmental behaviour and policy recommendations. The integration of economic and psychological theories in order to address environmental problems was seen to require the reassessment of 'old models' (e.g. by identifying what is absent but regarded as important). This would increase awareness of partial perspectives, biases and shortcomings. In this regard neither the economic approach which focuses upon preference links to behaviour, nor expansions of this model to include attitudes, beliefs and social norms (as in Fishbein and Ajzen), were regarded as satisfactory. Defining/identifying potential 'new models' was regarded as desirable. However, this might be problematic because one set of shortcomings (in old models) might merely be replaced by a new set. Nevertheless, various suggestions were made as to how models of motivation and behaviour could be improved by including neglected aspects such as ethics, emotions and non-consequentialist reasoning. A motivation/value typology

might be established to include factors regarded as stable (e.g. ethical/moral principles), susceptible to change (impressions/information), individual and social. In addition, some role for feedback loops was seen as necessary. Collective or social choice was seen as inadequately understood and addressed. The aggregation of individual expressions of choice (e.g. preferences as in cost-benefit analysis) was regarded as a poor representation of collective values and attitudes. Collective choice was seen as a completely different process, requiring a different approach to gain understanding.

Social dilemmas and environmental regulation

The discussion of regulatory issues introduced a focus upon the societal level of decision-making as opposed to that of the individual. One approach was to look at how needs, opportunities and abilities might interact to determine motivation and behaviour. This contrasted with the individualistic focus of the attitudes belief model. Variables such as opportunities and behavioural control emphasised that an understanding of the institutional context of decision-making and processes was necessary. That is, social institutions could determine individual opportunities, for example. This raised questions of institutional analysis. For example, how firms control behaviour (e.g. of employees, consumers) and react to regulation as institutions. The social, or macro, dimensions of environmental problems/issues were regarded as neglected. The concept of a collective good was seen as ambiguous, i.e. who decides what is the collective good; how can we collectively decide/arrive at what is desirable.

The interaction between different institutions and their implicit value systems was seen as determining the choice of regulatory tools and measures for decision justification. In addition, the choice of the institutional approach was recognised as impacting upon behaviour and value expression. An often complex feedback process was recognised to be operative. Crowding-in and crowding-out provided a good example of the impact that different policy instruments can

have on preferences, perceptions and behaviour. Thus the effectiveness of policy instruments was crucially dependent upon wider considerations than the normally entered economic models.

Crowding-in and crowding-out also provided a good example of the link between psychology and economics. A general need for evaluating processes was recognised. For example, cost-benefit analyses and deliberative processes might be examined in terms of endorsement and acceptance by the public.

Overarching and methodological issues

Trade-offs are commonly assumed to be present in most choices, but in fact are rare in multiattribute/non-compensatory choices. Policy orientation of research in economics and psychology is often weak. Social psychology seemed to focus more on processes whereas economic theory had a focus on outcomes. An interesting area of research would be to relate processes to outcomes and assess their interaction. Some consideration of how environmental problems are handled differently in different countries could prove a useful research area. In addition, the approach of different policy-making institutions might be studied.

Outcomes of the first SPEER workshop and planning of the second SPEER workshop

In order to clarify concepts attached to different uses of words/jargon, the workshop participants identified words which should be defined; these include terms used in economics, psychology and philosophy (sometimes the same word has different meanings across disciplines). Definitions will be gathered and collated via email and during the Cambridge workshop.

The following themes were identified as important issues to be further elaborated and discussed and could form the sessions for the Cambridge workshop: (i) Behaviour, Attitude, Preferences, Ethics; (ii) Context: Social Identity, Institutions, Social Norms; (iii) Society / Community Decisions; (iv) Regulation; (v) Social Dilemmas. The consensus was that both individual and collective choice should be covered, but that greater emphasis be

placed on the latter where economic theory is found to be particularly inadequate. Most issues could be addressed using empirical examples which apply theories. The aim would be to probe into underlying assumptions of current theories and methods and whether 'real life' situations can be explained with current theories. Other issues of interest identified included: the role of existence/ formation of values; comparing 'hard' measures (e.g. pay-offs) and 'soft' measures (e.g. values, attitudes); relating insights into theory and methodology to the design of empirical work; looking into the validity and acceptability of methods; assessing decision processes; and looking into

different aspects of what motivates certain behaviour action (such as prices, social identity, values).

Based on group work and a plenary discussion on the planning of the second SPEER workshop, a suitable format for the workshop was decided to be 20-minute presentations of papers (which will have been previously distributed to all participants), 5 minutes for a discussant, followed by 35 minutes of open discussion. Some group work is also planned to allow in-depth discussion of key issues in groups of eight to ten people. The workshop will take place in Cambridge, Christ's College, 30 March to 2 April 2000.

Information can be obtained from:
Claudia Carter,
 Cambridge Research for the Environment (CRE), Department of Land Economy, University of Cambridge, 19 Silver Street, Cambridge CB3 9EP, United Kingdom.
 Tel: +44 1223 330802
 Fax: +44 1223 337130
 Web site: <http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk/speer/>

Tackling Environmental Resource Management (TERM II) Steering Committee

Professor G.A. van der Knaap (Chairman)

*Erasmus University
 Rotterdam
 Economic Geography
 Institute
 P.O. Box 1738
 3000 DR Rotterdam
 The Netherlands
 Tel: +31 10 408 14 61
 Fax: +31 10 408 91 61
 Email: vanderknaap@few.eur.nl*

Dr. Knut H. Alfsen

*Director
 CICERO - Center for
 International Climate and
 Environmental Research
 P.O. Box 1129
 Blindern
 0317 Oslo
 Norway
 Tel: +47 22 85 87 50
 Fax: +47 22 85 87 51
 Email: knut.alfsen@cicero.uio.no*

Dr. Mikael Skou Andersen

*Aarhus University
 Department of Political
 Science
 Universitetsparken
 8000 Aarhus C
 Denmark
 Tel: +45 31 10 66 00
 Fax: +45 31 19 68 68
 Email: andersen@ps.au.dk*

Dr. Frans Berkhout

*University of Sussex
 ESRC Global Environment
 Change Programme
 Mantell Building
 Falmer*

Brighton BN1 9RF
 United Kingdom
 Tel: +44 1273 877 130
 Fax: +44 1273 604 483
 Email: F.Berkhout@sussex.ac.uk

Professor Francesco Chiarello

*Università di Bari
 Facoltà di Giurisprudenza
 Dpto. di Scienze Storiche
 e Sociali
 Piazza Cesare Battisti, 1
 70121 Bari
 Italy
 Tel: +39 080 8771722
 (home)
 5717343 (univ)
 Fax: +39 080 5717344
 Email: f.chiarello@lex.uniba.it
 or f.chiarello@iol.it*

Professor Heinz Gutscher

*Universität Zürich
 Psychologisches Institut
 Abteilung Sozialpsychologie
 Plattenstrasse 14
 8032 Zürich
 Switzerland
 Tel: +41 1 634 21 13
 Fax: +41 1 634 4931
 Email:
 gutscher@sozpsy.unizh.ch*

Professor Marja Järvelä

*University of Jyväskylä
 Department of Social
 Sciences and Philosophy
 P.O. Box 35
 10551 Jyväskylä
 Finland
 Tel: +358 14 603111
 Fax: +358 14 603 101
 Email: mjarvela@dodo.jyu.fi*

Professor Sandor Kerekes

*Head of Department of
 Environmental
 Economics and Technology
 Budapest University of
 Economics
 Fovan ter 8
 1095 Budapest
 Hungary
 Tel: +36 1 217 95 88
 Email:
 skerekes@enviro.bke.hu*

Professor Lennart J. Lundqvist

*Göteborg University
 Dept of Political Science
 Box 711
 405 30 Göteborg
 Sweden
 Tel: +46 31 773 1229
 Fax: +46 31 773 4599
 Email:
 lennart.lundqvist@pol.gu.se*

Dr. Andrew Sors (EU Observer)

*Head of Unit
 Improving the Socio-
 Economic Knowledge Base
 European Commission
 Square de Meeüs 8
 1040 Brussels
 Belgium
 Tel: +32 2 295 7659
 Fax: +32 2 299 4462
 Email:
 andrew.sors@dg12.cec.be*

Professor Hans Spada

*Albert-Ludwigs-
 Universität Freiburg
 Psychologisches Institut
 Niemensstrasse 10*

79085 Freiburg im Breisgau
 Germany
 Tel: +49 761 203 2487
 Fax: +49 761 203 2490
 Email:
 spada@psychologie.uni-
 freiburg.de

Professor Joan Subirats

*Universidad Autónoma de
 Barcelona
 Facultad de Ciencias
 Políticas, Económicas y
 Comerciales
 Departamento de Ciencia
 Política y Derecho Público
 08095 Bellaterra
 (Barcelona)
 Spain
 Tel: +34 93 581 17 67
 Fax: +34 93 581 24 39
 Email: joan.subirats@uab.es*

Scientific Coordinator:

Dr. Aad Correljé

*Erasmus University
 Rotterdam
 Dept. of Applied Economics
 Postbus 1738
 3000 DR Rotterdam
 The Netherlands
 Tel: +31 10 4081456
 Fax: +31 10 4527009
 Email: correlje@few.eur.nl*

ESF Scientific Secretary:

Marianne Yagoubi

Email: myagoubi@esf.org

Call for Proposals 2000

Guidelines for applicants

General information

The TERM Phase II programme invites social scientists and/or research groups based at European universities to apply for grants under its second round. Grants are available for the organisation of summer schools, workshops and for exchanges. Organising research groups should comprise researchers from different European countries (minimum four countries). The budget available for the organisation of a summer school is 30 000 Euros (200 000 FF). For a workshop the available budget is 15 000-22 500 Euros (100 000 – 150 000 FF). In addition there is funding available for exchanges. Some co-sponsoring from other sources is welcomed. Workshops in which policy makers or other user-groups will take part are welcome as well.

The TERM Phase II programme runs for three years (1999-2001). In this second round a maximum of three summer school proposals and three workshops can be supported. The duration of the grants will be twelve months. Decisions will be announced in November 2000 for grants to be held in calendar year 2001.

The main criteria for assessment of the application are the European added value of the workshop or summer school and the extent to which the activity fits in the TERM programme. The objectives of the programme are the following:

- to provide European added value to national programmes and projects;
- to offer a facility that is regarded as valuable and worthwhile by researchers involved in national programmes and projects;
- to provide opportunities for young scientists who are starting their scientific careers;
- to broaden the basis for research on environmental issues in the social sciences;
- to stimulate multidisciplinary research on these issues;
- to publish results from activities organised within the programme.

The themes of the programme are as follows:

- A. The comparative dynamics of consumption and production processes
- B. Environmental management and policy instruments under uncertainty
- C. Forms of international environmental cooperation and their development
- D. Perception, communication and the social representation of environmental change

A short description of these themes is as follows:

A. The comparative dynamics of consumption and production processes

This research theme explores the way in which consumption and lifestyles determine the environmental costs and benefits of economic growth. Furthermore, changes in patterns of consumption behaviour are studied. Examples of specific areas covered are: the impact of infrastructures, transportation and communication systems and the role of public rules, subsidies, levies and fiscal structures.

B. Environmental management and policy instruments under uncertainty

This theme is concerned with the problem of providing public goods, viz. the environment, given the problem of collective action. The focus is on instruments; their design, implementation problems, the lack of effectiveness of traditional regulatory approaches, and uncertainty with respect to basic scientific understanding of complex environmental issues and behavioural responses.

C. Forms of international environmental cooperation and their development

To an increasing extent pollution is becoming a transboundary problem (the greenhouse effect, acidification, etc.) This raises the special problem of international policy coordination. Several aspects will be studied under this theme: international environmental agreements and institutions, the

role of interest groups, such as NGOs, and private companies groups at the international level, and the interlinkages between domestic and international policy processes.

D. Perception, communication and the social representation of environmental change

This theme considers the way in which people perceive environmental problems and how their knowledge and attitudes influence their behaviour. Key research issues include: the communication of environmental problems, how to change behaviour, and relations between class stratification and perception, knowledge and behaviour. The focus is both on individuals and on groups.

How to apply

Applicants should submit their proposal electronically. The application form is available at: http://www.esf.org/db/social/term/term_call.htm and requires the following information:

- Title of proposal, name of the project leader, organising research group, and research abstract.
- Budget estimates.
- A short abstract of the aims and objectives of the summer school or workshop.
- The type of the activity to be organised (summer school or workshop), its length and the participants (names of senior scientists and the number of young scientists to be invited). A description of the summer school or workshop should explain its value for the TERM programme. It should be indicated whether exchanges are planned in addition to the summer school or workshop and how these will be organised.
- The theme(s) of the TERM programme under which the proposal falls, plus a brief description of the theoretical and/or empirical context, relevant methodological issues and the manner in which the disciplines involved in the project contribute. Please include an indication of the expected scientific added-value of the project.
- The location and duration of the event. A statement of the organisational and administrative arrangements (e.g. who will take overall responsibility for organising the workshop or summer school).
- Plans for the dissemination and publication of research results.
- Short curriculum vitae on the project leader and the organising group.
- Detailed specification of the budget for the project and the exchanges and, if any, the amount of co-sponsoring. Estimates should be provided under the following main headings (a) workshop/summer school, (b) exchanges, (c) coordinating group, (d) administrative costs (i.e. sub-headings: postage, photocopying; telephone, fax; secretarial assistance). This latter heading should normally amount to no more than 10% of the grant.

Applications should not exceed 10 pages.

Deadline for applications: 15 July 2000

Decisions will be announced in November 2000.

Contact

Please fill in and return the electronic application form available at: http://www.esf.org/db/social/term/term_call.htm to: Ms Caroline Eckert, European Science Foundation, TERM II programme 1 quai Lezay-Marnésia, 67080 Strasbourg cedex, France Tel: +33 (0)3 88 76 71 42, Fax: +33 (0)3 88 37 05 32 Email: Ceckert@esf.org

The TERM programme is financed as an *à la carte* scientific programme by the following ESF Member Organisations: Statens Samfundsvidenskabelige Forskningsråd, Denmark; Suomen Akatemia/Finlands Akademi, Finland; Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Germany; Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Hungary; Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy; Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, the Netherlands; Norges Forskningsråd, Norway; Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Oficina de Ciencia y Tecnología, Spain; Humanistisk Samhällsvetenskapliga Forskningsrådet, Sweden; Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, Switzerland; Economic and Social Research Council, United Kingdom.