Editorial

A warm welcome to the latest issue of the Occupational Health Psychologist (OHPist). As this is the first issue since the 7th EA-OHP conference (Dublin, November 2006), we feel it is appropriate to take a moment to reflect on a hugely successful event! The Dublin conference was the largest EA-OHP event to date, and was attended by almost 250 delegates from 25 different countries. The continuing growth of the Academy’s events is extremely encouraging, and no doubt reflects the increasing importance and recognition of occupational health psychology (OHP) across the globe. I’m sure I speak on behalf of all our readers in extending our thanks to the conference organisers and delegates for creating such an informative and sociable event.

Two highlights of the conference were the keynote presentations by Maureen Dollard and Norbert Semmer. Both presentations were thought-provoking and inspiring, and set the tone for the rest of the conference. I was able to catch up with the two keynote speakers, and my interview with Maureen can be found on page 4 of this issue; similarly, the next issue will contain an interview with Norbert. Our thanks go to Norbert and Maureen, not only for their excellent keynote presentations, but also for taking the time out to speak to the OHPist. (Slides from the keynote presentations can be downloaded from the Academy’s website http://www.ea-ohp.org/Conferences/index.asp).
A number of awards were made at the closing ceremony in Dublin, to reflect significant contributions to the Academy and the wider discipline. Steve Sauter and Kari Lindstrom were installed as Fellows of the Academy, in reflection of their distinguished contributions to the field. In addition, the Andre Bussing Memorial Prize was awarded to Nele de Cuyper for her research into temporary employment and insecurity. This prize specifically recognizes the contribution made by researchers early in their careers. On page 6 of this issue, Nele reflects on the Dublin conference and her experiences as a young OHP researcher.

We also bring you news of two new forum chairs, who were appointed in January 2007. Peter Kelly (UK Health and Safety Executive) takes over as chair of the Professional Practice Forum, while Annet de Lange (University Of Groningen, Netherlands) is the new chair of the Research Forum. Some background information on Peter and Annet can be found on page 8 of this issue, along with a summary of their ambitions as forum chairs. Our Congratulations go to Annet and Peter on their recent appointments.

As in previous issues, we feel very fortunate to be able to present cutting-edge OHP research. Jo Rick (University of Sheffield) and her colleagues provide an account of their important research into the effectiveness and safety of workplace trauma interventions (page 11). Our thanks go to Jo and her research collaborators for communicating this work via the OHPist.

I will end, as I usually do, with a call for articles for future issues of the OHPist. Some of you may have received my recent email inviting submissions, and thanks to those of you who have already responded with ideas. General submission guidelines can be found on the final page of this issue, although please feel free to email me if you have any questions about the publication. The next issue will appear in June/July, with another issue scheduled for the end of the year.

In the meantime, I wish you all happy and healthy working lives!

Paul Flaxman
On behalf of the OHPist editorial team
Email: Paul.Flaxman.1@city.ac.uk

Disclaimer
The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of any other person or organisation. The Occupational Health Psychologist does not in any way endorse the views expressed.
SAVE THE DATE!

8th Conference of the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology

12-14 November 2008

Valencia, Spain

Hosted by the University of Valencia

Further details coming soon...

Building on the success of previous conferences in the series, the Academy is delighted to announce that its 8th full conference will be held at the University of Valencia over a three-day period in November 2008. Save the date in your diaries now!
How did you first become interested in Occupational Health psychology?

I suppose my first experience of the issue of work stress involved looking at environment stress - that was what initially stimulated my interest. I then had the opportunity to study the issue of work stress in the Department of Cultural Services in South Australia. I found the issue to be really interesting, because of the political implications of stress at work. Then to find that the way work is organised, and the content of the job, affects correctional officer’s well being. It really was interesting. And from there I just kept looking at other occupations and other kinds of issues. Just to find that there is a relationship between what happens on the job and someone’s well being is really quite defining. It’s obvious now, but it was really fascinating to actually confirm that.

Could you describe some recent OHP projects that you have conducted or been involved in?

Well the biggest project that we have been involved in has been with the Victoria Work Cover, in the state of Victoria, the Department of Health and Community Services, and the Department of Education and Training. They decided that work stress was an issue in the public sector, and decided to trial the Cox and Griffiths’ risk management approach. They asked me to provide some advice about how to do that, and also to help evaluate it. It was a difficult project. It involved massive amounts of consultation. Just the planning of it took a year and a half. There was a lot of politics, and a lot of different viewpoints about what stress was. But it had top government support, and layers of support at all levels. But still it wasn’t an easy process. There was a lot of dialogue about how the intervention was going to pan out. It was evaluated within a short period of time, at the end of twelve months, which really meant that actions from the work groups were being implemented over the last six months or so. Then it was a case of analysing that data, constantly looking at it, to see what it meant; particularly to see whether psychological distress could be reduced over that period of time. It wasn’t just so much about the control group and the intervention group. Actually, what was really interesting was that ‘intervention’ is not a constant thing; that is, some people in an intervention group get the intervention, while some people don’t. And this is why it’s so hard to do this type of research in an organisation, because the intervention is not necessarily consistent. So, when we looked at high levels of intervention, and low levels of intervention, we saw very interesting interaction effects. If you look at exposure to the intervention within the intervention group, you can see that there are some high levels of exposure – those who were actually exposed to the implemented actions. That exposure led to changes in job characteristics and the organisational and social context; this in turn led to changes in psychological distress. You could see this like a causal pathway, and that was really exciting.

Which area of OHP are you currently most interested in?

I would really like to do different OHP work to what others are doing. I like analysing what’s going on in the world, in the area, who is doing what, and what the omissions are in our knowledge base. So I think that is a really important exercise to undertake.

I’m interested in enterprise development, and how that could improve the health and economic status of people on the one hand. But there are also other issues relating to exploitation, for example, where the world market utilises third world labour. So, yes, I am interested in issues of globalisation, and marketing regulation and how that affects workers. I am very interested in workers in their context, in their communities, in their societies, and in the world, and how all those things affect their health and well being.

What is the current state of OHP in Australia?

OHP is not really developed at all in Australia. We have the Australian Psychological Society; and we have core areas of interest, which are represented by college academic programmes: health psychology, clinical psychology, work and organisational psychology. As yet, there isn’t one for occupational health psychology. I don’t know of anyone else’s programmes that offer it, and it’s just not discussed as occupational health psychology.
Across the globe, what do you think would help to enhance the profile of the discipline?

I think that is a really good question, and after analysing the papers that have been published in the Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, it seems that probably the scope of the research agenda has been too narrow. And I think that there are a lot more interesting issues that could be studied. OHP doesn’t have to be studied at only an individual level. It can instead be studied at various levels in an organisation and how they affect individual health and safety. You could also look at the health and safety of people in the community. Looking at the impact of what goes on in an organisation, and its impact on other domains. So, for example, we conducted a study of effort-reward imbalance at work, and saw that it was associated with levels of anger, which were then associated with levels of driving anger. So you could see that injustice in the workplace translated into driving aggression. We saw this in a sample in Japan and in Australia. So, I think studying the consequences of occupational health psychology in other domains would be an innovation.

What have you enjoyed most about the Dublin conference?

I have really enjoyed the presentations. I have loved just catching up with people. That’s really great. Also meeting people that I haven’t met before. It’s all been nice for me actually! I really liked the reaction that the people had to my keynote presentation, particularly because I think the issues are really important. It was really hard to make a decision to present that paper, and each part of it was carefully considered. I know that there can be a backlash against having ideas which are a little bit different, so I was really pleased with the reaction of conference delegates. I hope it will encourage people to consider more carefully the implications of what happens in one economy, and how it affects people in another economy. And also, you know, to take some action against injustices; for occupational health psychologists to be empowered themselves to speak out against what they observe in the workplace, and see if they can make some sort of impact on policies or legislation. I think that all sounds pretty hard. However, I think a simple strategy is to provide feedback to the people under study. Not that we really want to put people ‘under study’. We want to conduct research ‘with’ people. But having worked with people to find results, to make certain that they understand what those results are, along with any potential implications, so that they can be empowered to take some action.

In a nutshell, what is your philosophy?

My philosophy? Oh this is going to take a while!

I am keen to make sure that what I do in research and practice does no harm to other people. And hopefully that it enables them to come to some realisations about their own potential. I am just really mindful of not conducting research that just reproduces oppression. What I mean by that is, having students or myself conducting research in organisations, and then utilising that information purely for our own ends, like obtaining a PhD or publishing a paper. Instead, I think we should be trying hard to make sure that the information is translated back to the people, about whom it concerns, so that they can be empowered to take action. Because they might actually be the smartest people to know what to do with that information. I encourage my students to go out and interview people, so that you can start with an open mind about what the possibilities are. In that way, you get a more comprehensive, holistic view of people in their work. And then to try and make sense of it. Then to go back to the people to try to validate their sense-making. So that the goals of scientific enquiry are met, and those processes can also be validated. Of course the students get certain benefits; but then so do the people involved in the research. I’m pretty opposed to students going out and just doing surveys with people, without any reciprocation.

Biography

Maureen Dollard was raised in a rural area of South Australia, and recently moved to the Metropolitan Campus at the University of South Australia. Maureen is Director of the Masters’ programme in Organisational Psychology, as well as Director of the Centre for Applied Psychological Research. She is currently co-chair for the International Congress on Occupational Health (ICOH), and is Founding Editor of the International Journal of Rural Psychology. A list of Professor Dollard’s publications can be found at http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/staff/Homepage.asp?Name=Maureen.Dollard
At its final meeting of 2006, the Executive Committee introduced an annual award to be made to organisations in recognition of long-term support of Academy activities. A maximum of two awards will be issued annually. The first two recipients were the Institute of Work, Health & Organisations at the University of Nottingham (UK). I-WHO is an Academy founding member and since its inception has consistently donated staff time and other resources. A second award was made to Instituto Superior da Maia (Portugal). ISMAI hosted the Academy’s 2004 Porto conference and sponsored the production and printing of the book of proceedings arising out of that conference and the subsequent Dublin 2006 conference.

Our photographs show Jonathan Houdmont (Executive Officer, EA-OHP) presenting I-WHO’s award to Neil Coulson (Deputy Director, I-WHO) and Tom Cox (Director, I-WHO) as well as Scott McIntyre (Publications Officer, EA-OHP) presenting ISMAI’s award to Domingos Oliveira Silva (President, ISMAI) and José Azevedo (President, Maiêutica (ISMAI parent company)).

Congratulations to Nele De Cuyper, who received the Andre Bussing Memorial Prize at the closing ceremony of the Dublin conference. The award recognises outstanding research from early career researchers. Nele receives a cash prize and free attendance at the 2008 EA-OHP conference. In the article below, Nele reflects on her experiences in Dublin.

I sometimes experience research as an exercise in frustration-tolerance. ‘Even though there are many aspects to admire in your research, the reviewers have pointed out some weaknesses in your research design’. Sound familiar? You don’t know who these reviewers are. Talk about a lack of control. You don’t know whether your article will ever be accepted. Talk about insecurity. And thus you imagine that these reviewers are really nasty people, who have fun criticising your article and research. And you know that many of these reviewers may go to conferences, such as the one organised by the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology.

So, I was a little bit worried about going to the conference, let alone to present my research to many Famous and Very Famous Researchers. But it turned out to be real fun. The (Very) Famous Researchers were not at all what I imagined them to be. Sure, they had some questions and criticisms on other people’s research, including mine. But they asked these questions out of curiosity, it seemed, and they also questioned their own research. That I found truly inspiring, the more so given the beautiful location of Dublin castle (really an interaction effect most of us will never establish in our data).
It is impossible to talk about being inspired without mentioning the keynote speakers. They were both great, even though my reactions to their talks were quite different. Let me explain. During the talk by Prof. Semmer (who falls into the category of Very Famous Researcher), I found myself busy writing down almost everything he said: Prof. Semmer somehow integrated the most important theoretical models (The Michigan Model! The Job Demand-Control Model! Social Exchange Theory! Effort Reward Imbalance!) into his ‘stress-as-offence-to-self’ framework, and he moreover made me believe that it was easy to come up with. By way of contrast, I did not make any notes at all during the presentation by Prof. Dollard. I experienced what we mean when talking about getting into flow. And I know for sure now that the X-factor does exist (Yes, I watch Idols. And X-factor. But only to investigate how stress affects one’s performance on stage!). Prof. Dollard reminded me of why occupational health psychologists are needed and will be needed… and how easily I tend to forget that.

Another thing I found very inspiring was the diversity of research topics. I just can’t name them all: overtime work, bullying, work-life balance, research into various interventions, psychological contract research… And besides that, there are many statistical techniques to learn. Back at home, working on my manuscripts, I focus mostly on research on temporary employment, job insecurity, and how they relate to various indicators of health and well-being. And I like doing that. But now more than ever, I’m convinced that there are many other interesting topics, which may easily fill a post-PhD life, or two.

In sum, the organisers did an excellent job: they invited us to talk and discuss our research; they made sure we did not have to worry about where to go; they selected a beautiful location… Being inspired is conditional upon these factors. Many many thanks.

Biography
Nele De Cuyper is working as a PhD student at the Research Centre for Work, Organization and Personnel Psychology, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (K.U.Leuven), Belgium. She was involved in the European project PSYCONES (PSYchological CONtracting across Employment Situations) on temporary employment. Her main research interests concern temporary employment, job insecurity, employability and the psychological contract as well as attitudes towards work and well-being in general. These topics are covered in her PhD, which is being supervised by Prof. Dr. Hans De Witte.

Some 250 delegates attended Dublin Castle to share recent developments in OHP research, practice, and education.
On 1st January 2007 new Chairs were appointed to the Academy’s Professional Practice and Research Fora. The new incumbents’ term of office ends 31st December 2009. Here, both introduce themselves and describe their ambitions for the next three years.

**Peter Kelly - Chair, Professional Practice Forum**

Peter is a Higher Scientific Officer and Occupational Health Psychologist at the Health & Safety Executive, the enforcement authority for health and safety in Great Britain. In recent years Peter has been intimately involved in the development of official guidance on the organisational management of work-related stress in the guise of the HSE Management Standards. He is also involved in working with the Department for Health on the development of national policy as it relates to vocational rehabilitation for mental health problems.

Peter is keen to use his new role within the EA-OHP to foster closer links between research and professional practice in OHP, to encourage a culture whereby one informs the other through the activities of the respective Academy Fora. Peter is particularly eager to contribute to the development of professional career pathways in OHP. This will be achieved, in part, through the forging of strategic relations with national and international interested bodies.

**Annet de Lange: Chair, Research Forum**

Annet studied Psychology at Utrecht University from 1995 to 1999 and specialised in PAGO (Psychology of Work, Health and Organizations). She continued her career as a PhD-student at the department of Work and Organizational Psychology of the University of Nijmegen. This PhD study concerned a prospective cohort study in collaboration with TNO Work and Employment; titled SMASH (i.e. Study on Musculoskeletal Disorders, Absenteeism, Stress, and Health). From 2003-2006 she worked as an Assistant Professor human resource management/organizational behavior at the department of Business Administration of the Vrije university of Amsterdam. In 2006 she started working as an Associate professor bachelor program at the university of Groningen. In her current position she coordinates the bachelor program in psychology, is member of several educational boards and lectures on diversity in organisations, work-related stress and research methods. Her research interests include longitudinal research, causal relations between work and mental health, and the impact of working life on the health and motivation of older workers.

Annet is keen to use her tenure as Chair of the Research Forum to increase the communication and interaction between occupational health researchers in Europe (and further); by organising a research workshop at each Academy conference, and by trying to organise new (financial) incentives or platforms for further collaboration between European occupational health researchers.
Work & Stress

From the editorial team

Tom Cox, Toon Taris and Mary Tisserand

Forthcoming papers

Work & Stress is an international, multidisciplinary journal that is directed at all concerned with the interplay of work, health and organisations - researchers as well as practitioners. Therefore we are always interested in papers that blend several aspects together. The perfect contribution to the journal would be novel, empirically sound, and interesting to a large proportion of our diverse readership. The next issue of Work & Stress (Volume 21 part 1), which is in press, includes several good examples of studies that are interesting to practitioners and researchers alike.

Worldwide surveillance of risk

In their paper entitled "National Surveillance of Psychosocial Risk Factors in the Workplace: An International Overview", Maureen Dollard, Natalie Skinner, Michelle Tuckey and Tessa Bailey, from the Work and Stress Research Group of the University of South Australia, present a systematic comparison of no less than 35 national surveillance systems (plus four multi-country systems) for psychosocial risks and outcomes, across 20 countries. Such systems are important to benchmark the changing work environment and for the development and monitoring of evidence-based policies and programs to prevent stress and promote mental and physical health and well-being at work. Maureen's paper describes the content of each system and gives an overview of sampling methodology. She concludes with a set of strategic recommendations for the development and future use of such systems.

This paper is unique in its aim and scope and offers interesting insights in the degree to which countries and geographic regions differ in the degree to which they have access to surveillance systems as a tool in promoting healthy work environments. Moreover, it provides recommendations regarding the type of factors that should be covered in such systems, which serve as a checklist that may be used to judge the quality of surveillance systems – including the one that may be currently be in use in your own country.

Insecurity and temporary work

A second paper in this forthcoming edition deals with the effects of job insecurity on the well-being and performance of temporary and permanent workers. The nature and organization of work is rapidly changing; not only is the content of jobs very different from that of 20 years ago, but the very nature of employment itself has changed. Nowadays having a “job for life” occurs only rarely, and many workers experience some degree of uncertainty regarding the continuation of their employment. The relationships between job insecurity and work outcomes is examined by Nele de Cuyper and Hans de Witte from the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium. In their paper entitled "Job insecurity in temporary versus permanent workers: Associations with attitudes, well-being and behaviour" they explore the processes that link job insecurity to adverse work outcomes such as satisfaction, performance and commitment. Most interestingly, they argue that a high degree of job insecurity presents a breach of the psychological contract between worker
and their employer, but only for those workers who have permanent employment. In contrast, workers with a temporary contract will not consider insecurity as a contract breach. Therefore, having job insecurity should have adverse consequences for workers' well-being, especially for those in permanent employment. The authors present data that largely supports this idea, underlining the importance to their wellbeing of workers' expectations regarding their employment.

Nele was the recipient of the André Büssing Memorial Award at the recent EA-OHP conference in Dublin (see page 6 in this newsletter)

The role of job tenure

Few studies have examined how the effects of work stressors change over the duration of employment in a particular job. The impact of the working environment may be greater in the early stages, and employees may devise coping strategies over time. Furthermore, those who have been in the job longer may be a select group of "survivors". In a longitudinal study, "Job tenure as a moderator of stressor-strain relations: A comparison of experienced and new-start teachers" by Graham Bradley from Griffith University, Australia, the DxC interaction effect was only found in the new-start teachers. Graham draws attention to the need to consider the role of tenure and career stage in studies of work stress, and argues that work stressor-strain effects may be underestimated in research that does not do this.

Emotional labour

Emotional labour is one of several areas identified in Maureen Dollard's paper as requiring attention by surveillance systems in future. In their forthcoming paper "Emotional labour and emotional exhaustion: Interpersonal and intrapersonal mechanisms", David Martinez-Iñigo and Carlos Alcover from Madrid, together with Peter Totterdell and David Holman from Sheffield, investigate how the use of various strategies used to regulate emotion relate to the emotional exhaustion of doctors. These strategies include automatic, surface and deep regulation of emotion. They also test two mechanisms that might explain those relationships.

Context specificity

Carol McClernahan, Melanie Giles and John Mallett of the University of Ulster, Northern Ireland, contribute a paper on an occupation-specific test of the D-C-S model. Using a sample of academics, they did not find support for the interaction hypothesis of the D-C/D-C-S model. However, they did find additive effects of demands and control on psychological distress, and of demands and support on burnout and job satisfaction. They argue that to fully understand the work-strain relationship, research should include more variables that are specific to a particular occupation or workplace.

New website

You can register to be notified when this forthcoming edition is published: Go to http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/02678373.asp and then click on the link "Table of contents alerting".

Do also visit the journal’s page on the publisher's new web platform, "Informaworld". This gives you instant access to published papers, and also offers a search facility by subject or author. See: www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713697904~db=all

EA-OHP members receive a free annual subscription to Work & Stress. If you are not yet a member, sign up today at http://www.ea-ohp.org/Membership/index.asp
Introduction & Objectives
Since the early 1900s there has been a growing awareness of the psychiatric impact of certain severe stressors on an individual's ability to function effectively in both their personal and professional lives. The pattern of harm that follows traumatic events has to some extent been charted (see for example DSM-IV - R) and more recently attention has focused on developing responses that serve to minimise further harm post trauma.

By the mid 1990s by far the most common response in evidence in UK organisations was that of Psychological Debriefing (PD) or Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD) (Rick et al 1998). However, major concerns about the clinical impact of debriefing have been expressed since the mid 1990s (Raphael, Meldrum & McFarlane, 1995; Wessely, Bisson & Rose, 1998) culminating in the publication of NICE Clinical Guideline 26 in March 2005 that:

"For individuals who have experienced a traumatic event, the systematic provision to that individual alone of brief, single-session interventions (often referred to as debriefing) that focus on the traumatic incident, should not be routine practice when delivering services" (their emphasis).

At the same time UK legislation has increasingly clarified the responsibility of employers for the psychological as well as the physical safety of their employees. As the law on trauma induced illness has become clearer, so liability and legal responsibility in relation to psychiatric injury is of growing concern to many employers.

Sadly few good quality evaluations of trauma management programmes exist (Rick & Briner, 2000) and as a result persuasive evidence about which responses work best in reducing or preventing trauma symptoms is limited.

The Current research
The current research sought to establish the safety and efficacy of different levels of intervention post-trauma. Eight hundred and thirty seven employees and franchise holders at Royal Mail Group (RMG) were tracked for a thirteen month period post incident. The research took advantage of naturally occurring changes within the organisation (i.e. the roll out of a new trauma management procedure) to measure the impact of differing levels of support on trauma symptom levels, absence and attitudes to the workplace up to 13 months post trauma. Specifically the research sought to identify which level of trauma support produced the best results in relation to:

- Employee satisfaction
- Symptom levels, and
- Absence or contract status

Methodology
Participants in the study were all employees or franchise holders within RMG in the UK. They were identified by exposure to pre-defined incident types (e.g. robbery, armed raid) so avoiding bias in self-reporting of incidents. Participants were contacted at three time points during the study (immediately post incident, at three months and at 13 months) and asked to complete questionnaires containing measures of psychological symptoms and work related attitudes. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary and participants were given the option to withdraw at any time. In addition to self report data, organisational data was collected on incident type, organisational support and contract status or absence at 12 months post trauma.

Self report data included:
- symptom levels
- emotional and physical functioning
- social support
- organisational support

Centrally collected data included:
- incident type
- support provided by the organisation
- absence data or contract status 12 months post incident
Results
Levels of trauma support were analysed in three broad categories:
1. normal managerial support
2. crisis management
3. Support Post Trauma (SPoT) protocol (a number of managers received training on how to deliver sessions describing possible reactions to the incident and signposting sources of help within the organisation, they were also trained in spotting possible symptoms and staff who may need further support)

Are the RMG interventions safe?

• No significant differences were found between intervention and non-intervention groups with regard to recovery rates or symptoms levels at 13 month follow up
• Symptom levels decreased significantly at each time point both the intervention and non-intervention groups.

There was no evidence of adverse effects from attending the SPoT meetings.

Are the RMG interventions effective?

There were significant differences between employees dependant on the level of managerial support received post incident. Those attending SPoT meetings were significantly more likely to say that:
• they felt they knew what to expect following the incident
• they knew where to get further information if they needed it, and
• they knew where in the organisation to get support

Additionally, those attending SPoT meetings were more likely to
• feel that their symptoms were normal in the circumstances
• feel the company cared about their well-being
• feel more confident about going back to work/being at work

The results indicate that SPoT meetings are an effective way of transmitting important information to employees post trauma, particularly about how to access support within the organisation. There is no evidence that they have a direct impact (positive or negative) on symptom levels or absence. ‘Perceived Organisational Support’ emerged as an important variable in the analysis. This referred not to the type of support, but the recipients’ assessments of the support they received and was strongly related to both symptoms and absence. It was hypothesised that perceived organisational support at immediately post trauma could impact on symptom levels at three months and ultimately on absence. Further analysis of the data using structural equation modelling revealed two clear pathways. These were consistent with the hypothesised model. The first pathway linked higher levels of perceived support with absence via reduced symptoms. The second pathway identifies the factors directly associated with high symptoms and absence (see fig 1).

Types of Support & Absence Mediated by Symptom Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social support</th>
<th>First day support</th>
<th>SPoT Meeting</th>
<th>Type of incident</th>
<th>Perceived Organisational support</th>
<th>Negative impact of events</th>
<th>Absence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 \]
**Conclusions**

Findings indicate that enhanced manager support is both a safe and effective managerial response to traumatic workplace incidents. It has significant impact on employee attitudes to the work environment, but no direct impact on symptom levels or absence. However, the way an individual feels as a result of the support they receive is associated with symptom levels and absence. SEM analysis of these data revealed that positive experiences of practical support immediately following an incident (crisis management) as well as attending the enhanced manager support meetings resulted in higher perceived organisational support, lower symptoms and lower absence. The findings indicate that organisations have an important role to play in the management of individuals post trauma and that in some cases good management of the situation and practical support can result in greater perceived organisational support and ultimately to lower symptom levels and absence rates amongst employees.

**References**


Correspondence pertaining to this abstract should be directed to the lead author at jo.rick@shef.ac.uk.

**Editorial note**

This research described in this extended abstract was presented at the Academy’s Dublin conference in November 2006. Unfortunately, owing to a formatting error, the abstract was omitted from the book of proceedings. The abstract is thus reproduced here in extended form and sincere apologies are extended to the authors.
7th Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference (IOP) / 1st Asia Pacific Congress on Work and Organisational Psychology (APCWOP)

28th June – 1st July 2007
Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

The 2007 IOP/APCWOP Conference will bring together prominent researchers from the Asia Pacific region and beyond, exploring new and challenging themes while expanding the footprint of work and organisational psychology in the Asia Pacific.

Keynote speakers
- Professor Arnold Bakker, Institute of Psychology, Erasmus University Rotterdam
- Professor Bobby Banerjee, International Graduate School of Business, University of South Australia
- Professor Paula Caligiuri, Centre for HR Strategy, Rutgers University
- Professor David Chan, School of Economics and Social Sciences, Singapore Management University
- Professor Belle Rose Rags, Professor of Human Resource Management, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
- The APS Elton Mayo Award Winner

Submissions deadline: 5th February 2007
Visit www.iopconference.com.au to access the online ‘Call for Submissions’ form and for program and registration details.
Minutes

1. President’s Briefing
   - The meeting was deemed quorate.
   - Tom Cox (President) introduced the incumbent officers of the EA-OHP and outlined the Academy’s purpose, legal status and activity framework. Three key issues that will task the Academy in the immediate future were highlighted: cooperation with SOHP, preparations for the next full conference, elections for offices of the Executive and Forum Committees.

2. Legal Status
   - Jonathan Houdmont (Executive Officer) explained to the meeting that the Academy was incorporated as a registered charity in English law on 1st August 2006. Charitable status has required various modifications to the Academy’s organisational structures and procedures (as outlined in the Governing Constitution available on the Academy’s website). There are also accounting and taxation implications (see below).

3. Financial Report
   - Philip Dewe (Finance Director) set out the new financial regulations to which the Academy must comply as a result of its new legal status. The specific accounting regulations that apply will depend on the level of revenue generated over the 12 month period 1 August 2006 – 31 July 2007.
   - The Dublin conference was well attended (more than 230 delegates) and has generated a surplus. Precise figures will be published upon closure of the conference accounts.
   - It is anticipated that the introduction of an online bookstore and membership facility will have a positive impact on income.
   - The Dublin conference surplus and the anticipated increase in income from the website is required to support preparations for the 2008 full conference, regional conferences in 2007, the development of EA-OHP publications, financial accounting and auditing procedures, costs associated with regular committee meetings required under charitable status and website maintenance. Furthermore, EA-OHP must pay deferred overheads to the Institute of Work, Health & Organisations (University of Nottingham) for monies owing from the employment of an Executive Officer over a period of years. Complications arise since the Academy only officially came into existence on 1st August 2006 and in legal terms did not exist prior to that date. Lawyers are being consulted to resolve how deferred overheads might be repaid.
   - The Academy’s appreciation of the contribution of Stavroula Leka to the day to day management of Academy finances was noted.

4. Membership
   - Jonathan Houdmont described the various membership models that have been implemented since the Academy’s inception in 1999. These have involved the incorporation of membership fees into conference delegate fees in various ways. This position has become untenable since the decision of the 2004 Annual Business Meeting to adopt a biennial full conference model. Previous arrangements also risked pitching conference fees beyond the reach of students and made it difficult for individuals who chose not to attend the conferences to join the Academy.
• An online membership facility was introduced in the summer of 2006 that separates out conference attendance from membership fees. The online system allows for automated annual renewals which will ensure a continued income stream.
• A significant numerical increase in memberships is anticipated for 2007 owing to an arrangement with Taylor & Francis whereby from January 2007 all members will receive a free individual subscription to the Academy’s affiliated journal, Work & Stress.

5. Publications
• Scott McIntyre (Publications Officer) noted that the quality of the conference proceedings has increased in recent years owing to the sponsorship of ISMAI Publishing. The arrangement with ISMAI Publishing is to be reviewed in 2007.
• Taylor & Francis, publisher of the Academy's affiliated journal, Work & Stress, have recently signed an agreement with the Academy whereby all members will receive a free individual subscription to the journal. The agreement comes into effect on 1st January 2007.
• The first volume in an annual book series was launched at the Dublin conference. *Occupational Health Psychology: European Perspectives on Research, Education & Practice*, aims to offer an annual glimpse at cutting-edge developments across the three supporting pillars of occupational health psychology. The book series is published by ISMAI Publications. At present the book is only available for purchase at the Academy’s online bookstore. Possible distribution deals are being negotiated.

6. Website
• Jonathan Houdmont noted that the website is likely to become the major income source in the coming years following the introduction of an online bookstore, membership and conference registration facilities.
• Some teething problems have been experienced with the website. Most notably, many conference delegates did not receive an automatically generated receipt upon registration. This has required the labour intensive manual production of receipts. All website issues are being addressed.

7. Collaboration with SOHP
• Tom Cox informed the meeting that a meeting was to be held on 9th November between the Executive Committees of the EA-OHP and American SOHP to discuss the way forward in terms of collaboration and co-operation. It is important that the two organisations work together in a constructive fashion.
• The International Co-ordinating Group for Occupational Health Psychology (ICG-OHP) was established in 2000 as a vehicle for stakeholder groups to move forward together. It is possible that the ICG-OHP will be resurrected as a means of permitting EA-OHP, SOHP and other regional representative bodies to work together.

8. Elections
• Jonathan Houdmont explained that as a consequence of the Academy having obtained charitable status modifications are required to governance structures. This will involve elections of members to offices of the Executive and Forum Committees. Nominations must be received by 30 November 2006 and elections will take place in December 2006. The successful candidates will be installed in office in January 2007 with three-year tenure. Further information will be sent to all members.

9. 2007 and 2008 conference activities
• The next full Academy conference will take place in November 2008 and negotiations are underway with a possible host in Spain. An offer for hosting the 2008 conference has been received from a Canadian university. Although very much appreciated, the Executive Committee has decided that the offer cannot be pursued as it lies outside of the Academy’s geographical constituency.
• Two tentative offers for hosting the 2010 full conference have been received (The Netherlands and Switzerland). Arrangements for 2010 will be announced at the 2008 conference.
• In addition to full biennial conferences, the Academy is keen to encourage individuals and groups to organise regional events on locally pertinent themes under Academy auspices. Interested parties should contact the Executive Officer, Jonathan Houdmont.

Meeting Closed

Date of next meeting: 2007 (TBC)
SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Please find below general guidelines for submitting articles for future issues of the *Occupational Health Psychologist* (*OHPist*). We hope that our willingness to publish many different types of articles will encourage all of our members to contribute. We welcome submissions from students, new researchers, practitioners, and from long standing members of the Academy. We aim to publish three issues per year: winter (Jan/Feb), spring/summer (June/July), and autumn (Oct/Nov).

**OHP Research / Practice**

We welcome short reports of research findings, practice issues, case studies, brief literature reviews, and theoretical articles. You could, for example, use the *OHPist* to gain exposure for your work whilst preparing for publication, or for work that may not otherwise be published within the OHP domain. Articles for this section can be 1500 - 2000 words.

**OHP Briefings**

We also welcome overviews of your OHP-related activities, or those of your research group, consultancy, or organisation. We believe that this type of article will provide a useful insight into the sort of work that is being undertaken in different parts of Europe. This section could also be used to communicate policy developments that have implications for OHP research, practice, and education in your country. This type of article could be up to 2000 words, although we will accept longer articles if more than one member of a group wishes to contribute.

**Other articles**

We welcome open letters to your fellow occupational health psychologists regarding any OHP-related topics, and summaries (in English) of OHP issues that have been reported by your national news media.

Please email your articles to
Paul.Flaxman.1@city.ac.uk
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