Wishing You a Happy and Relaxed Festive Season

From all of us at EAOHP
A very warm welcome to you all, from all of us in the Editorial Team! This is our last issue of the year of *The Occupational Health Psychologist*.

We begin this issue with our Research in Brief article, which is provided on this occasion by Nina Olin and her colleagues from the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health. Nina and her colleagues were winners of the best poster competition at the EAOHP conference held in Athens earlier this year. In this feature, which is based on their winning poster, they examine the relationship between organizational culture and workplace bullying, and report on the impact of an intervention in situations where bullying has taken place.

In our Focus on Practice interview, Aaron Percival, tells us how he became interested in Occupational Health Psychology, and about his work as Safety Culture Improvement Manager at the Babcock International Group, a global engineering company based in Scotland.

We are grateful to Stravoula Leka and colleagues for a report of their evaluation of policy and practice to promote mental health in the workplace in Europe, on the basis of which they have made a series of recommendations to the European Commission, and developed an interpretative document of Council Directive 89/391/EEC to clarify legal requirements for employers and other key stakeholders in Europe, and also developed a guidance document on how to implement a comprehensive approach for the promotion of mental health in the workplace.

And, if you are interested in attending, or presenting at a conference relevant to Occupational Health Psychology next year, we provide you with a comprehensive list of choices. We also have news about the launch of a new journal from the Society of Occupational Health Psychology titled ‘Occupational Health Science’.

On a final note, we would like to wish you all a very happy, healthy and relaxed holiday season.

**Sue Cowan, Editor**

On behalf of the Editorial Team

date: s.cowan@hw.ac.uk
Towards zero tolerance of workplace bullying

By Olin N, Vartia M, Pahkin K

This research was awarded the Best Poster Prize at the EAOHP conference held at the 12th Conference of EAOHP, Athens 2016

Background

Bullying at work is a complicated escalated process with numerous causes. Studies have shown that various features of the psychosocial work environment may trigger bullying at a workplace (Baillien, De Cuyper & De Witte, 2011; Baillien & De Witte, 2009; Einarsen, Raknes & Matthiesen, 1994; Hauge, Skogstad & Einarsen, 2007; Hoel et. al., 2010; Vartia, 1996). Examples of such features include role conflicts and role ambiguity, high workload and high control over one's work, poor organizational climate, substantial changes at work, and destructive leadership style.

It has been suggested that the role of organizational culture and organizational practices is important for understanding the onset and escalating process of bullying. Organizational culture may include features that enable, or even reward bullying. On the other hand, organizational practices may include methods and joint rules that prevent and inhibit the emergence and escalation of a bullying process. Research on the associations between the features of organizational culture and workplace bullying has been scarce so far.

The aim and methods of the project

The aim of the "Amicable Working Environment - towards zero tolerance of workplace bullying" - research and intervention project is to support the development of an organizational culture that does not accept bullying at work. The project explores the connections between the operational culture of an organization and organizational practices, and the onset of inappropriate behavior and bullying at work, as well as intervening in situations where bullying has taken place. The multi-level intervention has been carried out on three levels: 1) management and HR, 2) supervisors and 3) work units.

Supervisory interventions included two training sessions, both lasting for three hours. Work unit interventions included from one to three training sessions, each lasting from one to three hours. Approximately 160 supervisors took part in the first training, and approximately 130 in the second one. Most supervisors took part in both sessions, while others attended either the first or the second session. In all, about 300 employees and supervisors took part in work unit –level training sessions.

Methods

A pre-intervention survey was conducted in spring 2015 among the whole personnel of the six participating organizations. Of the 1636 respondents, 14% were supervisors. Of all respondents, 4% had experienced bullying. 34% reported that they had observed inappropriate behavior at their workplace. A follow-up survey was carried out in April-September 2016. In all, 1254 responded, 13% of whom were supervisors.

This paper presents the first answers to the research question: What features of the organization inhibit employees and supervisors from broaching workplace bullying at their own workplace, and can these features be reduced by supervisory- and work unit level interventions?

Preliminary findings

Most of the supervisors considered the training interventions to be very useful. Approx. 40% of supervisors of the first session, and approx. 70% of the second session, reported in the immediate feedback of the sessions that they had received information and tools that they can use in their work. In the follow-up survey about two out of three supervisors regarded the supervisory interventions as useful to themselves. Also work unit interventions were mostly experienced as useful in the immediate feedback, and in the follow up, 50% of the respondents regarded them as useful.

In the pre-intervention survey, employees reported the mindset that "it is not my business", and supervisors reported the feeling that bullying at work is a sensitive subject and an issue difficult to talk about to be the most common factors hindering interference in bullying. (Table 1 on next page)

The results of the follow-up survey show that work unit interventions and supervisory training seem to have had some impact, and that some perceived hindrances have become somewhat smaller.

Conclusions

The role of supervisors is essential when we are trying to prevent or reduce bullying at work. The findings of the project indicate that both supervisors
and work units benefit from training, and that hindrances to tackling bullying at work can be reduced.

**Nina Olin**
Finnish Institute of Occupational Health
nina.olin@ttl.fi

**A poster used within the intervention is presented on the next page**

**References**


---

**Table 1. Factors that hinder broaching bullying in the pre-intervention survey and in the follow-up survey, employees and supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Pre-intervention survey, all employees (n=1372)</th>
<th>Follow-up survey, employees who took part in interventions (n=230)</th>
<th>Pre-intervention survey, all supervisors (n=211)</th>
<th>Follow-up survey, supervisors who took part in training (n=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying at work is a sensitive subject and an issue which is difficult to talk about</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those experiencing bullying do not want to discuss the situation</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>54 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying is not recognized</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haste</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>42 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is not my business to intervene” is a common way of thinking</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>47 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not handle conflicts in our workplace</td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not used to intervening in inappropriate behavior at our workplace</td>
<td>34 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If you get bullied, it is your own fault” is a common way of thinking</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying is a “fashion” and people complain about nothing</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>14 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF YOU TALK ABOUT SOMEONE
- SAY NICE THINGS.
Olá Lisbon!

EAOHP delighted to announce its 2018 conference, which will take place in Lisbon, Portugal on 5-7 September. The EAOHP 2018 conference is organized in collaboration with the Organizational Behaviour and Human Resources (OBHR) research group of the Business Research Unit (BRU-IUL) of ISCTE-IUL (Lisbon, Portugal). BRU-IUL is a multidisciplinary research unit that spans the main fields of Business, Economics and Finance. OBHR’s main scientific fields are Work Psychology, Organizational Psychology, Occupational Health Psychology and Human Resource Management. It aims to develop knowledge and know-how, in order to address social problems relating to organizational innovation, competitiveness, performance, quality of working life and wellbeing by focusing on different levels of explanation and contexts. OBHR’s main thematic line is New challenges for individuals and organizations: Wellbeing, innovation and performance at work.

5-7 SEPTEMBER | 13th CONFERENCE OF THE EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY

Book Your Dates!
Calls for papers will open in May 2017
More conference details will be provided in due time. Stay tuned via our website, newsletter and social media channels.
**Aaron Percival**

In this issue’s interview we see the application of OHP from a safety perspective as Aaron Percival, from Babcock International Group in Scotland tells us about his work as an in-house Safety Culture Improvement Manager.

**How did you first become interested in Occupational Health Psychology?**

When doing my undergraduate I realised how much time people actually spend in work. I remember one day thinking how important it must be to make this environment one that is beneficial for people. I tend to divide my life up into separate areas (relationships, career/ work, finance, etc.) and one of these is health and fitness. This then made me think about how the work environment needs to be one that is conductive to my health, so I started becoming more interested in what psychology could tell me about a beneficial workplace to our health and well-being.

**What is your educational background, and what if any, previous relevant work experience have you had?**

I completed a Masters in Occupational Psychology at the University of Nottingham and while there got a job working for an engineering company. This engineering company had started a project with a psychologist, looking at what impact safety conversations had in improving their safety performance. I came in half way through this project, finished it off and was then hired by them to further develop the project to other sites; which eventually saw me working across the north of England in steel works, petrochemical plants, power stations and cement works. All the while I was helping analyse safety data, develop solutions for highlighted needs and give advice on how to improve the safety of their staff.

**Could you describe some of the work initiatives/projects in which you have been, or are currently, involved?**

I've spent a significant amount of time measuring safety culture. In my experience, companies, and especially engineering ones, like quantitative ways of defining culture. With the support of other colleagues, I have developed a tool to do measure safety culture, although there is still some way to go in validating it. I balance this in reporting alongside other measures while using more qualitative data from the tool as well.

My team also engage in developing and delivering workshops to better understand what may be influencing the health and safety of employees and to follow up on issues highlighted in our measurement activities, as well as to help develop skills and promote attitudes improve safety in different teams. For example, I continue to facilitate workshops that help others on how to challenge unsafe behaviours and conditions or become more willing to accept challenge.

Most of the time though a lot of my work is around relationship management (i.e., to get out and talk with people). I emphasise to my team constantly that in order to achieve our aims we need to make sure we have positive working relationships with as many people as possible. Fortunately I enjoy chatting to people.

**What is the biggest challenges for you as an OHP practitioner?**

such as workshops, forums, coaching etc. to do this and I provide a psychological perspective and analysis on trends and data that the company have. My key responsibilities are to manage and support the delivery of a suite of different projects aimed at creating a more mature safety culture.
Learning the ability of translating theory and research into something others can understand. I’ve probably learnt the hard way about how not to communicate psychological concepts to certain audiences (tip: don’t ever try and talk about change blindness to a welder about to start a job straight after lunch, especially if he is on the clock!). A lot of what we do is communicating potential solutions based on our understanding of contemporary research and theory. The challenge after that is getting buy-in from people to put into action these solutions.

Also, if you go internally into a company as an OHP practitioner you can find yourself being the only psychologist (dependant on the type of company and work). This can be professionally lonely at times and so you have to make sure you keep a good network around you. This then helps in numerous ways, including helping you keep up to date with latest thinking, being able to sound board ideas, and to receive another perspective when needed.

**In what direction do you see OHP practice going in the future?**

In heavy industrial environments there seems to be a growing interest around better learning from experience, and how to develop and disseminate this more efficiently across workforces. I’ve done a lot of work around the concept of James Reason’s “Just Culture”, which partly relates to this interest. For knowledge worker and within the service industries I would say there seems to be a greater focus on mental health and wellbeing, for example stress in the workplace. I’m not saying that the reverse doesn’t happen but personally I see a lot more on these subjects in the highlighted areas.

**What advice would you give to someone looking for their first job as an OHP practitioner?**

Take time to meet all your stakeholders. You will probably more easily pick up new processes and systems but developing relationships earlier will pay greater dividends later.

**What advice would you give to someone considering OHP as a career?**

Learn how to network. If you have a clear interest in an area then find someone who is in it and don’t be afraid to ask to meet up for a coffee. If you’re unsure of what exactly you want to do go along to events run by interest groups and just chat to people, and be honest!

**Contact details**

For more information please contact Aaron at:

- [AJPercival@gmail.com](mailto:AJPercival@gmail.com)

---

**Contribute to the Newsletter!**

**This is your newsletter!** We do our best to cover what interests you, but we need your input. We welcome contributions of all kinds – for instance, news of people in practice, education and/or research, including new professional appointments and contracts, conference announcements, reports of symposia, accounts of work in progress, and letters to the Editor.

We are keen to include content from any contributory discipline, in order that we can encourage discussion and debate around Occupational Health Psychology in its fullest possible sense. You don’t have to be an EAOHP member to contribute, nor do you have to be based in Europe. We welcome contributions from all parts of the globe. We will publish any item that is of interest to Newsletter readers (who number some 1,000 individuals worldwide).

If English is not your first language, don’t let this put you off – if you need it, you will be provided with help to prepare your item.

If you have a contribution for the Newsletter then just send it to a member of the Newsletter Team or, if you are undecided, get in touch with Sue Cowan, Kevin Teoh or Vlad Dediu to discuss your ideas. See the back page of this Newsletter for our contact details.

---

**Work & Stress—Online Access**

All members of the Academy receive a personal subscription to the quarterly international journal ‘Work & Stress’. If there are any queries, kindly contact our membership officer: Cristina Di Tecco (c.ditecco@inail.it)
Policy and Practice in Europe

Evaluation of policy and practice to promote mental health in the workplace in Europe

Stavroula Leka and Aditya Jain, University of Nottingham, UK
Richard Wynne, Work Research Centre, Ireland
Véronique De Broeck and Karla Vandenbroek, Prevent, Belgium
Irene Houtman, TNO, Netherlands
David McDaid and Ah-La Park, London School of Economics, UK

Introduction

It is generally accepted that ‘work is good for you’, contributing to personal fulfilment and financial and social prosperity (Waddell & Burton, 2006). There are economic, social and moral arguments that work is the most effective way to improve the well-being of these individuals, their families and their communities (King & Wickam-Jones 1999). Moreover, for people who have experienced poor mental health, maintaining or returning to employment can also be a vital element in the recovery process, helping to build self-esteem, confidence and social inclusion (Perkins, Farmer, & Litchfield 2009). There is growing awareness that (long-term) worklessness is harmful to physical and mental health, and also increasing evidence which highlights that work is generally good for one’s health and well-being, provided one has ‘a good job’ (Langenhan, Leka & Jain, 2013; Waddell & Burton, 2006).

A substantial body of evidence is now available on work-related risks that can negatively affect both mental and physical health with an associated negative effect on business performance and society (WHO, 2008; ILO, 2016). Although risks in the physical work environment can have a direct negative effect on mental health, that is accentuated by their interaction with risks in the psychosocial work environment. In addition, psychosocial hazards (also often termed work organisation characteristics or organisational stressors) have been shown to pose significant risk and have a negative impact on mental health (WHO, 2010; ILO, 2016).

In recognition of this, the European Commission sought to establish the situation in the EU and EEA/EFTA countries on mental health in the workplace and funded a research study to evaluate the scope and requirements of possible modifications of relevant EU Safety & Health at Work legislation with a view to ultimately ensure adequate protection of workers’ mental health from workplace related risks. This study (EC, 2014) conducted by a team of researchers at the University of Nottingham, Work Research Centre, Prevent, TNO and London School of Economics had three objectives:

1. To provide the European Commission with information on the situation in the EU and EFTA countries of mental health in the workplace. This required an in depth analysis of the current EU legal framework on workers’ health and safety protection.

2. To develop a range of scenarios, and identify the pros and cons of each with the primary objective of providing a sufficiently robust information base which the Commission could use to consider policy options aiming to ensure that workers are effectively protected from risks to their mental health arising from workplace related risks.

3. To develop guidance to help employers and workers alike fulfil their obligations, namely those explicitly provided for by Framework Directive 89/391/EEC, with the overarching objective of making sure that mental health is considered an inescapable element of any occupational safety and health (OSH policy) and practical measures.

Impact of mental ill health

This study commenced with a review of the magnitude of mental health concerns in the workplace in Europe and the impact of mental ill health on individuals, organizations and society. The prevalence of mental ill health in the workplace, including poor psychological well-being is widespread across all EU/EFTA countries and there are indications that this will only increase due to exposure to risk factors such as job insecurity, work intensification and organizational restructuring. In addition, the impact of mental ill health is profound on individuals, organizations and society as a whole.

Mental ill health has a profound impact on individuals, organizations and society but awareness on the positive impact of good mental health also needs to be raised

At the individual level, exposure to psychosocial risks can result not only to poor psychological health and well-being but also to physical problems such as cardiovascular disease. These problems challenge participation in the workforce and performance through absenteeism and presenteeism. Discrimination and social exclusion against those affected by mental health disorders still remain a problem exacerbating the situation.

At the organizational level, evidence indicates that mental ill health and poor psychological well-being affect business performance through...
absenteeism, presenteeism, reduced job satisfaction and organizational commitment, a poor work climate and human error. Additional costs are incurred by businesses in terms of hiring and training costs as well as reduced productivity and innovation.

At societal level, there are associated costs to national social security and benefit systems, national economies and challenges on healthcare systems. These trends are projected to continue in the future. The negative impact of poor mental health in the workplace is now undisputed. However, further awareness needs to be raised on the positive impact of good mental health on sustainability at individual, organizational and societal level as a means of achieving the Europe 2020 goals.

The policy situation at the EU level
The second step of the study was a policy review at EU level with a focus on both regulatory and voluntary policy instruments, detailing the ‘history’ of policy evolution in this area in the EU. This was supplemented by a gap analysis. Employment, including OSH, legislation as well as public health legislation address the issue by placing emphasis on prevention through tackling risk factors and preventing discrimination. However, some challenges were identified. For example, while a common legal framework in the EU exists in relation to mental health in the workplace through the Framework Directive 89/391/EEC which covers all types of risk to workers’ health, there still appears to be limited awareness of this provision both by employers and other key stakeholders. The situation seems to be negatively exacerbated further by the fact that the Framework Directive does not include specific terminology in relation to mental health in the workplace (for example it only refers to broad areas from which risk factors can arise, such as work organisation, and does not include terms such as work-related stress or psychosocial risk).

The review and gap analysis of regulatory and voluntary policy initiatives highlighted that: a. there is lack of clarity and specificity on the terminology used; and b. although the different instruments/initiatives are based on related paradigms, very few of them provide specific guidance on managing risks in relation to mental health in the workplace to enable organisations (and especially small and medium-sized enterprises - SMEs) to implement a preventive framework of action. Several additional policy instruments of a non-binding nature have clarified the relevance and application of the Framework Directive in this area such as the framework agreement on work-related stress. The EC guidance on risk assessment also includes useful detail in this area.

The gap analysis showed that a number of non-binding policies have been developed at EU level which provide specific guidance in this area while several gaps are evident in legislation at EU level. In light of this, it would be advisable to revisit the content of the Framework Directive in relation to psychosocial risks and mental health in the workplace to provide further clarity and harmonise terminology across other key OSH legislation accordingly. The review also showed that there is more scope for better co-ordination at EU institutional level in this area.

The policy situation at the national level
The third step of this study was the review of policies at national level in the EU/EFTA countries which highlighted that legislation in this area is more specific is several member states with many cases of updated legislation in recent years. Specific legislation refers directly to psychosocial risks, work-related stress, mental health in the workplace, harassment and bullying. It also makes clear reference to risk assessment for psychosocial risks as an employer responsibility. Other initiatives such as strategies and campaigns as well as social partner agreements were also identified. In addition, we conducted a case study analysis, including interviews with key stakeholders, of different types of policy instruments and initiatives which showcased several examples of good practice that have been implemented in individual, or even across, member states. These have helped tremendously in clarifying the legal framework and employer and employee responsibilities. An example is the Management Standards for work-related stress in the UK that have been adapted in Italy.

A mixed picture across member states but with several good practice examples. The status quo implies questionable progress
Awareness raising of these initiatives and sharing of good practices across the EU has only recently started to materialise to some extent and there is far more scope in learning from these good practices and even exploring the feasibility of promoting a more unified approach at EU level. To do so, existing monitoring systems in the EU (such as the European Working Conditions Survey by Eurofound and the European Survey of Enterprises on New & Emerging Risks by EU-OSHA) will have to be strengthened to allow better benchmarking across members states. A more co-ordinated action plan would be beneficial at EU level, clarifying requirements (both in employment and public health policies) and the case for mental health promotion in the workplace and drawing upon good practice efforts within specific countries. In addition, monitoring across the EU and between and within Member States should be further developed by refining existing systems. A specific issue to be considered is the inclusion of mental health disorders in lists of occupational diseases in EU countries. Without effective monitoring and dedicated reporting, knowledge at the Community level about the rate of progress would be weak.

The analysis further indicated that, if the status quo as concerns the policy context to mental health in the workplace is maintained, it is likely that a number of activities will continue to take place across the EU/EFTA countries in this area given the impact of mental ill health on individuals, organizations and
society. However, there is unclear as to whether they will achieve the desired outcomes, especially since preventive actions still seem to be lacking across countries. Continuation of EU activities as currently set would not necessarily lead to an improvement of the situation, given the progress achieved so far, nor would it necessarily lead to greater awareness in relation to the vital importance of mental health in the workplace. Although this option would not imply any additional administrative costs, or require re-orientation of funds from other policies, it bears the significant and undisputed cost of inaction.

Identifying the way forward – stakeholder perspectives

To explore additional scenarios at EU level, developed through our review of policies, the next step in the study included the development and evaluation of several scenarios on policy options in relation to mental health in the workplace in the EU on the basis of a Delphi study including interviews and an online survey. The analysis indicated that the views of key stakeholders across countries on the various policy scenarios (maintaining the status quo; introducing non-binding EU initiatives; combining or consolidating EU Directives; providing a technical update of existing EU legislation; developing EU legislation in this area) differ. Overall, non-binding EU initiatives were most often preferred, which may reflect the view from stakeholders that additional legislation may be difficult to develop whilst well-designed non-binding measures have been shown to help improve the focus on mental health in the workplace in some country contexts. The scenario on ‘developing a technical update of existing legislation’ ranked overall second, whereas ‘combining or consolidating EU Directives’ ranked third.

Views on the best way forward differ across countries and stakeholders

Differences across countries were as follows: ‘non-binding EU initiatives’ were on average most preferred in Southern Europe and UK & Ireland. Interestingly, in new member states this scenario shared first place with the scenario on ‘developing new EU legislation’. In Northern EU countries, ‘developing new EU legislation’ was the most preferred scenario. While Continental country respondents preferred a ‘technical update of existing legislation’. The differences in preference were more pronounced for the different stakeholder groups as compared to country clusters. Experts and professionals preferred ‘non-binding EU initiatives’ the most. Employee representatives and policy makers in some countries (particularly labor inspectorates) most strongly preferred ‘developing new EU legislation’, whereas employer representatives most often preferred the ‘status quo’. Regarding different non-binding EU scenario options, the different stakeholders expressed a preference for further awareness raising campaigns, closely followed by developing and implementing national strategies on mental health in the workplace, and introducing management standards.

Recommendations

On the basis of the project findings the following recommendations were made to the Commission:

- Revisit the content (coverage and terminology) of Council Directive 89/391/EEC to include clear reference to psychosocial risks and mental health in the workplace.
- Harmonise coverage and terminology in relation to psychosocial risks and mental health in the workplace across all key pieces of OSH legislation.
- Consider the inclusion of mental health disorders in the list of occupational diseases at EU level.
- Continue to promote both regulatory and non-binding initiatives to raise awareness and promote good practice.
- Co-ordinate action at EU institutional level in this area to achieve maximum impact.
- Raise awareness on the positive impact of good mental health and its association with sustainability as a means of achieving the Europe 2020 goals.
- Strengthen existing monitoring systems in the EU (such as the European Working Conditions Survey by Eurofound and the European Survey of Enterprises on New & Emerging Risks by EU-OSHA) to allow better monitoring and benchmarking across member states.
- Publicise lessons learnt from good practices implemented in member states to motivate action across the EU.
- Place further emphasis on measures to support small and medium-sized enterprises to actively
implement good practices in the workplace.

- Promote the guidance document on how to implement a comprehensive approach for the promotion of mental health in the workplace.

The final steps of this project focused on the development of two guidance documents. The first is an interpretative document of the implementation of Council Directive 89/391/EEC in relation to mental health in the workplace (Leka & Jain, 2014). This interpretative document aims to reiterate, in particular to employers and anyone with relevant responsibilities in organizations, the formal requirements of Council Directive 89/391/EEC as regards mental health in the workplace. The second is a guidance document on how to implement a comprehensive approach for the promotion of mental health in the workplace (Wynne et al., 2014). It is hoped that these two documents will clarify legal requirements and good practice in this area further for employers and other key stakeholders in Europe.

References


Book Updates

Work-Life Balance in Times of Recession, Austerity and Beyond


Published by Routledge. ISBN: 978-1138926448

This book reflects the enormous interest in work-life balance and current pressing concerns about the impacts of austerity more broadly. It draws on contemporary research and practitioner experiences to explore how work-life balance and related workplace and social policy fare in turbulent economic times and the implications for employees, employers and wider societies. Authors consider workplace trends, practices and employment relations and the impacts on work, care and well-being of diverse workers. A guiding theme throughout the book is a dual agenda of supporting employee work-life balance, workplace effectiveness and social justice. The final chapters present case studies of innovative processes and organizational practices for addressing the triple agenda, note the important role of social policy context and discuss the challenge of extending debates on work-life balance to include a social justice dimension.

This book will be of interest to academics and postgraduate students of organisational psychology, sociology, human resource management, management and business studies, law and social policy, as well as employers, managers, HR managers, trade unions, and policy makers.
Providing an overview of researchers’ and practitioners’ “confessions” on the fascinating phenomenon of failed or derailed organizational health and well-being interventions and contextualizing these confessions is the aim of this innovative volume. Organizational intervention failures, paradoxes and unexpected consequences can offer a lot of rich and extremely useful practical lessons on intervention design and implementation and possibly on the design of future research on organizational interventions. This volume presents lessons learned from derailed interventions and provides possible solutions to those tasked with implementing interventions. It provides an open, practical and solutions-focused account of researchers’ and practitioners’ experiences in implementing organizational interventions for health and well-being.

The book:
- Includes unpublished lessons from failed organizational interventions.
- Is a strong book on practice and a reference of in depth practical information.
- Provides a thorough understanding of issues that practitioners may face and researchers may want to explore.

Review one of the these books!

Call for Book Reviewers

EAOHP is looking to expand our team of book reviewers. There are a number of benefits to becoming a book reviewer, including:
- access to the latest books, allowing you to keep up to date with your areas of practice, education and/or research, or simply those that interest you most;
- getting your name known in relevant circles;
- expanding your CV;
- and you get to keep any book that you review!

Book reviews should be approximately 500 to 700 words in length. Books for review will be sent to you, so you will not incur any costs. If English is not your first language, don’t let this put you off – if you need it, you will be provided with help to prepare your review. If you would like to join our team of book reviewers, please email the Newsletter’s Book Reviews Editor, Gail Kinman (Gail.Kinman@beds.ac.uk) with details of your interests.
Upcoming Conferences and Events

◊ Work, Stress, and Health 2017: Contemporary Challenges and Opportunities
  June 7-10th, 2017
  Minneapolis, USA
  http://www.apa.org/wsh/

◊ European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology:
  Enabling Change through Work and Organizational Psychology
  May 17-20th, 2017
  Dublin, Ireland
  http://www.eawop2017.org/

◊ Creating Healthy Organizations Conference: Science and Practice of Productivity and Well-Being
  June 1-3rd, 2017
  Irvine, California, USA

◊ 21st World Congress on Safety and Health at Work 2017
  September 3-6th, 2017
  Singapore
  https://www.safety2017singapore.com/

◊ 6th International Congress of the ICOH Scientific Committee on Work Organization & Psychosocial Factors (ICOH-WOPS)
  August 29– September 1st, 2017
  Mexico City, Mexico
  http://condor.zaragoza.unam.mx/wops/

◊ 32nd International Congress on Occupational Health
  April 29th– May 4th, 2018
  Dublin, Ireland
  http://icoh2018.org/wp/congress-overview/

◊ 13th European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology Conference
  September 5-7 2018
  Lisbon, Portugal
  http://www.eaohp.org/conference.html

The Academy and Social Media

The Academy is looking to better engage with our members and the wider public by improving our social media presence.

You can find us on the following social media platforms:

- Via our Twitter handle: @ea_ohp
- Our Facebook Page: EAOHP
- Our LinkedIn Group: European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology - EAOHP

Don't just follow us; Instead, engage with us by tweeting, starting discussions, asking questions, sharing articles and posting links.

If it’s related to Occupational Health Psychology, then we’re interested. Keep us in the loop by using the hashtag #EAOHP
Call for Papers

Occupational Health Science—New SOHP Journal

The Society for Occupational Health Psychology is happy to announce a new journal - Occupational Health Science. Occupational Health Science is a peer-reviewed journal dedicated to publishing leading edge scholarship on behavioral, social, psychological, and technological aspects of occupational health.

This peer-reviewed journal is dedicated to presenting leading edge scholarship on behavioral, social, psychological, and technological aspects of occupational health. The journal publishes papers that represent important empirical and/or theoretical contributions to our understanding of phenomena related to worker safety, health, and well-being. The journal combines a multidisciplinary orientation, an international perspective, a translational/evidence-based practice focus, and a flexible approach that welcomes both deductive (theory-based) and inductive (descriptive) articles. The contents include articles of interest to academics as well as practitioners in applied psychology, public health, industrial hygiene, occupational medicine, nursing, occupational safety, epidemiology, ergonomics, human resource management, organizational behavior, and economics.

The journal is accepting submissions so please consider submitting your research now!

Robert R. Sinclair, is the founding editor of OHS and he is supported by a strong team of associate editors (Mindy Bergman, Sharon Toker, and Mike Ford), a distinguished advisory board (Lois Tetrick, Leslie Hammer, Paul Spector, Kevin Kelloway, Mo Wang, and Laura Punnett), and a fantastic editorial board with over 70 members.

For more information please contact the founding editor Robert R. Sinclair (rsincla@clemson.edu)

Leading well: Leadership and employee safety and wellbeing

Work & Stress

In recent years there has been a growing interest within occupational health psychology in the role that leaders play in managing employee safety and health and promoting a workforce that is healthy as well as productive. Although this research has received increased attention, it faces several challenges.

The editors of this special issue invite high-quality conceptual and empirical papers addressing these and other challenges in the area of leadership and occupational health psychology. We welcome a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches. Interdisciplinary approaches and studies that include multiple levels (individual, group and organizational) and multiple raters are encouraged. We are interested in a wide range of questions concerning leadership and employee safety, health and well-being, including – but not limited to – the questions below:

- How can organisations support direct leaders in ensuring employee safety, health and psychological well-being?
- In which circumstances may transformational leadership behaviours have detrimental effects on employee safety, health and well-being?
- How can leaders promote followers’ proactive behaviours, and how are these linked to follower stress, well-being and performance?
- Which interventions may promote leaders’ skills, knowledge and competence in ensuring employee safety, health and well-being? And how can we ensure that training is transferred to the organizational setting?
- What are the effects of exerting various types of leadership (e.g. abusive or transformational leadership) on followers?


The special issue will appear in 2018.

See more information at: http://explore.tandfonline.com/cfp/beh/twst-leading-well
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**EOHOP — About Us**

The European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology: the European representative body for the discipline. The Academy is a registered charity under English law (registered charity number 1115640) that exists to support research, education, and professional practice across Europe. This is achieved through a biennial conference, academic and practitioner-oriented publications, and the provision of small grants to individuals and groups.

Individuals with an interest in the application of scientific psychological principles and practices to occupational health issues are invited to join the Academy. Membership attracts a host of benefits including a free personal subscription to the Academy’s affiliated journal, Work & Stress, as well as discounts on attendance at events.

---

**Academy Publications**

*the Occupational Health Psychologist*: Published two times per annum. ISSN 1743-16737 (Online). Back copies can be downloaded at [www.eahop.org/newsletter.html](http://www.eahop.org/newsletter.html)

*Work & Stress*: A journal of work, health and organizations. Published by Taylor & Francis in association with the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology. ISSN 0267-8373

*Contemporary Occupational Health Psychology: Global Perspectives on Research and Practice, Volume 3 (2014-2015).*

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

We are keen to publish many different kinds of articles, and we hope this will encourage a broad range of submissions. We welcome articles from people involved in practice, education and/or research in OHP and across the full range of contributory disciplines, and with a variety of levels of experience. If English is not your first language, don’t let this put you off – if you need it, you will be provided with help to prepare your item. We aim to publish three issues per year.

OHP research/practice
We welcome short reports (of no more than about 1000 words) of research findings, practice issues, case studies, brief literature reviews, and theoretical articles. This could be a valuable opportunity for you to disseminate information on your work both to academics and practitioners. When writing these reports please make them as accessible as possible to the broad readership of the Newsletter.

OHP briefings
We also welcome overviews of your OHP-related activities, or those of your research group, consultancy or organization. This type of article provides a useful insight into the sort of work that is being undertaken across the OHP world community. Additionally, this section enables the communication of policy developments that may have implications for OHP research, practice and education in your country. We ask that such articles are no longer than 1,200 words long.

Opportunities
We would be pleased to receive advertisements for job opportunities, internships or PhD studentships. If you have an opportunity that you would like to make our community aware of, please send a short description to the Editors.

Other articles
We welcome news, conference announcements, open letters regarding any OHP-related topics, responses to published articles and brief summaries (in English) of OHP issues that have been reported by your national news media.

We would be pleased to receive appropriate photographs to accompany your contributions.

Please email your questions, announcements or contributions to the Editors:

Sue Cowan: s.cowan@hw.ac.uk
Kevin Teoh: k.teoh@bbk.ac.uk
Vlad Dediu: vlad.dediu@nottingham.ac.uk

The Occupational Health Psychologist Editorial Team:
The Editor, Sue Cowan, is Head of Psychology, Heriot-Watt University
Kevin Teoh (Deputy Editor) is a Research Associate and doctoral student at Birkbeck University of London; Vlad Dediu (Editorial Assistant) is a doctoral student at the University of Nottingham.