New guidance standard on the management of psychosocial risks in the workplace

The British Standards Institution (BSI) has just published the first guidance standard on the management of psychosocial risks in the workplace. Publicly Available Specification (PAS) 1010 was developed by the PRIMA-EF Consortium (PRIMA-EF.org) in collaboration with BSI, the European Agency for Safety & Health at Work, the World Health Organization, the UK’s Health & Safety Executive (HSE), the European Trade Union Confederation and EEF – the UK manufacturers’ organisation. The development of PAS1010 was funded through the European Commission’s Leonardo Da Vinci Lifelong Learning Programme.

PAS1010 aims to promote best practice in the area of psychosocial risk management by bringing together essential guidance included in key standards by the European Union, International Labour Organization, World Health Organisation and the HSE. It has been written so that it compliments all existing standards on occupational health and safety management systems.

The new guidance standard is applicable to human resources managers and specialists, occupational health and safety managers and specialists, managers and owners of small and medium-sized enterprises, and employee representatives. It is most likely to be used by organisations that wish to establish a strategy and process of psychosocial risk management to eliminate or minimise risks to personnel and other interested parties who could be exposed to psychosocial hazards associated with its activities; to implement, maintain and continually improve the psychosocial risk management process and related practices; and to assure themselves of their conformity with their stated occupational health and safety and psychosocial risk policy.

Overall, the standard provides guidance and recommendations for psychosocial risk management to enable an organisation to develop and implement a strategy and to specify objectives that take into account legal requirements and information about psychosocial risks. It is intended to apply to all types and sizes of organization and to accommodate diverse geographical, cultural and social conditions.

PAS1010 is available from the BSI website: http://shop.bsigroup.com/en/ProductDetail/?pid=000000000030213276
For more information, contact: Stavroula.Leka@nottingham.ac.uk
Welcome to the Spring 2011 edition of the EAOHP newsletter. First, we are pleased to announce that the call for papers for next EAOHP conference, to be held in Zürich in 2012, is now open – for information see pages 3 and 13.

We begin with an article on the first guidance standard on the management of psychosocial risks in the workplace. The standard aims to promote best practice in psychosocial risk management by bringing together and complimenting essential guidance included in existing standards on occupational health and safety management systems. We also present an article by Stavroula Leka (IWHO, University of Nottingham) on PRIMAeT, a training programme that is being developed for psychosocial risk management in the workplace. Using a virtual learning environment, PRIMAeT builds on previous European research.

In a Research Report, Jennie Guise and Sue Cowan describe a qualitative study on work-family conflict in the UK offshore oil and gas industry. They identify work-family conflict as a main concern of the workers, who miss key family events and may experience difficulties in adjusting to on-shore life. This work will be of interest to those researching work that takes individuals away from home for long periods.

Our interview in this edition is with Sharon Clarke from Manchester Business School, who describes her route into Occupational Health Psychology and her view of the important concerns within the discipline with regard to health and safety management. She highlights the need for OHP issues to be integral to business strategy.

We also have a feature on how to increase the chances of having your research published in a top journal. In the first article Toon Taris, Scientific Editor of the journal, Work and Stress, uses a marketing metaphor to identify the key issues that authors need to consider when submitting a paper. This is followed by a summary of points made by the editors of three leading business journals.

Sadly, this is my last edition as Editor. Until a new editor is appointed Mary Tisserand will be the interim editor of the newsletter. She will welcome contributions or feedback, and suggestions regarding the content. She and Aditya Jain will also be glad of any suggestions or applications for the post of Editor – see the news page of this Newsletter.

I have enjoyed my time in this role and would like to extend my thanks to the excellent editorial team. I will miss working with each of you. I would also like to thank the contributors to the newsletter, without whom this would have been very difficult. Jonathan Houdmont, until recently the EAOHP’s Executive Officer, has been extremely supportive, and I also extend my thanks to him. Thank you finally to the readers of the newsletter, whose feedback has been invaluable.

Kate Sang, Editor on behalf of the Editorial Team.
email: k.sang@uea.ac.uk
Next EAOHP conference:

Zürich 2012
10th Conference
European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology
11-13 April 2012, ETH Zürich, Switzerland

Conference theme:
The contribution of occupational health psychology to individual, organizational and public health

The European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology in collaboration with the Division of Public and Organizational Health (POH) of the University of Zurich and the ETH Zurich would like to invite you to the 'Cultural Capital of Switzerland', Zürich, to attend the 10th conference of the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology. The event will take place 11-13 April, 2012, at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology - ETH Zurich.

In our complex, fast changing service and knowledge society, health is strongly influenced by the continuously changing interaction between organizations and their employees. Occupational health psychology aims to improve this interaction and thus can simultaneously contribute to individual, organizational and public health. The conference will address how to balance interventions and outcomes on these levels and thus how to increase equal health opportunities in our society.

Keynote speakers. The programme will include a distinguished line-up of keynote speakers. Those confirmed so far are Wilmar Schaufeli, University of Utrecht, Georg Bauer, ETH Zurich/University of Zürich, Switzerland. Sabine Guerts, Radboud University Nijmegen and Michael Marmot, University College London.

Call for papers now open!
To submit an abstract visit:
http://eaohp.org/conference.aspx

Georg Bauer, Conference Chair
Tom Cox, President, EAOHP
**Interview**

Sharon Clarke, a Reader within the Organizational Psychology Group at Manchester Business School, University of Manchester, UK, has a special interest in health and safety management. Here she describes some of her recent projects, one of which was presented at this year’s IOSH conference in Chicago.

**Sharon Clarke**

*How did you first become interested in occupational health psychology?*

I became interested in the area of Occupational Health Psychology (OHP) when studying for my undergraduate degree. My interest in occupational and organizational psychology was first sparked by courses I took at the University of Manchester. I was particularly inspired by Professor Jim Reason (now Emeritus Professor), who taught a final year course in human error and the role of humans in the breakdown of complex systems. This course focused on the ways in which the actions of individuals contribute to major accidents and disasters. This was at the time that Jim Reason published his seminal work ‘Human Error’ (Oxford University Press, 1990) and I remember working from a soft-bound pre-print copy of this book. This experience certainly shaped my thinking and led me to develop an interest in human error, initially from the view of cognitive psychology, but later from a broader social and organizational perspective.

As part of the same undergraduate degree, I also took a course in organizational psychology at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST; later merged with the University of Manchester in 2004), taught by leading psychologists, including Professors Ivan Robertson and Cary Cooper. Thus, my initial interest developed and I undertook a PhD, with Jim Reason at the University of Manchester, looking at organizational safety issues in British Rail (the once state-owned UK railway system, which was privatized in 1994). I became (somewhat unwittingly) an expert in the operation of trains and railway signalling systems and was a regular, in my orange high-visibility vest, conducting interviews with train drivers across North-West England. This research set the scene for my career in occupational health psychology (spanning over 20 years now), which has focused on organizational safety, in particular safety climate and safety culture, the role of occupational stress in accidents, and the importance of individual factors, such as personality, in accident involvement.

**What are your current activities and in which area of OHP are you most interested?**

My particular area of research is in organizational safety. I am most interested by the way in which safety climate and safety culture influence the attitudes and behaviour of people in the workplace. Most recently, I have led two projects investigating the design, implementation and evaluation of safety interventions in organizations. The first project was funded as a Knowledge Transfer Partnership (KTP). (KTPs are European programmes that help businesses to improve their competitiveness and productivity through the use of knowledge, technology and skills.) The second was funded by the Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH). Both projects have focused on the effectiveness of safety interventions: how we are able to successfully transfer the knowledge we have developed through research into practical applications for companies. In particular, the projects have looked at implementing safety interventions in small and medium sized organizations (SMEs) as well as large organizations (which have previously dominated this area of research). The recommendations arising from numerous accident investigations and many years of research have emphasized the importance of a positive safety culture for organizations. Nevertheless, there is still a lack of practical guidance on how organizations should go about developing and maintaining such a safety culture.

My most recent project, the one funded by IOSH, focused on the effects of training interventions on safety climate and safety culture. Although training is
one of the most commonly implemented interventions for companies seeking to improve safety, relatively little evaluation work has been conducted to assess the effectiveness of safety training, particularly in relation to longer term outcomes, such as safety culture. The research project collected baseline data on a range of safety measures from a sample of ten companies (7 SMEs and 3 large organizations) based in North-West England from manufacturing, construction, chemical and service industries. The impact of training interventions was measured by looking at employees’ motivation, safety knowledge, safety behaviour, safety perceptions and documented reports of minor injuries at two time points (12 months and 24 months) following the implementation of the interventions. The study was able to show that safety training had a significant effect in reducing accidents and, moreover, that safety climate became significantly more positive over time. Different aspects of the safety climate, related to the effectiveness of safety communication, training, safety systems, level of risk in the work environment and the amount of work pressure demonstrated significant improvement after 12 months and this improvement was maintained over a further 12 months. The greatest impact of the interventions was on the level of risk perceived in the employees’ work environment. This led to significant changes to employees’ attitudes and behaviour at work. Employee motivation was enhanced and employees were more willing to participate in safety-related activities. Both managers and employees in SMEs and large organizations across industrial sectors reported that the interventions had a significant impact on company safety culture and productivity. Best practice recommendations, based on the findings of the study, were that: training interventions should be tailored specifically to the company’s training needs (as assessed through health and safety appraisal processes); interventions should be embedded into the company’s processes and procedures; safety training should form part of the company’s overall strategy and be consistent with business objectives. We concluded from this project, which will be published as a research report on the IOSH website, that safety interventions can have a significant long-term impact on a company’s safety culture, when implemented in line with best practice recommendations.

The significance of occupational stress as a risk factor in accidents has long been recognised; however, the mechanisms underlying this relationship are currently not well-understood. One means of assessing the current state of our knowledge about the relationship between occupational stress on one hand, and accident involvement on the other, is to review existing studies through a quantitative method, such as meta-analysis. In my most recent work, meta-analysis was utilized to test the relationships between occupational stressors and safety outcomes. Overall, the meta-analysis was able to demonstrate that occupational stressors are associated with a greater involvement in workplace accidents. However, contrasting results were found in relation to two different types of occupational stressor (challenge stressors and hindrance stressors) in relation to safety behaviour. Challenge stressors (such as high workload, time pressure, job scope, and high responsibility) are demands or obstacles that can be overcome with extra effort to result in the accomplishment of goals and realise the potential for personal development. Such stressors are often shown to have positive motivational benefits and to result in greater job satisfaction and enhanced job performance. In contrast, hindrance stressors (such as situational constraints, hassles, role ambiguity, role and interpersonal conflict, and concerns about job security) are demands that are unlikely to be overcome by the employee, even with extra effort, and so have negative consequences for job satisfaction and performance.

Meta-analysis was used to summarize the relationships between challenge and hindrance stressors and safety behaviour. It was expected that hindrance stressors would have negative effects on safety behaviour, while the positive motivational benefits of challenge stressors were hypothesized to have positive effects on safety behaviour. As expected, hindrance stressors were associated with significantly lower compliance with safety rules (safety compliance) and participation in safety-related activities (safety participation). However, positive effects were not associated with challenge stressors. Instead, these stressors had a non-significant, near-zero association with safety compliance, and a significant negative association with safety participation. These findings would suggest that the extra effort expended to maintain both safety and job-related behaviours under pressure is often not enough, and the focus shifts to job performance. Both types of stressor were found to have a negative effect on employees’ willingness to engage in safety activities. Safety participation is a discretionary behaviour and so may be more readily withdrawn than safety compliance. However, whilst hindrance stressors also had a negative effect on safety compliance, this effect was not found for challenge stressors. It may be that greater effort is made by employees to maintain safety compliance under pressure (avoiding violations and bending rules) as these behaviours are most closely related to task performance and therefore most likely to be
rewarded. However, the positive benefits seen for other aspects of task performance were not found for safety-related behaviours. These quite distinct findings for challenge and hindrance stressors have significant implications for the management of occupational stressors in the workplace. In terms of safety, this would highlight the need to manage the sources and effects of hindrance stressors effectively as a means of preventing unsafe behaviour and accidents. Furthermore, to prevent accidents it is not sufficient to focus on the development of challenges (such as increased autonomy) as a means of motivating employees to engage in safety behaviour, as employees may still struggle to maintain safety compliance under pressure.

This work on challenge and hindrance stressors will be presented to the Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) in Chicago this month, in the invited symposium on New Developments in Safety Research.

Tell us something about your department

The Business School’s Organisational Psychology Group comprises members of academic staff whose expertise covers a wide spectrum of areas in business and psychology. Three leading researchers will be particularly well known to readers of the Academy Newsletter: Catherine Cassell, David Holman and Helge Hoel. Cathy, has a specific interest in the use of qualitative research techniques in both management and organisational research. She is co-editor of Qualitative Research in Organisations and Management: An International Journal. David Holman has a particular interest in work design and well-being at work, including affect and work design in call centres. Helge Hoel is one of the UK’s most active researchers in the field of bullying and harassment. He has written or co-produced reports for the International Labour Office (ILO, Geneva) and the European Foundation for the Improvement of Working and Living Conditions on issues related to stress, violence and harassment.

What are the current issues of importance in OHP?

OHP covers issues related to both the health and safety of individuals in the workplace. Nevertheless, the work of occupational health psychologists has tended to focus on one aspect of OHP or the other, with very little overlap between the two. For example, research in OHP has made a substantial contribution to the understanding of underlying factors that contribute to workplace accidents and injuries, particularly in relation to health and safety management in organizations. However, although it has long been recognized that working under stressful conditions leads to an increased likelihood of occupational injuries, much of the research looking at the negative consequences of work stress has focused on well-being and health-related outcomes. It is therefore perhaps surprising that there has been relatively little investigation of the contribution of occupational stressors to the occurrence of workplace accidents.

The relationship between occupational stress and workplace accidents is certainly complex and needs further investigation and research. Such knowledge is essential, however, if we are to develop effective interventions to prevent stress leading to accidents.

What do you think is the most important issue facing Occupational Health Psychologists today?

The implementation of OHP policies and practices by organizations is too often viewed as an ‘add on’, rather than as integral to the business. Furthermore, the importance of such policies and practices is not always recognised, as they are not viewed as making a significant contribution to the bottom-line success and profitability of organizations. This is a particular challenge for occupational health psychologists – ensuring that companies integrate health and safety into company policy and practices, and that they recognise that running a healthy and safe organisation is integral to running a profitable business. This is particularly important in the current economic climate, as health and safety is an area of investment that is often squeezed when organizations face financial difficulties. The consequences are greater stress on employees, who are working increasingly long hours, with higher workloads and undertaking greater responsibilities, often in exchange for reduced reward. Occupational health psychologists face the challenge of encouraging companies to maintain high levels of health, well-being and safety for workforces in difficult conditions, so that organizations and their employees may contribute to the recovery of national economies.

Contact: s.g.clarke@manchester.ac.uk

Sharon Clarke has published widely in the area of health and safety management, and has co-authored the books Managing the Risk of Workplace Stress with Cary Cooper, Human Safety and Risk Management with Ian Glendon and Eugene McKenna, and Co-Edited Occupational Health and Safety: Psychological and Behavioral Challenges with Ron Burke and Cary Cooper. Her research interests are in health and safety management, human contribution to accidents, safety culture and risk management. She is currently the holder of an IOSH-funded research grant examining the impact of safety training on safety climate within a range of organisations.
Perhaps you have noticed that publishing your work in an international journal has become more difficult in the last decade, especially if this is one of the leading, high-impact journals in which your university administrator wants you to publish. Even upon its first submission, a manuscript has to be close to perfection in many respects if you want to be invited by these journals to revise and resubmit your research. Obviously, your study should address an interesting and novel issue, but that is just the beginning. On top of this, your study's theoretical framework must be well-developed, built upon and integrate the most important results in its area, and also provide a clear, coherent and well thought-out set of research questions. Of course, the methods used should preferably be more than adequate, with the design involving large and representative study groups, random assignment to conditions (if applicable), and state-of-the-art data analysis. Finally, your study’s findings should be illuminating, conclusive, and should extend current knowledge. In practice it will often be humanly impossible to achieve all this, at least in the first version of a manuscript. However, the paper should be close enough to these goals to give a journal editor the impression that after relatively minor revision it could be an excellent contribution to their journal.

One of the reasons for these higher demands is that at present journals receive many more submissions than, say, ten years ago; indeed, many middle-class and top-level journals in psychology are able to publish only 10% of the papers submitted to them. Most of the rejected papers will be submitted elsewhere, after which the whole evaluation and reviewing process starts again. In practice this means that getting a paper published is an iterative process that requires much time and effort from many agents – including you as an author (naturally), but also Editors and referees (and that could also be you, in your role as the reviewer of others’ work).

Clearly, the question of how the efficiency of the publication process can be improved is becoming increasingly important. I believe that part of the solution lies in making authors aware of the fact that they resemble entrepreneurs who must sell their goods (i.e., the papers they have written) to customers (the Editors of scientific journals) in an exceedingly competitive market (there are many other suppliers of very similar goods that could also satisfy the needs of the customers; i.e., to produce high quality journals). A model that may clarify this comparison is the 4Ps model of marketing. The model simply posits that if you want to sell something to someone else successfully, your Product, its Price, its Placement and its Promotion must all be OK.

**The 4Ps of publishing**

The 4Ps model can easily be applied to publishing scientific papers. For example, **Product** can be read as **Paper**. In order to be publishable, a paper should be basically OK; there should be no major flaws in its research design or the methods used, its topic should...
be well-timed, the ideas expressed should be fresh and interesting, it must have a unique selling point (i.e., something worthwhile that differentiates it from other papers), have a useful application in practice, and overall it should be at least as good (and preferably better) than the other papers that are currently on the editor's desk.

Price refers to the costs involved for an editor to publish a paper. For instance, consider paper length. Most journals operate on a fixed page budget, meaning that each year they can only publish a limited number of papers. To maximize the number of published papers, they prefer shorter to longer papers – the "costs" of publishing long papers in terms of valuable journal space are relatively high. This means that it is sensible for you to critically examine your own manuscript before submission. Can its length perhaps be reduced? Are all figures and tables necessary? If you cite more than, say, 40 references, are all of these really indispensable? And don't forget, many journals in psychology have adopted the style manual of the American Psychological Association – not adhering to the recommendations provided in that manual could mean that your manuscript will need to be edited, which also increases an Editor's "costs" of accepting the manuscript for publication. All in all, in addition to being attractive to the editor in terms of its price, a concise, well-written paper is more likely to be reviewed quickly, to be published quickly and to be read by researchers.

Placement refers to the target group of a paper. Getting your paper published is easier if it matches well with the "signature" of a journal. For instance, you would not submit a paper addressing the association between work load and employee health to a purely methodological journal, because it is obvious that this journal will not be interested in publishing applied research. Similarly, it would not be appropriate to submit a paper that relied heavily on clinical or medical knowledge on the part of the reader to a journal that was largely read by occupational health psychologists. However, issues regarding the placement of a paper are usually more subtle. For example, some journals primarily publish short papers with little theory development and many long tables presenting mainly descriptive information. Other journals favour in-depth qualitative studies, others primarily focus on publishing review studies and conceptual papers, and so forth. If you want your paper to be received well by a particular journal, it is a good idea to read its mission statement, Instructions for Authors, and style requirements (e.g., APA style) first. Browse the indexes of recent volumes to see if your paper would fit in well. In case of doubt, contact the journal editor for advice. Whatever you do, do not pick a journal simply on the basis of its title and impact factor, because this will often mean that your submission does not fit that journal well and is likely to be rejected.

Finally, your paper could address an interesting issue (Product), be well-written and no longer than needed (Price) and be submitted to the right journal (Placement), but even then you may find it difficult to get it published. In that case, the chances are that the Promotion of your paper can be improved. Does the paper make it sufficiently clear that it addresses a scientifically interesting and practically important issue? Has its contribution to current knowledge been emphasized sufficiently strongly in the title of the paper, its abstract and its introductory and conclusion/discussion sections? How about the cover letter – does it do a good job in telling the editor that this particular submission is interesting, relevant and worthwhile and has potential value in practice? Although you should avoid overstating its findings, a clear presentation of the innovativeness and practical relevance of your research will certainly make it easier to get into print.

In conclusion

My impression is that many researchers are primarily product-focused and tend to make the most of their papers in terms of its content (theoretical framework, literature review), the methods used (designs and statistical analysis), the quality of the discussion section, et cetera. However, they should also keep the other three Ps in mind. Price: good manuscripts are reasonably short, include only the tables and figures that are really needed, and their style, grammar and spelling have all been carefully checked. Placement: they have carefully considered whether a journal is an appropriate outlet for their paper in terms of the match between the paper's topic and the remit of a journal. And finally, Promotion: authors have made clear to the editor and the reader why their study is interesting and worthwhile, both in their cover letter and at strategic places in the paper itself.

You should think about all four Ps for a variety of reasons. First, considering the Ps will improve your chances of success in getting into print. Second, attention to them will improve the efficiency of the publication process, leading to less work for authors (i.e., you), but also for Editors and referees. Third,
readers can more easily identify important research in their area, as papers on a particular subject will be published in a relatively limited number of journals that more or less specialise in this subject. And perhaps most importantly, considering the 4 Ps of publishing may speed up publication and thus reduce the interval between the discovery of important and useful information on the one hand and the development and implementation of effective interventions that are based on this information on the other. From a societal point of view this is clearly desirable. Therefore, it is not only sensible for you personally to consider all four Ps – it could well be argued that authors have a moral obligation to do so in order to promote the dissemination of their findings. In this sense, systematic application of the 4Ps of getting into print is likely to result in gains for everyone involved – better chances of getting published in the right outlet, a more efficient publication process, and a faster transformation of new knowledge into effective applications for the benefit of society as a whole.

Contact: t.taris@uu.nl

Toon Taris is a full professor of Work and Organizational Psychology at the University of Utrecht, the Netherlands. Over the last two decades he has published many papers and chapters on issues such as statistical methods, worker well-being (engagement, burnout, boredom) and work motivation (e.g., workaholism). He serves on the boards of several Dutch and international journals, and he is currently the Scientific Editor of the journal Work & Stress.

Suitability of papers for Work & Stress. The “Instructions for Authors” for journal Work & Stress includes a link to a document entitled “News submissions: suitability guide”. This indicates the types of paper that the journal aims to publish — and those that are unlikely to be accepted. It covers many of the points mentioned in the two papers in this feature on publishing.

“Meet the editors”

by Kate Sang, Norwich Business School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK.

UK academics are approaching the Research Exercise Framework (REF) 2014, which will assess the quality of research outputs in UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Performance in the REF will ‘inform the selective allocation of research funding to HEIs’ (HEFCE, 2011). A key element of assessing this performance will be evaluating research outputs, namely, publications. Therefore there is an increased emphasis on academics to publish research in highly ranked journals. In his article on page 7, Toon Taris (Scientific Editor of Work and Stress) shares with us his perspective on getting published in a top-ranked journal. Depending on the nature of their contribution, Occupational Health Psychologists may be interested in publishing their work not only in psychology journals but also in Business and Management journals.

On the 30th March, 2011, three editors of highly-ranked journals visited The University of East Anglia (Norwich, UK) to participate in a panel discussion about publishing in 3* and 4* journals according to the Association of Business Schools (ABS) ranking of journal quality. Our guests were:

Professor Mustafa Özbilgin from Brunel University. Editor of the British Journal of Management (ABS 4*).

Professor Steve Brown from the University of Exeter. Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Operations and Production Management (ABS 3* and top Productions and Operations Management journal in Europe).

Professor Mark Tadajewski from the University of
Strathclyde. Co-editor of the Journal of Marketing Management (ABS 3*).

All three gave short presentations about the aims and scope of their journals, the review process and tips on acceptance and how to get rejected! Given the high rejection rate of all three journals (fewer than 10% of submissions are published), it is more likely that submitted work will be rejected than accepted. Common reasons for rejection include poor fit between the research and the journal, lack of methodological rigour and justification, an under-developed literature review, failure to adhere to the author guidelines and lack of clarity about the contribution of the paper (what Steve Brown called the ‘so what?’ factor). Another common mistake is self-plagiarising, whereby, the paper is too similar to others previously published by the author/s or sections of the literature review are very similar.

The editors also felt that junior scholars are often too tentative in their writing, and therefore their theoretical contribution is unclear. If your work does get rejected, don’t lose heart! Often editors will provide feedback (even for desk rejections) as to a more appropriate journal for the work. If your work does go to reviewers but is rejected, take some time to read what they have said. Incorporating the relevant feedback will strengthen your work.

Although there is a high chance that submissions to top journals will be rejected, the editors did share tips that make success more likely.

- Ensure you are targeting the correct journal – read the editorial position statement (if available).
- Make sure you have told a coherent story – take your audience by the hand and walk them through the story of your paper (advice that is also relevant to PhD students).
- Understanding of the extant (and current) literature is crucial.
- Be clear as to who you are writing for – use appropriate language which communicates your message clearly.
- Ask a critical friend to read through your paper before you submit to your chosen journal.
- Be polite! Don’t directly criticise other scholar’s work. This politeness should extend to reviewers – make sure you address their comments thoroughly and respectfully.
- Identify the theoretical and practical implications of your work.

These tips will help to increase the chances of your work being published. The editors also stressed that those submitting to journals ensure they have followed the author guidelines. If your work has been submitted elsewhere (and rejected), avoid sending it directly off to another journal – it will often not be in the correct format for that journal and may not even be relevant.

If you are lucky enough to make it through desk rejection and the first round of reviewers recommend revisions, you have a good chance of having a successful submission. However, make sure you have addressed the reviewers’ comments thoroughly. In your covering letter to the editor, outline the changes you have made. If you do not agree with some of the comments, you can justify why you are not making those changes.

Overall, the editors were keen that we get over the fear of publishing, which Mustafa Özbilgin called “rejection anxiety”. Rejection is a learning opportunity – as Mark Tadajewski said, a paper can be rejected by a 3* journal and end up being published in a 4* journal.

Happy Publishing!!

Contact: k.sang@uea.ac.uk

Kate Sang is currently Editor of the EAOHP Newsletter.

References

ABS Journal Guide: http://www.the-abs.org.uk/?id=257

Preparations are under way for the Academy’s next conference, which will take place in Zürich, Switzerland, on 11th to 13th April 2012. The theme of the conference is “The contribution of occupational health psychology to individual, organizational & public health”. Confirmed keynote speakers include Sir Michael Marmot, University College London; Georg Bauer, ETH Zurich/University of Zürich; Wilmar Schaufeli, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands; and Sabine Guerts, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

The conference will also feature an international policy session and other special sessions on work engagement, organisational-level interventions and practice in OHP. The policy session, entitled ‘Policy and Occupational Health Psychology: Developments and Needs’, will bring together experts from the World Health Organization, International Labour Organization, employer organisations and trade associations to present and discuss relevant policy developments by each of these stakeholders and offer their views on future priorities and needs.

The call for papers is now open! Relevant topics can include (but are not limited to) individual factors and the psychosocial working environment; public health; special issues (including burnout and engagement, work-family issues and bullying and violence) and individual and organizational interventions.

To submit an abstract go to the conference website at: http://eaohp.org/conference.aspx

Editor of the Newsletter: Applications invited

This is the last Newsletter to be edited by Kate Sang, who has held the position since 2008. The Academy would like to extend its thanks to Kate for all the time she has given to this role.

The Academy is now seeking a new editor. Until an appointment has been made Mary Tisserand will be acting as interim editor, and she will remain to support the new Editor in putting the newsletter together.

Applications for the position of Editor are therefore invited. Although the bias of the newsletter is European, the newsletter is distributed worldwide and this is reflected in its content. Applicants need not be members of the Academy. The newsletter is published three times a year.

The Editor’s main responsibilities will be to source suitable material and to assess contributions. They may also want to put their own stamp on the newsletter, for instance by introducing new features. Ideally we seek someone who is aware of current issues in OHP and many of the people involved. They will not need to carry out detailed editing of material, as that can if necessary be done by other members of the newsletter team. The Newsletter is published three times a year.

If you would like to apply for this post or to seek more information please contact Aditya Jain: Aditya.jain@nottingham.ac.uk

Aditya will also welcome suggestions of people who we might contact with a view to their possibly filling this role.
Publishing in international peer-reviewed journals has become more difficult over the years, as I note in my article on publishing elsewhere in this issue of the Newsletter (see page 7). The number of high-quality submissions to these journals has increased, and authors face increasing competition in getting their work published. However, as the famous Dutch former football player and part-time philosopher Johan Cruyff once stated, every disadvantage comes with an advantage. One advantage is that the top journals are able to publish a high proportion of high-quality contributions, as is illustrated in the latest edition of Work & Stress (2011 part 1), which is now available online.

**Physical symptoms and job stress**

The first paper is a 79-study meta-analysis by Ashley Nixon and colleagues from the US: *Can work make you sick? A meta-analysis of the relationships between job stressors and physical symptoms.* The authors focused on the cross-sectional and longitudinal relationships between eight physical complaints and various occupational stressors, including interpersonal conflict, role conflict and ambiguity, workload, work hours, and lack of control. Unusually, the authors analysed results for the symptoms individually rather than use composite scores. Although all the stressors were found to be systematically related to the various physical complaints, the strongest effects were for organizational constraints and interpersonal conflict. Nixon not only presents the results of his analyses, he also explains the physiological mechanisms behind the main symptoms and makes proposals for future research.

**Aggression and leadership**

The second paper in this issue, *Exposure to psychological aggression at work and job performance: The mediating role of job attitudes and personal health*, by Aaron Schat and Michael Frone, from Canada and the US, underlines the importance of aggression and conflict at work to both health and performance. Drawing on a US national sample of over 2,000 participants, it focuses on the relationship between workplace aggression and job performance – an association that has rarely been studied. They showed that exposure to psychological aggression at work negatively predicted work performance, and that this relationship could be explained by decrements in job attitudes and health associated with exposure to the aggression.

Our third paper, *Inconsistent style of leadership as a predictor of safety behaviour*, addresses the effects of an “inconsistent” leadership style on workers' safety behaviours. Jane Mullen, Kevin Kelloway and Michael Tweed from Canada propose that a leader may display both passive and transformational leadership behaviours, and that this inconsistency affects the safety compliance of employees. Their expectations were confirmed in two samples (each from a different age group), showing that inconsistent safety leadership significantly affected safety compliance and participation. That is, the positive effect of a transformational style of leadership on safety participation and safety compliance decreased when leaders also displayed passive leadership with respect to safety.

**Diary studies: recovery and flow**

Two European contributions to this issue employed a diary design and focused on affect during on- and off-
job time. In the first of these, *Daily recovery from work: The role of activities, effort and pleasure*, Madelon van Hooff and colleagues from The Netherlands investigated how the time spent on activities in the work and off-job domains, and the pleasure and effort experienced while engaging in these activities, affect the daily recovery process. Multilevel analyses showed that engaging in pleasant activities during both work and off-job time were important for recovery, whereas conducting less pleasant activities was negatively related to recovery.

The importance of positive affect for worker well-being is underlined by the findings of the final paper in this issue, *Enjoyment and absorption: An electronic diary study on daily flow patterns* by Alma Rodríguez-Sánchez and her colleagues from Spain and The Netherlands. Also using experience sampling, the authors explore how levels of “flow” – a positive state of mind in which one is totally absorbed in a task – vary during the day and if this pattern is related to work and non-work tasks, in healthy versus burned-out workers. A curvilinear daily flow pattern was observed, with lower levels of flow during working hours. There were no differences in patterns of flow between the healthy and burned-out group, but overall the former experienced more flow than the latter.

Together, these five papers cover many of the topics that are currently being studied in occupational health psychology (flow, positive affect, performance, job characteristics, leadership, safety, and recovery). All employ strong designs (diaries, meta-analysis, cross-validation using independent samples, very large samples) and, perhaps most importantly, all papers are of both scientific and practical importance.

**Toon Taris: t.taris@uu.nl**

**Read the papers**

These papers, which were published in *Work & Stress* volume 25 part 1, can be accessed from the online contents list on the journal’s website, which is currently:

http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713697904

This web address may change towards the end of June, when the publisher, Taylor and Francis, brings in a new online platform for its journals and reference works: “Taylor & Francis Online”.

---

**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, conference announcements, reports of symposia, accounts of work in progress, letters to the editor, and news of people and their research, including new professional appointments and contracts.

You don’t have to be an EAOHP member to contribute. We will publish any item that is of interest to *Newsletter* readers (who number some 1000 individuals worldwide). If English is not your native language then we will help you 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, contact Mary Tisserand first to discuss whether it is suitable.

The newsletter is published three times a year.

To contact Mary Tisserand see back page of this Newsletter.
For most people, being gainfully employed is a necessity. From the workers’ perspective, it provides not only the means to earn a living but also satisfaction and a sense of ‘worth’. From an employers’ perspective, a good workforce is essential to carry out business activities, and from society’s perspective it creates wealth, equality and justice. The PRIMAeT programme aims to promote awareness raising and the development of expertise in one of the key areas in health and safety in modern working life: psychosocial risk management. Psychosocial risks, work-related stress, harassment and bullying, are now widely recognised major challenges to occupational health and safety (EU-OSHA, 2007). The available European data indicates that work-related stress costs the European Union (EU) at least €20 billion per year in lost time and health bills. Over 50% of absenteeism in the EU has its roots in work-related stress (EU-OSHA, 2009).

However, throughout Europe, occupational safety and health (OSH) practitioners, social partners and organisations differ in awareness and understanding of psychosocial risks, and how to address them. At the enterprise (organisational) level there is, therefore, a need for the implementation of systematic and effective prevention strategies, clearly linked to companies’ management practices (Leka et al., 2010). There is also a critical need to promote effective practice through the provision of training and tools that will stimulate and support organisations to prevent and manage psychosocial risks in the workplace. Training employers, employees and their representatives and occupational health and safety professionals in how to prevent and manage these risks can contribute to the promotion of a healthier workforce and healthier workplaces.

Psychosocial risk management – vocational education and training

The Psychosocial Risk Management – Vocational Education and Training (PRIMAeT) project focuses on the development of a training programme for promoting psychosocial risk management in the workplace delivered by means of a virtual learning environment (VLE). PRIMAeT builds on research conducted through the PRIMA-EF project (Psychosocial Risk Management – European Framework; Leka & Cox, 2008) that focused on the development of a European framework for psychosocial risk management in the workplace. PRIMA-EF was built on the review, critical assessment, reconciliation and harmonisation of methods that have proved valid in the EU for the management of psychosocial risks and the promotion of mental health and well-being at the workplace. It identifies common features of these methods in terms of principles, process, stages, measurement and outcomes. It is intended to accommodate all existing psychosocial risk management approaches across the EU and be used as a comprehensive, overarching framework for the harmonization of practice and methods in psychosocial risk management. It is also meant to be used as a guidance tool for the development of further methods, both in Europe and internationally, and provide a benchmark for validation of existing and new methods. The project engaged social partners (trade unions and employers) and other stakeholders throughout its implementation, including the WHO, ILO, EC, EU-OSHA, EUROFOUND, ICOH-WOPS, BUSINESSEUROPE, ETUC, ETUI, CEEP, UEAPME, UNIZO. (The full names of these and other bodies cited are given at the end of this article).

The PRIMA-EF consortium (www.prima-ef.org) received funding for the PRIMAeT project through the European Commission’s Lifelong Learning Leonardo da Vinci programme (Directorate General for Education & Culture), to develop training and educational materials that will be targeted at...
employers, managers, occupational health specialists and other practitioners.

The PRIMaET project aims to:

- Develop a training package that will include information to: raise awareness on psychosocial risks and their management for employees and their representatives, employers and OSH professionals, and develop tools that can be used at organisational level to prevent and manage psychosocial risks.
- Create awareness of the importance of participation and dialogue as essential parts of the psychosocial risk management process in the workplace.
- Improve accessibility of training provision for psychosocial risk management for managers and employers, especially those in small and medium sized enterprises, employees and their representatives as well as OSH professionals.

The training programme will be based on best practice as stipulated in key legislation and guidance on psychosocial risk management by the EC, ILO, WHO and HSE. It will also support the implementation of the new first guidance standard on the management of psychosocial risks in the workplace that has just been published by the British Standards Institution (BSI). The new BSI standard, called Publicly Available Specification (PAS) 1010, has been developed by the PRIMA-EF Consortium in collaboration with BSI, EU-OSHA, WHO, HSE, ETUC, EEF. It has been written so that it compliments all existing occupational health and safety management systems. Further information on the new guidance standard is given on page one of this newsletter.

**Needs analysis and review of available training**

Research conducted at the European level through the PRIMA-EF project clearly identified the need for training and skills development for the prevention and management of psychosocial risks in the workplace (Leka & Cox, 2008). Areas of training for the management of psychosocial risk management that were identified as important were:

- The nature of psychosocial risks and work-related stress
- Violence, harassment and bullying in the workplace
- Policy, legislation and regulations in relation to psychosocial risk management
- Development of organisational policies for the management of work-related psychosocial risks
- Obtaining management commitment and stakeholders’ involvement in the psychosocial risk management process
- Developing the business case for psychosocial risk management
- Assessment of psychosocial risks
- Interventions for managing psychosocial risks including bullying and harassment as well as work-related stress

**Evaluation of interventions**

To further identify key needs for education and training in psychosocial risk management across the EU as concerns different groups (stakeholders, OSH experts, practitioners and inspectors), a review of training provided by various stakeholders was carried out across a number of professional European networks and 20 European countries. Training provided by national trade unions, employer organisations, national OSH institutes, labour inspectorates, professional associations or other relevant sources was reviewed. The review of availability of training for psychosocial risk management was based on three main data sources:

1) direct contacts with relevant institutions and organisations;
2) review of selected topics on the website/course catalogues of relevant organisations;
3) review of published information on training for organisations.

The review covered three key aspects: the topic and content of training, the target audience, and the means of delivery.

In addition, at the European level, training courses cited or provided by EU-OSHA, ENETOSH, the ProMenPol project, BUSINESSEUROPE, ETUI, CEEP and UEAPME were reviewed. The review indicated that no training was being provided by the European employer organisations. Although the ETUI provided training to its members, no specific course for the prevention and management of psychosocial risks was provided. However, at the country level, over 200 relevant courses were found.

The review allowed the project consortium to draw conclusions concerning the training needs in the area of psychosocial risk management in Europe. It indicated that provision of training was not adequate, as even though some areas of training for the management of psychosocial risk management were offered in various countries (although significant differences were found between EU member states), comprehensive training covering all areas of the psychosocial risk management process was not offered.
by any provider. Existing training was found to cover only certain aspects of psychosocial risk management.

**PRIMAeT training programme: next steps**

The new training course will therefore focus on the development of practical and user-friendly tools that can be implemented in organisations to manage psychosocial risks. The PRIMAeT training programme will cover the following topics:

- Importance of psychosocial risks in the workplace
- Policy and psychosocial risks
- Setting up the psychosocial risk management process
- Engagement in the psychosocial risk management process
- Conducting a psychosocial risk assessment
- Dealing with psychosocial risk assessment findings: Developing an action plan
- Action plan evaluation
- Nature and impact of work-related stress
- Dealing with work-related stress
- Harassment at the workplace
- Dealing with harassment at the workplace
- Dealing with psychosocial risks: Advice for managers
- Dealing with psychosocial risks: Advice for employee representatives
- Dealing with psychosocial risks: Advice for employees
- Country-specific information

The training course is currently under development and will be piloted at the national level by the PRIMAeT project partners. Following the pilot, the programme will be modified and finalised. The training programme will be available for all users and registration for the course will be free of charge. The training programme will be made available in five different language versions (including English) and the materials could be translated into other languages by interested parties in the future. The option of providing the course through a blended learning model (combining e-learning and face-to-face training) will also be explored.

**Conclusions**

By developing training to prevent and manage psychosocial risks, the PRIMAeT project seeks to improve the availability and quality of relevant training systems within the EU. In addition, the guidance standard PAS1010 will promote ongoing good practice in this area, and will encourage managers/employers to engage in the PRIMAeT training, thus promoting and improving psychosocial risk management at the workplace.

**PRIMAeT website:**
http://prima-ef.org/primaet.aspx

**For more information, contact:**
Stavroula.Leka@nottingham.ac.uk

**Bodies cited in the text, with abbreviations**

British Standards Institution (BSI)
EEF (Engineering Employers Federation – the Manufacturers Organisation)
European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (UEAPME)
European Centre of Employers and Enterprises providing Public services (CEEP)
European Commission (EC)
European Foundation for the Improvement of Living & Working Conditions (EUROFOUND) European Network for Education and Training in Occupational Safety and Health (ENETOSH)
European Trade Union Congress (ETUC)
European Trade Union Institute (ETUI)
Health & Safety Executive, UK (HSE)
International Commission on Occupational Health – Scientific Committee on Work International Labour Office (ILO)
Organization & Psychosocial Factors (ICOH-WOPS)
Protecting and Promoting Mental Health (ProMenPol) project
UNIZO (Union of Independent Entrepreneurs)
World Health Organization (WHO)
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Work-family conflict in the UK offshore oil and gas industry: A qualitative study

by Jennie Guise and Sue Cowan, Working Well Together Ltd, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

The North Sea oil and gas industry plays a vital role in the European economy, in terms of the financial benefits deriving from the extraction of oil and gas reserves, and the substantial workforce employed by the operations that support the industry. In the UK alone, it provides more than 440,000 jobs, 32,000 of which are directly in oil and gas companies and major contractors (Oil and Gas UK, 2010). Around 22,000 people are based offshore for 100 or more nights per year (Ferguson, 2009).

The UK sector of this industry has faced serious staff recruitment and retention problems (Oil and Gas UK, 2010), and the reasons to date are unclear. The objectives of our study were, therefore, to explore the views and experiences of UK sector offshore employees, in order to provide insights into how employers might address recruitment and retention difficulties.

Method

The study was in two phases, using mixed methods. We began with a qualitative phase during which we carried out a number of focus groups and one-to-one interviews. This was followed by a quantitative phase in the form of a cross-sectional, postal questionnaire survey. Results from this second phase were presented at the July 2010 Congress of the International Association for Applied Psychology in Melbourne, Australia, and are in preparation for publication.

This paper reports some of the findings of the qualitative phase. Twenty-one, semi-structured focus groups were conducted with 86 employees representing a range of occupations, working on five offshore installations. They were purposefully selected to include a range of job type, age and, length of time in the industry. Participants worked on a range of installations – fixed and mobile, old and modern, and more or less remote. All of the participants were male; the proportion of women who regularly work offshore in the UK sector is only around 3% (Ferguson, 2009). Most (17) focus groups were conducted on offshore installations. The initial topic guide was based on issues that emerged from exploratory work with offshore employees in which we used a modified nominal group technique, and from key issues relating to occupational demands identified in the literature.

Data were recorded verbatim, transcribed and examined using framework analysis (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994).

Findings

Six key occupational demands emerged from the data analysis. They related to working practices, the physical environment, offshore working/social relationships, travel, courses and training, and separation from family. We focus here on those factors that relate to work-family conflict. This was usually the first topic raised when participants were asked about the kinds of things that could be problematic about working offshore. Limited opportunities for communication with home while at work, and in particular face-to-face contact, was especially felt when there were home-related problems:

"My oldest is 27, I’ve got a daughter, she’s 26, and..."
the fact that it was not caused particular resentment:

In addition, offshore workers often missed significant social events, and their regular and lengthy absences from home had an impact on their role in the family, which was often unclear on their return home:

"The problem is the wives get so independent that when you get home you’re under their feet, you’re interfering in their routine and they want to keep their routine going and you’re interfering in it."

"They [the family] get that sense of independence don’t they, when you’re away. Everybody does. Only one that jumps all over you and gives you kisses is the dog, you know. Everybody else acts as if you’ve just been for a paper and a pint of milk."

Participants also described the need for a period of re-adjustment to being at home, and then to leaving again for their next trip.

**Implications**

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) defined the concept of work-family conflict as “a form of inter-family conflict in which the role pressures from work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect.” Subsequent research has suggested that high levels of work-family conflict are correlated with negative outcomes for the individual, for their relationships and for the organisation. At the individual level, the outcome can include life dissatisfaction, depression, anxiety and poor health. It can be hard to maintain positive personal relationships. Organisations can suffer because work-family conflict can result in increased absenteeism and the loss of skilled employees (Hammer, Bauer & Grandey, 2003).

Anxiety is problematic for the individual, but the difficulties are compounded when the workplace is one in which safety issues are paramount. There is a risk that anxiety, in the context of physically and mentally demanding work, could make people more vulnerable to accidents, injuries and operational error.

Some of the implications of extended absence from home might therefore cause or exacerbate work-related stress. Issues related to such absences cannot always be avoided. For example, people with offshore careers are likely to miss some important family events. However, steps could be taken to improve communication with home and this might lessen the negative impact of regular absences. From the perspective of some of the participants, this area was one that could easily be addressed by employers, and the fact that it was not caused particular resentment:

"There’s never enough ways to communicate with your family. You’ll be on a rig with maybe 120 people and there’s one phone. I mean it’s stone age. I mean these guys is making an absolute fortune and they’re making no effort to make it easier for the crews and the guys in general to keep in contact with their family. With internet connections, there’s just simply not enough of them."

"It’s just little things like that, and it causes so much stress with so much guys because they can’t get the peace and privacy to make a simple phone call because these companies just won’t pay for another line equipment."

**Conclusions**

Our research has identified issues relating to work-family conflict that are highly significant, but that are not completely insurmountable. Indeed, some could be relatively easily addressed at low cost to employers. In particular, efforts could be made to increase the amount and quality of contact with home. Employers should provide improved and up-dated facilities for employees to maintain regular contact with their families.

The findings of the study have potential implications for other areas of employment involving extended periods of absence from family, for example, military personnel, sailors, fishermen and overseas aid workers.
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**Contact:** jennieguese@workingwelltogether.eu

**Jennie Guise and Sue Cowan** are Chartered Psychologists and Directors of Working Well Together Ltd., a consultancy company whose focus is on the understanding, control and prevention of work-related illness and injury (including psychological illness and injury) and the promotion of workplace health and wellbeing.
Recently published books

Newsletter readers (whether or not they are Academy members) are invited to contribute news or reviews of recently published books relating to research, practice and education in occupational health psychology and related fields. In the short descriptions below we have in most cases provided the publishers’ recommended prices, but you may find that prices are lower from other sources.

Books received

**Quality of Life and Work in Europe: Theory, Practice and Policy**

Intense globalization, rapidly changing workplaces and family patterns have renewed the international interest in quality of life. With an innovative, multi-method new approach to the interface between work and family, this book examines how we can make sense of different institutional arrangements, workplace conditions and gendered work and care practices that affect the conditions for achieving quality of work and quality of life in eight European countries. The multilayered analysis provides a deeper understanding of what a 'healthy organization' means from both the employee and the employer's perspective. The quality of life placement and Social Quality Instrument for measuring the social quality of work in European workplaces will be useful to researchers, employers and employees, as well as to policymakers. A new research agenda is also proposed.

**Organizational Stress Management: A Strategic Approach**

Stress is the most common cause of sick leave in many European countries and is a major cause of concern for companies worldwide, yet most 'Coping with Stress' texts deal with this at the individual level. *Organizational Stress Management* shows how companies can boost performance by adopting integrated organizational strategies to identify and reduce stress in their employees. This book includes practical advice on how to conduct a stress audit and how to target stress 'hot spots' within an organization. It provides a fresh strategic model for the manager concerned with the negative effects that stress can have both on company performance and the quality of life of individuals at work.

**Preventing Workplace Bullying. An Evidence-Based Guide for Managers and Employees**

Workplace bullying can have a serious effect on employees and ultimately undermine an organization's potential for profit. In this practical guide, Carlo Caponecchia and Anne Wyatt explain how to identify workplace bullying and apply best practice to preventing and managing it.

The authors outline what constitutes bullying at work, demystify some controversial issues, and discuss factors that influence workplace bullying. The responsibilities of management, together with legal implications, are outlined and supported with best practice guides for policies, complaints procedures and risk management systems. Options and resources for individuals experiencing bullying are also explored. Real case studies are used for illustration throughout the book.

This evidence-based book on workplace bullying should be a valuable resource for organizations of all sizes and for anyone affected by bullying at work, including employees, human resource managers, workplace consultants, counsellors, mediators and legal advisors.

**Managing Conflict in Organisations**
This book presents an analysis of the rational application of conflict theory in organizational life. The author maintains that conflict within an organizational context is not necessarily bad: in fact it may even be a positive indicator of effective organizational management, and within certain limits be essential to productivity. Conflict may result in creative solutions to problems or lead to the achievement of subsystems or larger organizational objectives that otherwise would not have been possible. Little or no conflict within organizations may lead to stagnation, poor decisions, and ineffectiveness.

The author, a Professor of Management at Western Kentucky University, is the founder of the International Journal of Organizational Analysis and International Journal of Conflict Management, and Editor of the annual series Current Topics in Management. The book should be of value to those teaching and studying in the area of conflict management, and anyone wishing to practise as a consultant in this field.


Books for review and reviewing for the Newsletter

If you would like to review one of these books we would be pleased to hear from you. You do not need to be an Academy member. We would also be glad to consider suggestions of other recently published books for review.

To authors and publishers: we would be glad to hear about newly published books and books in preparation.

In all cases please contact the Book Reviews Editor, Gail Kinman, at gail.kinman@beds.ac.uk.

Work-life Balance Needs and Solutions: A Focus on Diversity and Difference

10 June 2011

The British Psychological Society, London

Keynote Speaker

Professor Ellen Kossek, Michigan State University, USA

Work-life Diversity and the Employment Relationship

Other speakers include:

Dr Alex Beauregard, London School of Economics  Professor Mustafa Ozbilgin, Brunel University
Dr Caroline Gatrell, Lancaster University  Richard MacKinnon, Talent Q,
Dr Julie Waumsley, Northampton University  Will Mclnnes, Managing Director, NixonMcInnes
Dr Sarah Poppleton & Professor Rob Briner, Birkbeck College, University of London,

Registration now open

For further details and to register your interest in this event, please visit the conference webpage

http://www.bps.org.uk/WLBJUN2011

or contact Mandy Hemsill at the BPS: tel +44 (0)116 252 9555; email mandy.hemsill@bps.org.uk
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SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Please find below general guidelines for submitting articles for future issues of the Occupational Health Psychologist. We are keen to publish many different kinds of articles, and we hope this will encourage submissions from all our members. We welcome articles from students, new researchers, practitioners, as well as long-standing members of the Academy.

We aim to publish three issues per year (Spring, Summer and Autumn).

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 to both 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 organisation. This type of article provides a useful insight into the sort of work that is being undertaken across the OHP world community. This section also enables the communication of policy developments that may have implications for OHP research, practice and education in your country. Such articles should be no longer than 1200 words long.

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

Book Reviews
Books for review, or offers to review books, should be sent to the Book Reviews Editor, Gail Kinman: Gail.Kinman@beds.ac.uk

Other articles
We welcome news, conference announcements, open letters to your fellow occupational health psychologists 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.

To accompany all contributions we welcome appropriate photographs

Please email your questions, announcements or contributions to
Mary Tisserand:
Mary.tisserand@nottingham.ac.uk