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Welcome to the Fall 2016 edition (v. 16) of the Newsletter for the Society for Occupational Health Psychology. The editorial team is pleased to welcome Ms. Tanya Sidawi-Ostojic as co-editor for the Fall 2016 edition. Tanya will be taking over as editor of the newsletter in the Spring 2017 edition. The past three years have gone by quickly, and I have enjoyed serving as your SOHP newsletter editor. I’m also excited for the future of the newsletter under Tanya’s direction. She has some great ideas for new feature columns and newsletter formats. The newsletter editorial team is also pleased to welcome Dr. Lauren Murphy as a new member of the associate editor team and Ms. Shujaat Ahmed as a new member of the production editor team.

This edition of the newsletter starts with a note from the president of SOHP, Dr. Lisa Kath, who reports on her goals for the next year, including work on the website and membership management system, along with efforts to improve communication through the communications committee.

We also have a committee report from the Graduate Student Issues (GSI) committee prepared by Mr. Kyle Page, the chair of the GSI committee. Kyle’s report provides an overview of the activities of the GSI over the last year, including assisting with the SOHP membership survey effort. Kyle also shares the primary goals for the GSI over the next year.

We are also excited to include three columns for one of our new features entitled “Researcher’s Stories.” This is the first of a series of Researchers’ Stories that will be featured in forthcoming SOHP newsletters. Our hope is to share with you a selection of personal experiences based on a select topic that has in some way impacted the field of Occupational Health Psychology. For this Fall ’16 issue the topic is: How technology has changed the scientific research process from the perspective of experienced (~20 years) researcher(s), during the information technology era.

We are happy to share the stories of three recognized experts in the field, who were willing to offer their stories. This is a new column and we hope you too will enjoy it! If you have a story you would like to share please let us know and we will be sure to include it in an upcoming newsletter. We are already planning for the Spring ’17 issue and would like to feature stories from the field about The Do’s and Don’ts short list: What two bits of advice would you offer to the novice researcher starting out in the field of OHP?

The next column comes from Dr. Erin Eatough and Mr. Brad Gray and focuses on their experiences with offering a course on OHP at the undergraduate level. In this column, Dr. Eatough and Mr. Gray share their insights related to the steps they took to launch such a course and the challenges that came up along the way.

This edition of the newsletter also features an announcement regarding a new OHP journal—Occupational Health Science. Dr. Bob Sinclair is the founding editor of the journal and shares an overview of the focus of the journal, its development, and the anticipated production schedule.

Our next piece comes from Ms. Kelsey-Jo Ritter and Mr. Drew Mallory, who highlight the history of the field of humanitarian work psychology and also provide an overview of the Global Organization for Humanitarian Work Psychology (GOHWP).

The newsletter also includes an announcement about the upcoming Work, Stress, and Health conference to be held in Minneapolis/St. Paul Minnesota in May 2017. In addition, announcements for two OHP-related books are featured. The first is entitled “Occupational Health Psychology: Work, Stress, and Health” written by Dr. Irvin Schonfeld and Dr. Daisy Chang. The second book is an edited collection called “Derailed Organizational Interventions for Stress and Well-Being” edited by Dr. Maria Karanika-Murray & Dr. Caroline Biron.

We are also pleased to include a conference report from the 12th annual European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology, written by former SOHP newsletter associate editor, Dr. Janelle Cheung. Last but not least, we feature a report on an international investigation of training and education in OHP, prepared by Mr. Nicholas Ulrich, Ms. Hope Lysaght, Ms. Kayle Erickson, Ms. Marta Romeo-Lázaro, Ms. Daisy Zepeda from Northern Kentucky University. This report describes some of the preliminary findings from a global survey effort that aimed to understand the course offerings in the field of OHP around the globe.

Producing the newsletter is a team effort, and we are very grateful for the assistance of the editorial team. The newsletter is made possible with the assistance of Associate Editors, Dr. Heather Odle-Dusseau and Dr. Lauren Murphy, and Production Editors, Dr. Janelle Cheung and Ms. Shujaat Ahmed. We thank them for all of their work to bring together this newsletter.

We hope you enjoy reading this issue of the newsletter. If you have any comments or would like to write an article for a future issue, please e-mail us:
gary.giumetti@quinnipiac.edu or
tsidawiostojic@ccny.cuny.edu.
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Tanya and Kyle's report by Former Newsletter Editors, Dr. Janelle Cheung and Ms. Hope Lysaght
Greetings, SOHP nation! I wish I had some incredible inspiration for this column, but unfortunately, the start of the fall semester seems to have sapped all available inspiration at the moment. So I'm going to rely on my usual stream-of-consciousness style and see where we land. (Those of you who know me will be buckling their seat belts - those who don't will be silently vowing never to elect someone in California as president again.)

As usual, the summer has passed me by, with only about a third of my to-do list done. I started strong, but July was full of travel and adventure, but not a lot of work productivity. And you know what? I'm going to be unapologetic about that. Thanks to my handy-dandy OHP background, I know the importance of stress recovery for my well-being. I know the extent to which those of us in the US, at least, leave vacation time on the table every year. I read news stories about how we like to brag about how much busier we are than others - as though busy-ness itself was some sort of accomplishment. In fact, I've got one of my grad students looking at the social pressure to appear busy for her master's thesis. So, as I look back at my summer and ruminate on what was "not" done, I fight that urge, pull up some vacation photos, and remember that it was time well spent. OHP research says so.

However, as the fall semester gets rolling here, I am setting my sights on what goals I'd like to accomplish before the end of 2016. I firmly believe that our strongest asset is our community - I've never met a nicer, more supportive community of people, all working hard to help today's workforce stay healthy, happy, and productive. Primary among my goals for SOHP is to get a robust website and membership management system chosen. If we can get the technology behind the curtain to run a little more smoothly, that will hopefully allow us to strengthen the connections in our community of OHP researchers and practitioners.

Another way that we plan to strengthen our community is through improved communication. Our Communications Committee chairperson, Tanya Sidawi-Ostojic, is doing an incredible job sharing popular press and research articles related to OHP to our Facebook page. (Please give that page a "like" if you have not already done so.) You may have noticed that we recently sent out a survey regarding communication. The Communications Committee is hard at work doing some action planning based on the results of that survey, so a big thank you to all who responded.

Surely by now, you have heard that SOHP has started a brand new journal? Thanks to the tireless efforts of (now) Past-President Mo Wang and long-ago-past President Bob Sinclair, the Occupational Health Science journal is now a reality. Many thanks, also, to Paul Spector and Lois Tetrick for serving on the steering committee for the launch of that journal. We feel that the field of occupational health is growing, and there's room for another journal to help spread the word. The Journal of Occupational Health Psychology will, of course, always be near and dear to our hearts - I mean, just look at the name of that journal - but our vision for OHS is to complement JOHP by having a distinctive emphasis on multidisciplinary, international, and applied work. We will strengthen our community by keeping both of these journals vibrant and healthy, so keep working and keep submitting!

I make no secret of my love for our biennial (and yes, I had to look up the difference between biennial and biannual yet again - sigh) Work, Stress, and Health (WSH) conference. This is where I feel our community is at its strongest. You folks do an incredible job of pouring your heart and soul into the success of this conference, whether it's by reviewing submissions, participating on subcommittees, presenting your findings, or judging for various awards. Please help our community grow by inviting people you know to join us at WSH in Minneapolis next June. And if you have ideas for or would like to get more involved in this conference, feel free to email me (lisa.kath@sdsu.edu) or Member-at-Large Mike Ford (mford@albany.edu). We are the SOHP representatives on the WSH Core Planning Committee, and we'd be delighted to hear from you. The more people we have involved, the more we all get out of this wonderful event.

What are some other ways we can strengthen our community? The OHP listserv is a great resource for sharing job postings and asking OHP-related questions. But what other ideas do you have? Community interactions take time, and I realize that most of us feel time is our most precious resource. But if SOHP can meet you where you are and help you make connections with others, both within our OHP community and outside the community (maybe ergonomists, epidemiologists, industrial hygienists, or occupational medicine staff?), we'd love to be able to do so. You are stuck with me as your president until the end of 2017, so let's make the most of that, shall we? Email me (lisa.kath@sdsu.edu) for those with a short attention span if you have ideas for how we can invest in our community and best support each other in the excellent work that we do.
By Irvin Schönfeld (The City College & Graduate Center of CUNY)

When incoming editor Tanya Sidawi-Gotajaric asked me to write a piece for the feature Researchers’ Stories, I was prompt to write about an experience I had that may encourage readers to volunteer to review papers for journals. My volunteering to be a reviewer, although in the midst of a very busy schedule, led to an unlikely collaboration. And friendships. Let me tell you the story.

In mid-December 2012, I received an email asking me to review a paper submitted to the Journal of Health Psychology. I was reluctant to take the assignment. I was already a reviewer for a number of journals, and I had never before reviewed for two manuscripts. And I was working on a book. The semester was ending; my desk was stacked with student papers I needed to grade. In my personal life, my wife and I were planning a New Year’s Day party. It was no ordinary party. We invited 80 people to our Brooklyn apartment. In other words, I had a lot to do. I intended to say NO to the journal.

I am not one to feel guilty about either minor transgressions I may or may not have committed or interpersonal exchanges in which I may have been a tad impolite because I am a tad argumentative. I, however, did feel a small—micro—cloud hanging over me as I sat at my PC, composing an email to politely turn down JHP’s request to review the manuscript. An old refrain ran around in my head like the electronic news ticker that runs continuously around the building at Number One Times Square. The old refrain went something like “if no one volunteers to review manuscripts, science would stop.”

I peeked at the manuscript’s abstract. I found that the subject of the paper was moderately interesting—at least to me. It concerned the symptom profiles of two clinical samples, a burned out sample and a depressed sample, and a group of well controls. The abstract obliged me to remember that about 20 years earlier, I published a paper on the idea that burnout overlaps depression. I think three people read the paper if I count my wife. That was all that I published on burnout-depression.

With my interest aroused, I decided to be a good citizen. I agreed to review the manuscript. I dutifully wrote a review. I liked the paper and recommended that the journal publish it. I published, provided a small number of revisions be made. Having fulfilled my duty, I forgot about the paper.

About three months later—it was March 2013—I received an email from a doctoral student in France. He wanted to know if I would collaborate with him on a research project. I didn’t know the student, so I put the email aside to think about a polite way to say NO. I waited a day before writing him back. Then another day. And another day…. One week later, I received second email from the doctoral student. The second email contained the same request but this time there was an attachment. In order to show me his bona fides, the doctoral student attached to the email a PDF of a paper he wrote that was “in press.” To my astonishment, the paper was the one I had reviewed.

I could see from the PDF that the first author, Renzo Bianchi, was the real McCoy. I said YES, I would be delighted to work with you. And like Rick Blaine and Captain Renault, that was the beginning of a beautiful friendship. Mostly we have worked by email. Almost every day for going on four years our emails have crisscrossed the Atlantic. Often several emails a day. And a very occasional Skype.

On one leg of a long trip to Europe during the summer of 2013, I was in Paris. Renzo visited me there. We met for dinner one Friday evening, and talked shop. Then we met again the next morning before he and his girlfriend had to catch a train back to Besançon, a city in eastern France. He was pursuing a doctorate in psychology at the Université de Franche-Comté in that city. We continued to work via email. We were making progress on research Renzo initiated on burnout-depression overlap in 5,975 French schoolteachers. Renzo, Eric Laurent, Renzo’s professor at the university, and I finally published in the International Journal of Stress Management at the end of 2014. That same year, Renzo and I launched a study of burnout and depression in almost 1400 U.S. teachers. We would later publish our findings in the Journal of Clinical Psychology and Personality and Individual Differences. We kept working and working.

I was going to be in Europe again, in July and August of 2015. I arranged to spend five days visiting Renzo in Besançon. He had earned his doctorate seven months earlier, and was about to start a post-doc at the Université de Neuchâtel, in the French-speaking part of Switzerland. We used our time wisely, working on a human subjects application to my University’s IRB. We kept timing our design while aiming to get IRB approval to launch a second burnout-depression study of U.S. teachers for the 2015-2016 school year. We got approved but we also submitted two amendments to the IRB because we twice slightly altered our plan. We ultimately recruited more than 700 teachers.

Besançon is also Renzo’s home town. I got to meet his mother. I told her what a terrific son she has. That is something I don’t get to do very often as a professor although I occasionally take advantage of meeting parents at college graduations to tell them about their fine, hardworking adult children. Renzo’s mother took us for a walk around Besançon’s UNESCO World Heritage Site, the Citadel that perhaps the greatest military engineer and architect in history, Sébastien Le Prestre de Vauban, designed for Louis XIV. I also got to meet Eric Laurent and a group of graduate students at the Université de Franche-Comté. Eric graciously offered to drive Renzo and me to Neuchâtel, allowing the three of us to spend a day in that city. Besides visiting the city’s beautiful old quarter and its Collegiate Church, we spent time at Renzo’s new university. There we met Eric Mayor, Renzo’s new colleague at that university. Eric Mayor joined us on a research project involving New Zealand teachers. In the spirit of forging collaborations, my CUNY Graduate Center colleague Jay Verkuilen and CUNY doctoral student Venessa Singhroy joined us on a project involving the assessment of depression in U.S. teachers.

In March 2016, Eric Laurent and his girlfriend visited New York City. I had a chance to return some of Eric’s hospitality by taking them to dinner at one of the world’s greatest kosher delicatessens, introducing them to pastrami and matzah ball soup. These two French people were amazed at how good the food was. I was pleased that they enjoyed the dinner as much as they had. I had figured that because they are French they had high culinary standards.

Call it karma. Call it what you will. All that I described was set in motion by my reluctantly agreeing, in the midst of the traffic jam that ties us up at the end of every year, to review a paper for a journal I never previously reviewed for. Of course, helping out is its own reward. And I am not saying that if one of the readers of this story volunteers to review a paper, the reader will meet new people, make new friends, and publish articles with those new friends. However, I think that if we help each other out and cooperate with our fellow researchers, we will be rewarded. Not every time. Maybe just in terms of discovering from a manuscript’s reference section a valuable, but overlooked, source. But when we make ourselves available to review manuscripts, something good is bound to happen.
Researcher's Stories:
Janet Barnes-Farrell (University of Connecticut)

Q: How has technology changed the scientific research process from the perspective of an experienced (+20 years) researcher, during the information technology era.

Well I guess I qualify on the “experienced” dimension! And technology has certainly changed so many aspects of the research process for me that my laundry list would be a very long one, but I’ll just focus on one particular career-changing impact that new technology has had for me – it opened the door to a productive and interesting set of international and interdisciplinary collaborations with colleagues who study shiftwork. In the late 90’s, my friend and colleague at the University of Connecticut, Don Tepas, suggested that I (with my interests in aging workforce and work-life issues and my background in survey research) might be interested in working with him and some of his international shiftwork colleagues (who were primarily interested in working conditions and work schedules) to develop and carry out a joint project of mutual interest. It involved development of a survey (what we came to call the Survey of Work and Time: SWAT) that each of us would administer in our home countries (in our native languages), with me serving as “Data Central,” forming a repository for the aggregated dataset. An intrepid team of researchers from five countries optimistically jumped on board – it sounded like fun! We spent considerable e-mail time (this was pre-Skype) haggling over items, measures, and translations. All of these exchanges were in English (due in part to utter lack of proficiency in Croatian, Polish, Brazilian Portuguese, and Ukrainian), which sometimes made communications challenging, but we hammered things out and managed to collect five sets of data, which were analyzed independently and jointly (thanks again to technology that provided for electronic exchange of data sets) to examine a variety of questions. In 2000, the first product of our experiment in technology-facilitated collaboration came to fruition when we presented a symposium at the International Ergonomics Association, where I met all of my collaborators in person for the first time! What a delightful journey it was and continues to be. That TFIC (AKA technology-facilitated international collaboration – sorry, I felt the need for a new jargon acronym) was, for me, the beginning of a series of long-distance collaborations that have become an increasingly common way of forging scientific partnerships that can be interesting, productive – and ultimately lots of fun.

Researcher's Stories:
Paul Spector (University of South Florida)

The biggest technological development in data analysis was sparked by the introduction of computers into our field. The availability of relatively cheap and easily accessible computing allows researchers to easily conduct complex analyses with minimal effort and time compared to the pre-computer age. When I was a student, most researchers used the newly invented electronic calculator to do data analysis. Since hand calculation was labor intensive (in a statistics class in college, I spent 40 hours doing one multiple regression problem), people tended to do few analyses, and tended to keep them simple. Rather than computing a correlation or regression between two continuous variables, a researcher might dichotomize a predictor and compare means on the criterion with a t-test.

When I was halfway through graduate school in the early 70s, I began doing data analysis with computers, which were just being introduced into the field. At first there were mainframes that required the use of computer punch cards. I spent many hours in the university computer center punching cards and taking my deck to the window to submit. Then I would wait, sometimes hours, for the job to run and the printout placed on the output counter. Although cumbersome by modern standards, the availability of computing suddenly allowed us to conduct complex analyses on many variables at once. No longer were we limited to univariate statistics.

Of course, computers were of limited use without software. Just as individuals make their R modules freely available today, programs to conduct individual analyses were shared among the research community. Commercial packages, like SAS and SPSS, allowed researchers to both manipulate their data (e.g., summing items into scale scores), and conduct a wide range of analyses.

On the one hand, the ability to easily conduct analyses freed researchers from the drudgery of hand calculation, and expanded capabilities. Today we can data mine and conduct exploratory data analysis to discover interesting patterns in large datasets with many variables. Unfortunately, the ease in conducting analyses came with an unintended consequence. As the psychology side of OHP has followed the organizational sciences is taking an almost exclusive deductive, theory-derived hypothesis testing approach, issues of research integrity have been raised. These concerns mainly involve selective reporting of only significant results and reporting post hoc hypotheses as if they were a priori. Today there is growing awareness of these issues, and practices are beginning to evolve (e.g., the new SOHP journal Occupational Health Science will publish exploratory/inductive papers) as we all gain a better understanding of how best to utilize the computing power of our machines to advance the field of OHP.
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Graduate Student Issues (GSI) Committee Report by GSI Chair, Kyle Page, Roosevelt University

The Graduate Student Issues (GSI) Committee for SOHP consists of 19 student volunteer members. The Graduate Student Issues Committee is focused on addressing the needs of all student members of SOHP. Attention is given to developing and maintaining a positive environment within the society in which students can grow and develop their skills as OHP teachers, researchers, and practitioners.

As with previous years, our members have been quite busy! This past year, we hosted a reception at the Society of Industrial Organizational Psychology (SIOP) 16 Anaheim conference to raise awareness and membership of the Society of Occupational Health Psychology (SOHP). This reception was well attended as we packed the patio of the Cheesecake Factory! Not only do these events increase our presence at conferences, it also allows individuals to get to know discuss research and applied topics in a amicable environment. A special thanks to all the members of the GSI committee who helped this event go so wonderfully! If you missed out, don’t worry, there will be similar events at the SIOP 17 Orlando conference and the Work, Stress, and Health (WSH) 17 Minneapolis conference.

The GSI committee also helped conduct and analyze the membership survey that was distributed this year. Of the roughly 130 individuals who took part of the survey, 84% were current members, roughly 77% were either professional or full members, 16% were students, and 7% were international affiliates or students. Of the survey participants, 63% were likely to suggest membership to another individual and 28% were somewhat likely. In addition, 55% of the members were satisfied, 23% were somewhat satisfied, and 16% were neutral about their membership in SOHP. One of the most heartening findings was that 67.2% believed that they developed moderate to high levels of professional relationships due to membership in SOHP. When asking about which communication method society members preferred to use to get to know other members better, the top three options were networking events, society newsletter, and society website. Society members also preferred to be contacted by direct email or newsletter for general updates, OHP field updates, and reminders and events, whereas fewer than 20 members wanted to be contacted via twitter. Lastly, 42 members had joined the LinkedIn group and 38 the Facebook page.

Our major goals for this year are to: (1) Continue to recruit new student members to SOHP, (2) Plan for the SOHP receptions at the SIOP and WSH conferences, (3) Utilize information from the membership survey to better communicate with our “so-hip” members (yes that was a newsletter pun), and (4) Continue to increase our presence at conferences that our members attend. Along with these, we will always try to keep our members happy and engaged.

If you are an undergraduate or graduate student who has any questions or concerns that you would like addressed, please contact me at (kylejpage@gmail.com). For a list of our current GSI members, visit http://www.sohp-online.org/GSICom.htm

Teaching OHP at the Undergraduate Level by Erin Eatough & Brad Gray, Baruch College and City University of New York

“Occupational Health Psychology” is traditionally only a course one would see at the doctoral level or possibly at the master’s level. Finding an undergraduate course on the topic is generally unheard of, as evidenced by the current lack of a textbook or resources suited for undergraduate education in our quite fledgling field. Indeed, neither of us had ever heard of the teaching of OHP at the undergraduate level until this year when we decided to offer the first ever OHP course at the undergraduate level at Baruch College at the City University of New York (CUNY). We can’t be sure it was the first ever, but it is at least the first we know of.

Coming from Baruch College, we are in a relatively unique environment in terms of industrial-organizational psychology education. In fact, we are among the small handful of universities that offer a major in not just psychology, but also in industrial-organizational psychology in particular, as well as a major in I/O. Thus, our department is quite proxv to the field of IO and its growing subdomains, which undoubtedly removed many obstacles for us when proposing to put such a seemingly niche elective on the books. In fact, we simultaneously had proposed and then launched Baruch’s first ever master’s level OHP course in our terminal master’s IO program (we also have a separate doctoral program). In many ways, the undergraduate level course we designed was quite similar to the master’s level course, and should your institution happen to have a master’s level OHP course, you might be particularly well poised to convert it to the undergraduate level. That said, the purpose of this article is to share the process of, challenges with, and lessons learned from launching an undergraduate OHP course so that our experience may be of use to other faculty and institutions in the future that desire to integrate an OHP course into their undergraduate curriculum. Let our beginner blunders be your victories! As OHP continues to proliferate, we are sure it is only a matter of time until undergraduate OHP is not an anomaly.

Because Erin would be executing the brand new master’s level course and Brad (as well as another graduate student at Baruch, Christine Smith) would be executing the new undergraduate level course, our efforts were combined in the design and preparatory work leading up to the “big launch”. For example, between the courses, the units we decided upon were the same, the order of execution of units the same, and the lecture materials and discussion points quite similar. Please see Table 1 for list of units covered. Differences arose in the depth with which topics were covered, the quantity and type of reading assignments, and in assessment. Whereas the master’s course
Teaching OHP at the Undergraduate Level (cont’d)

organized topics more “deeply”, meaning that simply more concepts were presented in each unit, more content was covered in each lecture, and more connections were made to empirical work in each unit, the undergraduate level course required a depth level commensurate with other undergraduate psychology electives. Furthermore, reading assignments in the undergraduate course were typically 1-2 readings per week (for example a chapter from a handbook and one journal article) whereas the master’s course students where reading 4-6 readings (chapters and articles) per week. Finally, assessment for the undergraduate course consisted of two exams that were in a multiple choice and short-answer format, and a short group presentation at the end of the semester. The master’s course had 1 final, cumulative exam in an essay format and 1 quite demanding final applied project where students designed an OHP intervention for a real organization’s problem.

The undergraduate level of the course came with some unique challenges. As mentioned earlier, this course was perhaps the first of its kind, so finding appropriate textbooks and articles was no easy feat. In the end we combined reading materials from Quick and Tetrick’s handbook (2010) with both seminal journal articles and contemporary articles in OHP. There was significant pushback. Some seminars of articles, including those quite theory heavy. Some mentioned having difficulty comprehending them or in the cases of empirical studies, that they got lost in trying to understand the analyses. As we move forward, some degree of trial and error will lead us to making improvements over time but will likely consist of reducing theoretical pieces and selecting empirical studies that can be more easily explained/interpreted.

Another challenge was that the content of OHP is less relatable when the student has no work experience. Students who have worked can draw direct comparisons to or from their personal experiences, can fill out and discuss the results of commonly used questionnaires in class, or even just share stories of their own, if any at all. Though the concepts are certainly still understandable without personal experience, as an instructor it presents a challenge with making the material relevant to some never-employed undergrads. Some strategies we suggest are using interviews of family or friends about their jobs and experiences or connecting experiences with student-life whenever possible such as heavy workload, lack of resources, student services for stress management like an organization with such services or interventions, etc. In our case, in the next offering of the course, we have added an additional session on workplace bullying and stress management.

Furthermore, it was a challenge to find supplemental media materials (such as videos and podcasts) that were squarely OHP focused. Certainly many exist, but there is no central location from which to find appropriate material, especially in the always-popular video format, for integration into lectures. Resources we ended up pulling together come from: NIOSH’s Total Worker Health website, SLOP white papers (e.g. On the Case of Health, Bullying, etc.), Harvard Business Review, CBS news (story on leading for a healthy organization), YouTube (through general scouting of relevant videos using keywords to identify and screen options), and portions of Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide (Chen, P. Y. & Cooper, C. L., 2014). A list of the supplemental materials we have compiled can be provided upon request.

Finally, we realized that some lessons overlapped too much with material likely covered from other IO classes (e.g. some methodological issues and some job design-PE fit material was likely encountered in introductory IO). These portions of the course will be downplayed to better suit the pre-existing knowledge level of our students, but may not be of concern at other institutions.

We hope that our experiences will help others get their own undergraduate OHP course started. Though we had the platform of an existing bachelor’s degree in IO psychology from which to launch our OHP course, we believe that the course can be successfully implemented and taught at schools without a specific IO undergraduate degree as well. We are happy to share our syllabi or chat with anyone who is interested. Please feel free to reach out to either of us!

References

Table 1:

| What is OHP? |
| Definition, mission and history |
| Methodological Issues |
| Measurement concerns, design considerations, debates in the field |
| Theoretical Models |
| Theories of job satisfaction and occupational stress (i.e. Stressor-strain model, JDC model, COR theory): related empirical research |
| Job Design and P-E Fit |
| Job Characteristics theory, P-E Fit theory, related empirical research |
| Job Stress |
| Survey of stressors, conceptualizations of strain, related research |
| Interventions I |
| Organizational-level stress-intervention, related research |
| Interventions II |
| Individual-level stress-intervention, Training for stress management, Coping, related research |
| Workplace Bullying, Mistreatment, and Violence |
| Forms of mistreatment, conflict and bullying, violence prevention, violence climate, related research |
| Safety and Injury |
| Safety climate, WRFMSDs, Injuries, measurement of physical and injury outcomes, related research |
| Work-Family Conflict and Schedules |
| WFC, WFE, flextime, telework, family supportive climates, shift work, related research |
| Directions in OHP |
| OHP and the changing nature of work, leading for wellbeing, New research ideas/directions |
Introducing Occupational Health Science
by Bob Sinclair, Clemson University

I am pleased to announce the creation of a new journal - Occupational Health Science (OHS) - where SOHP members will be able to keep up with the latest research developments in our field and publish their own research. I am the founding editor of OHS and I am 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, Ma Wang, and Laura Punnett), and a fantastic editorial board with over 70 members including many SOHP members. The journal is active now so you can start submitting your research now! The submission link is: www.editorialmanager.com/OHES/default.aspx.

The Springer webpage also details the specific kinds of research we see as appropriate for this journal (click on the "about this publication" link on the page listed above). Our aims and scope statement is below:

Occupational Health Science is a peer-reviewed journal dedicated to publishing leading edge scholarship on behavioral, social, psychological, and technological aspects of occupational health. Occupational Health Science publishes papers that represent important empirical and/or theoretical contributions to understanding of phenomena related to worker safety, health, and well-being. The distinctive features of this journal include a multidisciplinary orientation, an international perspective, a translational/evidence-based approach, and a flexible approach that allows for both deductive (theory-based) and inductive (descriptive) articles. As a multidisciplinary journal, Occupational Health Science publishes articles of interest to academics as well as practitioners in the fields of occupational health psychology, applied psychology, public health, industrial hygiene, occupational medicine, nursing, occupational safety, epidemiology, ergonomics, sociology, human resource management, organizational behavior, and economics.

OHS arose out of conversations among Ma Wang, Paul Spector, Lois Tetrick and me, starting in about 2012. Our current SOHP officers have been a big help in finalizing the publishing agreement with Springer, particularly Ma Wang, as Mo took the journal proposal to multiple publishers and drew on his expertise to help make the vision we had a reality. Springer has been a great partner to work with in the development of the journal and together, we have established multiple benefits for SOHP as a result. The SOHP logo will be displayed on the front cover of the journal. OHP members will receive electronic copies of OHS as a member benefit and proceeds from the journal will go to SOHP as an eventual revenue source for the organization.

I anticipate two issues being published in 2017. The first issue (approximately mid-June 2017) will be a special inaugural issue with invited contributions from several distinguished authors. The second issue also may have some invited papers, but by then we hope to be publishing unsolicited submissions as well. Then, after 2017, we plan to go to four issues per year.

I will articulate some of my thoughts about editorial policy in an editorial in the first issue, but I am more than happy to address any questions you have between now and then. Basically, I want the journal to do everything it can to help advance the science of creating a safer and healthier workplace. I think we need to be open to creative ideas and new approaches and to retain a multidisciplinary focus when possible. We are also open to ideas about possible guest-edited special issues as well. So, please do let me know (rsincl@clemson.edu) if you have any questions about the journal, submissions, suggestions, etc. Please share this news widely in your professional networks and I will look forward to seeing your great work in print!

Humanitarian Work Psychology and the United Nations
by Kelsey Jo-Ritter, Bowling Green State University & Drew Mallory, Purdue University

Many scholars gravitate to the field of occupational health psychology (OHP) in an effort to improve the quality of employees’ work-life and well-being. As researchers and practitioners, this desire to make a positive impact on others was evident at this year’s Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology annual conference; many theme track sessions focused on using I-O to “Change the World through Organizations, Pro-Bono I/O”, and “Prosocial Insights from the United Nations”. Yet, despite this new emphasis on prosocial psychology, SIOP focuses explicitly on work psychology (and may thus not always be a perfect fit for some occupational health psychologists), there is another membership organization directly concerned with prosocial goals that dovetails perfectly with the core field of OHP. The Global Organisation for Humanitarian Work Psychology (GOHWP) represents a group of people from around the world who seek to “promote and engage in humanitarian activities through the practice and study of organisational psychology. By definition, GOHWP’s website describes humanitarian work psychology (HWP) as “the synthesis of organisational, industrial, work, and other areas of psychology with deliberate and organised efforts to enhance human welfare”, which many organizational health researchers and practitioners will find resonant.

The field of HWP originated some years ago with Stuart C. Carr’s establishment of Povio, a listserv developed for those interested in applying organizational psychology in prosocial avenues. This stimulated others’ interest in prosocial work, with symposia cropping up at annual SIOP meetings in the years to come. In 2009, the term humanitarian work psychology was born, and the Global Task Force for Humanitarian Work Psychology was established by Stuart Carr, Mary O’Neill Berry, and Lea Morai. From these beginnings grew GOHWP, a global organization with nearly 1,000 members dedicated to using psychology for the advance-
Humanitarian Work Psychology and the United Nations (cont’d)

ment of workers, humanitarian work, and the betterment of individuals across the world. Members published several books HWP subjects, innumerable articles, and drawn scientists and practitioners from all over the world to join in its global mission.

Membership is open to psychologists involved in any aspect of HWP. Upon joining, members have the opportunity to engage with one another to find collaborative projects or work on one of the many volunteer initiatives dedicated to achieving GOHWP’s global aims. One exciting new project that GOHWP members and volunteers have taken up is to provide evidenced-based recommendations to the United Nations. Specifically, teams are working to construct a database of I-O and OHP research that supports the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals (e.g., end poverty in all its forms everywhere, promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full, productive employment and decent work for all).

The Sustainable Development Goals are expected to influence policy—socially, economically, and environmentally—thus, the desired outcome of this initiative is to ensure academic research is more readily accessible to non-academics who are laboring across the world working on such important missions. Whether interested in assisting GOHWP in communicating best practices in compatible areas of psychology to UN stakeholders, joining on with other initiatives, or just meeting like-minded professionals interested in applying the psychology of work to the "greater good," GOHWP is a useful resource that OHP professionals should utilize and embrace.

Book Announcement: OHP: Work, Stress, and Health

Irvin Schonfeld, City College of the City University of New York
Chu-Hsiang (Daisy) Chang, Michigan State University

Irvin Sam Schonfeld and Chu-Hsiang (Daisy) Chang’s new book Occupational Health Psychology: Work, Stress, and Health will be available from the Springer Publishing Company in December, 2016. Featuring a comprehensive look at research on, and theories of, workplace stress, the book examines the impact of psychosocial working conditions on such problems as psychological distress, depression, alcohol use, cardiovascular disease, and musculoskeletal problems. The experience of unemployment, job insecurity, workplace aggression, and work-family balance is also explored. There is a chapter devoted to the history of occupational health psychology (OHP). Another chapter examines the stresses experienced by specific occupational groups including teachers, nurses, soldiers, first responders, and agricultural and construction workers. The book includes a chapter devoted entirely to interventions aimed at improving the health and well-being of workers. Workplace safety and the relationship of workplace leadership and organizational climate to worker health are also explored. The book concludes with a discussion of the future of OHP. Additional information is available at http://www.springerpub.com/occupational-health-psychology.html.

Book Announcement: Derailed Organizational Interventions for Stress and Well-Being

Maria Karanika-Murray & Caroline Biron (Editors)

Derailed Organizational Interventions for Stress and Well-Being: Confessions of Failure and Solutions for Success
• Includes unpublished lessons from failed organizational interventions
• 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

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 European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology (EAOHP)

Volume 16 (Fall, 2016)

The 12th EAOHP Conference in Thessaloniki

As stated in the conference program: “In a world that is in constant flux and crises of many forms (financial, humanitarian, geopolitical and organizational) have become the norm, employees’ health and well-being pay a high toll. In this changing context, occupational health psychology has a critical role to play.” The conference addressed what occupational health researchers and practitioners can do to prevent psychological risks and, more importantly, build resourceful and resilient environments in which people can not only survive but thrive and flourish despite adversity. The program included keynotes from Professor Joan Benach, Professor Christina Maslach, and Professor Karina Nielsen. In addition, the conference had a powerful and engaging lineup of 176 symposiums, 183 oral sessions, as well as 84 posters.

The European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology is 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. The 13th European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology Conference will take place from September 5-7, 2018 in Lisbon, Portugal. The EAOHP 2018 conference will be co-organized by the Business Research Unit (BRU-IUL), specifically by the Organizational Behavior and Human Resources (OBHR) research group. BRU-IUL is a multidisciplinary research unit that spans the main fields of Business, Economics, and Finance in ISCTE-IUL (Lisbon, Portugal). More details will be available in early 2017 on their website: http://www.eaohp.org/conference.html

SOHP representatives are encouraged to join this wonderful conference in 2018.

An International Investigation of Training in Occupational Health Psychology

Nicholas Ullrich, Hope Lysaght, Kayle Erickson, Marta Romeo-Lazaro, Daisy Zepeda
Northern Kentucky University

Individuals from the American Psychological Association (APA), the Society for Occupational Health Psychology (SOHP), the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology, (EAOHP), The Johns Hopkins University, and Northern Kentucky University worked collaboratively to assess the extent to which occupational health psychology (OHP) is studied worldwide. The goal was to determine the contemporary prevalence of coursework in OHP internationally to better direct students, researchers, and practitioners to these resources.

Although graduate courses in Occupational Health Psychology (OHP) have emerged progressively over the past 30 years, their international prevalence is unknown. To address this ambiguity, Steve Sauter and Joe Hurrell, Jr. proposed that we develop and conduct an international survey of contemporary training and coursework in OHP.

With their guidance and the assistance of a working group comprised of individuals from the American Psychological Association (Gwendolyn Puryear Keita), the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology (Stavroula Leka, Sergio Iavicoli, Cristina Di Tecco), the Society for Occupational Health Psychology (Lisa Kath), The Johns Hopkins University (Heather Roberts-Fox), and Northern Kentucky University (Philip Moberg) we developed and administered a survey to identify sources of OHP and OHP-related training.*

To maximize responses, our goal was to create an extremely short, one-to-two minute, anonymous survey that nevertheless would be comprehensive in scope. Following several drafts, multiple revisions, and much discussion of wording intended to elicit the targeted information, we designed a tightly focused, three-item survey with an opportunity to expand responses to each question. The survey was presented digitally using Qualtrics survey administration software.

The first item asked if respondents ever had taken or taught a formal university or college course with the phrase “Occupational Health Psychology” in the course title or written course description. An affirmative response elicited a follow-up question that asked the name of the academic institution and department, institute, center, or program where the course was offered.

A negative response to item one prompted a second item, which asked if respondents were aware of a formal university or college course with the phrase “Occupational Health Psychology” in the course title or written course description. An affirmative response elicited a follow-up question that asked the name of the academic institution and department, institute, center, or program where the course was offered.

Regardless of the preceding responses, the third item asked all respondents if they ever had taken or taught a formal university or college course having a primary focus on topic(s) in Occupational Health Psychology, but without the phrase “Occupational Health Psychology” in the course title or written course description. Similarly, an affirmative response elicited the same follow-up question, supplemented by an
item asking for the course title.

Prior to activation, we piloted the survey with the assistance of 11 members from the Society for Occupational Health Psychology (SOHP) to ensure that the digital administration format was logical, understandable, and functioning as intended. With confirmation from the pilot study, we launched the survey from March 8th through March 18th, 2016.

 Constituents from American Psychological Association (APA), European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology (EAOHP), and SOHP announced and provided a link to the survey to members through their respective listservs and to attendees of the APA/NIOSH/SOHP Work, Stress, and Health conference. The thought was that contacting members and attendees through these lists would provide direct access to interested individuals in Occupational Health Psychology who have been exposed to OHP-related courses and OHP training programs. Because the population of listerv members and conference attendees was substantial and potentially redundant (i.e., OHP, 656 members; SOHP, 324 members; EA-OHP, 534 members; Work, Stress, & Health conference, 1,522 attendees) and because we did not have direct access to these lists, we projected that the survey announcement would reach approximately 2,000 unique individuals.

In total, 301 individuals representing 29 different countries across 6 continents responded to the survey. Analysis of the response data revealed that 157 respondents (52.2%) representing 24 unique countries indicated that they had taken or taught a course with the phrase, “Occupational Health Psychology,” in the course title or written course description. Of the remaining 144 respondents who had not taken or taught an Occupational Health Psychology course, 52 were aware of such courses.

Examination of item responses produced findings that were simultaneously surprising and encouraging. The number of unique academic institutions (i.e., colleges or universities) that had offered courses in Occupational Health Psychology was 81. In total, across all three questions, 136 unique institutions were identified.

This surprisingly large number of international colleges and universities offering occupational health psychology related courses, identified from a comparatively modest sample, leads to the conclusion that Occupational Health Psychology has become firmly established worldwide, and that formal training in OHP and courses or programs that address topics in OHP may be far more prevalent than generally recognized.

We look forward to sharing more specific details from this preliminary research study at the 12th International Conference on Occupational Stress and Health in Minneapolis, June 7-10, 2017, and intend to expand this study in the near future to more fully understand training in the field of OHP to better direct students, practitioners, and researchers to these resources. Thoughts and ideas for potential exploration are welcome and may be forwarded to Philip Moberg at moberpg1@nk.edu.

*Additional technical support was provided by members of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (Jeannie Nigam, Ted Scharf, Jessica Streit, Naomi Swanson).

WSH 2017 Announcement

Wes Baker
American Psychological Association

The twelfth International Conference on Occupational Stress and Health, "Work, Stress and Health 2017: Contemporary Challenges and Opportunities," will be held at the Hilton Minneapolis, Minneapolis, MN, on June 7-10, 2017, with preconference workshops and opening events on June 7. This conference is convened by the American Psychological Association, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and the Society for Occupational Health Psychology.

The Work, Stress, and Health Conference series addresses the ever-changing nature of work and the implications of these changes for the health, safety, and well-being of workers. The conference covers numerous topics of interest to labor, management, practitioners, and researchers. The 2017 conference will give special attention to contemporary workplace challenges that present new research and intervention opportunities. Work continues to change at a rapid pace. Workplaces and their employees face a host of new challenges. Some examples of contemporary challenges and opportunities of special interest include but are certainly not limited to: 1) Dynamic employment patterns, 2) Technology, 3) International emergencies/disasters, 4) Extreme violence and work, 5) Leave policies, 6) Supportive work, 7) Changing workforce, and 8) Comprehensive or integrated interventions.

Registration will be available late 2016/early 2017 online at [http://apa.org/wsh/2017](http://apa.org/wsh/2017).

Thank you for reading the Society for Occupational Health Psychology Newsletter!

ABOUT SOHP

The Society for Occupational Health Psychology is a non-profit organization with the purpose of engaging in activities to instruct the public on subjects useful to the individual and beneficial to the community. These efforts are achieved (1) by obtaining, and disseminating to the public factual data regarding occupational health psychology through the promotion and encouragement of psychological research on significant theoretical and practical questions relating to occupational health and (2) by promoting and encouraging the application of the findings of such psychological research to the problems of the workplace.