

# ENOP Newsletter

NO 13 APRIL 1987

Editorial responsibility  
Peter Dachler  
Secretariat  
Anne Rocha Perazzo

---

**Seventh ENOP Symposium: Siofók, Hungary, May 20 - 24**

- Objectives and Programme
- Preparation for the Business Meeting

**Guidelines for ENOP Workshops**

**Third Workshop on safety at work**

**Tidbits of News**

**Third West European Congress on the Psychology of Work and Organization April 13 - 15, 1987 in Antwerpen**

Maison des Sciences de l'Homme  
54 Bd. Raspail  
75270 Paris Cedex 06  
Tel. (1) 45 44 38 49

## SEVENTH ENOP SYMPOSIUM 1987

### EUROPEAN METHODOLOGIES IN WORK AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Siofók, Hungary, 20 - 24 May 1987

#### Programme

##### Aims

The symposium has the following aims:

1. to establish the situation of European Work and Organizational Psychology with regard to diagnostic and intervention methodology
2. to clarify points of agreement and disagreement among schools and countries
3. to involve ENOP-members in the development of a European spirit in Work and Organizational Psychology

##### Programme structure

The programme will contain:

a "working session" devoted to an assessment of ENOP-members' positions with regard to main areas of professional activity, as well as preferences (and dislikes) for methods; this working session will be preceded by a preparatory mail survey among ENOP-members;

paper presentations and discussions on critical methodological issues in four areas of professional activity:

1. Organizational analysis and structuring
2. Task analysis and design
3. Personnel training and development
4. Personnel selection and allocation

a "feedback session", summarizing the results of the survey and the discussion during the working session.

a final "discussion session".

##### Time table

Wednesday May 20  
20.00

Arrival of participants  
Welcome by hosts

Thursday May 21

Excursion to a factory, Raba Hungarian Rail Carriage and Machine Works, Győr (Laboratory of Work Psychology)

Friday May 22

09.00 - 10.00

Introduction to the symposium theme (R.A. Roe & E. Spaltro)

10.00 - 11.00

Working session

11.00 - 11.15

Coffee break

11.15 - 12.30

Paper on methodology in organizational analysis and structuring (E. Ekvall; discussant: D. Francescato)

12.30 - 14.30

Lunch

14.30 - 15.45

Paper on methodology in task analysis and design (J. Leplat; discussant: P. Richter)

15.45 - 16.00

Coffee/tea break

16.00 - 17.15

Paper on methodology in personnel training and development (G. de Cock; discussant: G.M. Peiro)

Dinner

20.00 - 22.00

Business meeting: Future and structure of ENOP

Saturday May 23

09.30 - 10.45

Paper on methodology in personnel selection and allocation (C. de Wolff; discussant: P. Coetsier)

10.45 - 11.00

Coffee break

11.00 - 12.00

Feedback session (E. Spaltro & R.A.Roe)

12.00 - 13.00

Final discussion session

13.00 - 14.30

Lunch

14.30 -----

(to be organized by Hungarian colleagues)

Sunday May 24

Departure of participants

---

### Participation

Participants will be asked:

to indicate three main types of professional activity (in terms of tasks, client problems) that they are involved in;

to indicate preferred (and disliked) methods for diagnosis and intervention for each of these activities.

This will have to be prepared in advance by responding to a written questionnaire, and to be completed during the Working session at the Symposium.

The questionnaire will be distributed late April 1987. It will have to be completed and sent in as soon as possible, but at least 2 weeks before the conference.

## Publication

It is planned to publish the papers and the results of the discussion in a monograph, to be edited by Spaltro and Roe.

## Preparatory comments for the Business Meeting at the Symposium in Siofok.

## Future of ENOP

After the discussion we had at the last ENOP Symposium in Paris last Spring, about the current state of ENOP and possible future directions, the CoCo was asked to work out a proposal for future directions of ENOP. It spent the major portion of its meeting on possible options. Bernhard Wilpert drafted a "think piece" to serve as a departure for the discussion. These comments and suggestions follow with the changes and amendments that emerged out of the deliberations during the CoCo meeting.

### 1. Original Rationales for Creating ENOP

When founding ENOP in 1981 it was our main intention to foster a genuine European approach and perspective in Work and Organizational Psychology (W/O Psy.). To accomplish this we used the following instruments:

- a) Information exchange through documentation (e.g. directory of European Institutions), symposia, workshops, newsletter;
- b) Personnel exchange of academics on all levels among European institutes;
- c) Training through workshops and Joint Study Programmes;
- d) International collaborative research (e.g. Workmotivation, Work Socialization of Youth - WOSY, Industrial Democracy in Europe - IDE);
- e) Promotional and professional activities (e.g. special

meetings at international conferences, establishment of theme oriented study groups: New Technologies and Work - Network).

Important conditions for an effective functioning of ENOP were seen to be:

- a) A certain degree of financial and administrative support by the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme;
- b) A limited number of members in order to facilitate the development of personal contact, mutual trust and intellectual stimulation;
- c) A wide international distribution of membership;
- d) A minimum of (informal) planning and administrative structure (Co-ordinating Committee).

## 2. An Interims Evaluation

Five years in the life of an international network is a short time. Nevertheless, the five instruments of realizing our goals were used rather effectively:

- a) The information exchange within and beyond ENOP seems to work satisfactorily according to all standards applicable to an international venture such as ours;
- b) Worthwhile personal exchange has started in many instances. However, much more should and could be done to overcome the notorious lack of mobility among European academics; especially students should more intensively be involved;
- c) Training was mainly linked to our 6 workshops and symposia at international meetings. Quite promising are the efforts to establish a European summerschool on New Technology and W/O Psy with the support of the EC-Commission;
- d) International collaborative research has been carried on in three projects with active involvement of ENOP-members. The research has and might have started without ENOP. But it was certainly helped by the existence of it.

- e) Promotional activities can be seen as all those that focus on developments and challenges for European W/O Psy. Mentioned should be here:

The Study Group of New Technologies and Work (Network) which was founded by ENOP members with the support of the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme and the Werner-Reimers-Foundation. Its problem focus required interdisciplinary broadening and has in three scientific conferences so far brought together a great variety of young European researchers and reputed scholars from many fields and countries. Three publications are emerging now from that work. They should appeal to the scientific community as well as practitioners.

The initiative of a Joint Study Program (Summer School) which is hoped to become an important contribution to training of future researchers working on their Ph.D. in different countries.

In short, ENOP is leaving its adolescent state. We ought to take note of the aspects impinging on its new adulthood:

New scientific activities emerge that will necessarily affect ENOP:  
the Western European Conferences in W/O Psy,  
European Conference of Psychology.

There is a growing discontent about the exclusivity of ENOP membership in and outside of ENOP.

There is a growing discontent within ENOP about the co-optational procedures so far employed.

In view of the changes in European I/O psychology, the main purpose and function of ENOP is becoming increasingly ambiguous.

There is a growing concern with demonstrable (i.e. publications) scholarly output of ENOP activities (e.g. ENOP Symposia, workshops) and resulting from ENOP members actively contributing to ENOP related scientific/professional projects.

3. Whiter we go ?

In short, external and internal developments force us into rethinking ENOP's functions and objectives. There seem to be three options:

a) Academic Society Model

The model would ensure the necessary output but would at the same time require a drastic expansion of membership and formalization of procedure. This, in turn, would conflict and compete with the emerging European academic societies and activities mentioned above. This is, among others, why the majority of ENOP-members present at the last meeting in Paris tended to refuse the model.

b) Quitting the scene Model

One might assume the position that ENOP has done its task, hence, we might turn to other business and close the shop. This is a real and sensible option which ought to be weighed against the third one:

c) Yeast-in-the-Dough-Model

Enop could consider itself as a servant and motor within European W/O Psy. At least four venues are open for such a self-concept:

1. Stimulate within emerging societies and conferences the discussion about salient themes by organizing respective symposia, taking new initiatives, influencing programmatic orientations and actively work with and contribute to such

There is a growing concern with demonstrable (i.e. publications) scholarly output of ENOP activities (e.g. ENOP Symposia, workshops) and resulting from ENOP members actively contributing to ENOP related scientific/professional projects.

3. Whiter we go ?

In short, external and internal developments force us into rethinking ENOP's functions and objectives. There seem to be three options:

a) Academic Society Model

The model would ensure the necessary output but would at the same time require a drastic expansion of membership and formalization of procedure. This, in turn, would conflict and compete with the emerging European academic societies and activities mentioned above. This is, among others, why the majority of ENOP-members present at the last meeting in Paris tended to refuse the model.

b) Quitting the scene Model

One might assume the position that ENOP has done its task, hence, we might turn to other business and close the shop. This is a real and sensible option which ought to be weighed against the third one:

c) Yeast-in-the-Dough-Model

Enop could consider itself as a servant and motor within European W/O Psy. At least four venues are open for such a self-concept:

1. Stimulate within emerging societies and conferences the discussion about salient themes by organizing respective symposia, taking new initiatives, influencing programmatic orientations and actively work with and contribute to such



emerging societies and conferences.

2. Wherever this is not possible (because certain themes might as yet be too unstructured, or too sensitive or too complex), ENOP might organize workshops or conferences on its own (as in the past), open to all interested parties.
3. Stimulate improvement of university teaching and learning in W/O Psychology by exchange of materials, people (students and faculty) and by fostering better co-operation among universities who have or want to initiate W/O psychology programmes.
4. ENOP could serve as a network of networks. Based upon recognition of a major yet underresearched or neglected aspect of European W/O psychology, ENOP could initiate networks of interested researchers in and outside of the discipline of W/O psychology, each working on certain themes over a period of years with the main intent of producing scholarly publications. In this way ENOP could function as an initiator or motor in identifying and getting work started on neglected issues in W/O psychology and in coordinating and helping with obtaining funds and identifying appropriate and interested researchers for the various networks.

Option A seems not acceptable, option B is self-policing and option C, which is the one proposed by CoCo, has certain organizational implications.

#### 4. Structural consequences of Option C

- a) Membership could basically remain as it is, except that we must develop stricter rules for dropping members who are inactive or who are only minimally interested in actively contributing to the scientific goals and purposes of ENOP. The CoCo suggests that ENOP members be dropped from membership if a person has missed two

consecutive meetings and/or if a person does not or only to a minimal degree participate in the spinn-off activities of ENOP or does not initiate an ENOP-relevant programme. Thus members who sit passively on the side-lines of ENOP activities take up a place of a colleague in their respective countries who would actively contribute to the goals and purposes of ENOP.

ENOP membership should also terminate when a person is retired from his academic position and she/he has completed a ENOP programme worked on at the time of retirement.

When a vacancy in ENOP occurs, the ENOP members of the affected country should be able to unanimously endorse the suggested new member. Secondly, the new member should be a member of a university faculty who "covers" W/O psychology as broadly as possible. And thirdly, the new member should be active in the field of W/O psychology, somewhat above the "average" in the respective country.

- b) Annual Symposia would change their function from an amiable and non-committal get-together to genuine work sessions preparing concise plans for action in the fields mentioned above.
- c) The Coordinating Committee would need to include the permanent functions (e.g. ENOP publications, liaison with the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, newsletter, etc.) as well as consultative functions based upon specific, approved ENOP programmes.

Essentially the CoCo would contain a board and a consultative coordinating group. It is suggested that the CoCo includes:

4 elected members responsible for the permanent functions mentioned above, and no more than 4 members, each of whom is elected on the basis of

an approved ENOP programme.

As mentioned in 4 b, these programmes are generated, approved and reported on in the annual symposia. Elections for service in the consultative functions of CoCo are based upon the approval of programmes by the plenary session.

- d) The Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, it is assumed, would like such a model and might continue to lend its support as before.

The CoCo suggests, that if these suggestions are accepted at the next business meeting we should decide to let the new form and approach of ENOP run for a 2 year trial period and critically evaluate its success after that before settling on a more permanent solution.

#### Comments by the editor

We had hoped that ENOP members would follow the CoCo's invitation to send their comments, ideas, suggestions, critiques, etc. on the proposed Yeast-in-the-dough model for ENOP's future. Unfortunately only one comment and suggestion was received, which is reproduced below. Let me however strongly encourage all ENOP members to give some active thought to this proposal and to any further ideas regarding ENOP's future and come prepared with arguments and suggestions to the business meeting at the ENOP symposium. The issue is not only to accept or not accept the proposed model and its organizational consequences. The issue is to also actively design a significant start toward a more meaningful future of ENOP at the business meeting.

#### Comments and suggestions on the proposed model by Gaston De Cock.

I agree with the proposal of the Coordinating Committee of ENOP. Concerning the structural consequences of option C, I would like

to add an other one. If a member is in the situation, where he works closely together with colleagues in the same field and the same rank it would be useful to create an opportunity for them to participate more actively in ENOP.

Because of the limited number of members I propose to let them take the decision who will participate according to the topics of the annual symposia.

In our case the Center of Organizational Psychology would be "the member" and for the ENOP symposium the Center could select the person, who will participate.

## Guidelines for ENOP Workshops

### Budgeting

Proposals for ENOP Workshops must be submitted to the ENOP-Secretariat before October 31 to be included in the budget of the following year. The Coordinating Committee will discuss the proposals and establish a priority list for the budgeting.

### Funding

In principle, participants are requested to obtain travel funds from their home institutions. In case it is really impossible for participants to obtain funding, the MSH may be able to contribute to the expenses, provided that participants travel with APEX or other reduced fares (e.g. package deals, "tarif visite").

British participants may have their travel expenses covered by the ESRC via the MSH provided that the workshop is held in Paris. The MSH covers local expenses (per diem) for workshops held in Paris.

### Technical aspects

For technical details concerning workshop please apply to ENOP-Secretariat: Mme Anne Rocha Perazzo

B. 425 Maison des Sciences de l'Homme

54 Bd. Raspail, 75006 PARIS

Tel. (1) 45 44 09 01

The ENOP Secretariat is prepared to assist in making sur place arrangements provided the requisite information (dates, list of participants) is given with sufficient head time (Note: the meeting rooms of the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme are frequently booked out 6 months in advance).

**Third Workshop on the Psychology of safety at work, Technical University in Braunschweig, Germany, March 23 - 24, 1987**

The workshop on safety at work was originally conceived in 1984 and since then implemented by C. Graf Hoyos. This third workshop on work safety was held in the department of psychology at the Technical University in Braunschweig together with Prof. E. Erke. The intention of this workshop was to bring together both scientists and practitioners for an intensive exchange of ideas regarding current problems in safety at work. Some fourteen papers were presented. In addition the workshop included four "Discussion Circles". Participants came from Germany, France and the Netherlands.

The papers and the results of the discussions from the two earlier workshops have been printed and are available from either:

Lehrstuhl für Psychologie  
TU München  
Lothstrasse 17  
8000 München 2, Germany

or

Institut für Psychologie  
I.W. v. Goethe Universität  
Mertonstrasse 6  
6000 Frankfurt/M., Germany

## Tidbits of News

### A forward looking idea from Peter Herriot.

How about ENOP applying for free space on the Olympus satellite, to be launched in 1988 by the European Space Agency ? This is paid for by 7 European nations, and provides facilities for video conferencing and data transmission. The UK representative of ESA is Brian Champness, CS & P Ltd., 7, Commercial St., Gunnislake, Cornwall PL18 9JW, UK (tel. 0822 833573). Closing date for applications, end of April!

### A new PhD scheme at Birbeck College of the University of London (Peter Herriot)

We advertise for students in a particular area of study in the Spring of each year. This year the area is "Organisational Change in the Public Sector"; last year it was "Stress in Organisations". Then we negotiate with both the applicants and their organisations to ensure that there will be access provided. All of the students, who are part-time, base their research upon the organisation(s) in which they work. They all commence their studies together in the autumn, and meet as a group, together with two academics, about once every two weeks. If there are specific topics on which they ask for instruction (e.g. computing facilities), this is provided. Otherwise, the group is involved in helping each member better to structure the problem to be investigated. Students have found that the help and encouragement thus received prevents the loneliness and alientation often associated with PhD work.

For more information write to Peter Herriot, head, department of occupational psychology, Birbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX.

Research in progress in the department of psychology at the Technical University in Munich (Lothstr. 17, 8000 München 2.

"Transfer of safety information in industrial settings" is the title of a research project performed by the Department of Psychology at the Technical University of Munich (Prof. Dr. C. Graf Hoyos).

This project is financially supported until 1988 by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). The project leader is Dr. Ursula Bernhardt.

To mark the state of the art in the field of psychological investigations on the possibilities of implementing driver-information-systems and state-of-the-driver-controll-systems in cars, the Department of Psychology at the Technical University of Munich became subcontractor of the BMW AG, Munich, one of the nine car producing companies associated in the "prometheus"-project.

This project is financially supported by the European Community.

Further information is available from the Department of Psychology (Dipl. Psych. W. Fastenmeier, Dr. Gstalter, Dr. Ruppert).



**Third West European Congress on the Psychology of Work and Organisation, April 13 - 15, 1987 in Antwerpen, Belgium.**

The third West European Congress on the Psychology of Work and Organisation in Antwerpen, although covering many of the major themes in W/O Psychology, focussed on new technologies and organisations. Beside the traditional seminars, workshops and postersessions there was an introductory lecture by Claude Levy-Leboyer and a panel discussion on the implications of new technologies for organisations on which two ENOP members, Rob Roe and Bernhard Wilpert, participated as panel members. A number of other ENOP members actively participated in seminars and workshops (Peter Dachler, Gaston de Cock, C. Graf Hoyos, Uwe Kleinbeck, Jacques Leplat) as well as in the organizing committee (Jose Peiro). Is that a sign for the Yeast-in-the-Dough model of ENOP ? The future will tell.