ENOP

EUROPEAN NETWORK OF ORGANISATIONAL AND WORK PSYCHOLOGISTS

NEWSLETTER NO. 33

Editorial Responsibility:
John Hurley

Secretariat:
Anne Rocha Perazzo
Maison des Science de L'Homme
54 Boulevard Raspail
75270 Paris Cedex 06

Tel: 33 1 49 54 22 48
Fax: 33 1 45 48 83 53
email: arocha@msh-paris.fr

May, 1997

ENOP Newsletter No. 33
May, 1997

CONTENTS

SYMPOSIUM 1997

Like Roman Gaul, this years symposium was divided in three parts: a poster session during which each member outlined their research activities; a review of research evaluation, which was a follow-up from last years symposium; and the main topic for this year, that of scientific dissemination..

1 Poster Session

A number of presentations were made outlining in a very interesting and informative way, the nature of members research activities. Those presentations for which we received copy, are included here.

Miklo Antalovits, TU Budapest
Department of Ergonomics and Psychology
Project supported by the National Scientific Research Fund (OTKA)

~ Project no. 2765(0TKA)-5-3 18 "Combined environmental effects affecting people working in Those presentations for which we received copy, are included here. space." (Interdisciplinary project co-ordinated by L. Banhidi, with the participation of M. Antalovits, L. Izso, G. Mischinger.)

Projects supported by industrial contracts

· Human factors influencing the safe operation of nuclear power plants. Elaboration and introduction of methodologies to increase the efficiency of simulator training's at the Paks NPP. (M. Antalovits, L. Izso)

· Improvement of ergonomic conditions of the human - computer interaction at computerised work settings in telecommunication. Analysis and development possibilities of the quality of telecommunication services with emphasised consideration of human factors. (M. Antalovits, Gy. Szabo, E. Kard, J. Hazy)

· Development of a methodology for the ergonomic evaluation and development of assembly technologies. (G. Mischinger, M. Antalovits, Gy. Szabo)

Projects running with application grants

· Development of a methodology for the ergonomic assessment of user interfaces of software products. (L. Izso, G. Mischinger, M. Antalovits)

International projects

· TEMPUS JEP 6221: "Establishment of an Industrial Design Engineering Specialization at the Technical University of Budapest."

· **IDEAL TEMPUS JEP:** "Introducing a psychologist assistant training course at tertiary level, elaboration of its distance learning based teaching materials."

· PHARE HU-94.05 "Development of the Common Skills Module of the Accredited Vocational Training of Higher Grade."

International research cooperation

Our partners and topics of common interest:

Delft University of Technology: Research topic in the framework of the bilateral cooperation agreement between TUD and TUB: "**Ergonomic Design of Human-Computer Interfaces**" (Research group of Prof. R. den Buurman.) Joint research.

· **Berlin University of Technology:** Research topic in the framework of the bilateral cooperation agreement between TU Berlin and TUB: "**Safety and reliability in high complexity socio-technical systems**". (Research group of Prof. B. Wilpert.) Joint research. exchange of researchers.

RENE BOUWEN
1. Organisational Psychology, (with Tharsi Taillieu)

-Conversational Organisation: (Upcoming: international conference on 'Multi-voiced Organising' June 4-6, 1997, Leuven) -social constructionist theory development (change, conflict, groups) -discourse analysis methods

-Organisational change and innovation: -Organisational learning and change strategies -Potential task learning space -Personal and organisational entrepreneurship -Innovation in High Tech starters -Consulting styles and intervention strategies (post-graduate training for group and organisational consultation) -Homogeneity and variety in R&D teams (Pied project) -Exchange among unequal parties in NGO's (Pied) -Episodes of creativity in change projects (Pied)

-Workteams in context (Pied)
-Group Development and effectiveness in training groups and functional teams.
-Experiential learning in outdoor activities (Pied)
-Conflict formulation: framing and reframing
-climate of labour relations
-Organisational Culture and Climate (K. De Witte)
-international instrument development (Focus)
-change in organisational culture
-New forms of organising
-Telework
-Network activities and lateral relationships
-multiparty interorganizational collaboration

2. Personnel Psychology (Karel De Witte, Tharsi Taillieu) -recruitment and selection strategies -new psychological contracts -continuing education policies and strategies -employee survey methodologies -careers of managers -assessment methods

3. Community Psychology (Leo Laarou) -emergent social movements -unemployment and meaning of work -attitudes of specific social groups (unions, minorities) -small group work

4. Ergonomics and Health Psychology (Omer Van Den Bergh) -stress and stress management -safety and prevention training, behaviour modification "work load assessment

Willy Haukedal 140350 Bergen Norway

1982: Psychologist
1986: M.Sc.
1990: DR. OECON
1996: Professor Organisational Psychology, University of Bergen

Basic Interests:
Knowledge intensive organisations
Cognitive managerial/organisational theory

Projects (current)

1. Business Intelligence: utilization of commisioned research
- Conditions for effective use
- Quasi experimental studies of hospitality industry
- Phase II starts in April
- Organisational and individual (cognitive) variables identified so far

2. Leading "knowledge workers".
- Variables involved in such leadership
- Determinants of productivity of knowledge workers
- Qualitative explorative study starts May
- Quantative study starts 1998 (Phase II)
- Theory building main objective
- Industry studied: Broadcasting (TV)
  Hospitality (Hotels)

Currently, apart from research, I am very much occupied with transition from a business school to a university setting.

Also, taking over a "new" department, is making some demands on my time and attention. Especially since we are involved in revising the w/o field of practice, research and education.

Gert Graversen

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY AT UNIVERSITIES

Psycho-Physics

1950 Perception Phenomenology
Gestalt Psych.

1960 Psychodynamics

1970 [Social Psychology Critical marxist Psychology

1980 Cognitive Psychology

1990 Social Construction

WORK & ORGANISATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AT AND OUTSIDE UNIVERSITY

-Work methods and instruction
Psychology-technical testing
Personnel Selection
Applied social psychology
Group dynamics
Personnel selection
T- Group training
Organisation development
Social experiments
Psychosocial aspects of work -
sociotechnic systems
Job redesign
cognitive ergonomics
Meaning of work
HRM
org. Learning and competence
Management of meaning

Personal: in and outside the university

The individual and the organisation
Psychotechnical Testing
Group training (NTL)
Mini-society
Organisation devel
exp. In social systems
Working conditions and health:
work and stress
QWL
Job development and redesign
Life changes
Meaning of org.

David Guest Birkbeck College

The Future of the Career

This is a continuing research programme with the Careers Research Forum, a consortium of 40 leading companies. The !997 projects are focusing on career expectations of graduates and how these are modified during the first ten years of work, and the costs and benefits of generalist versus specialised careers. The research combines survey work, case studies and organisational analysis.

Employment Contracts, the Psychological Contract and their Impact on Innovation, Commitment and Motivation.

This two-year project is exploring the impact of different forms of employment contract (permanent, fixed -term, sub-contract and self-employment) on the psychological contract and, in turn. on the outcomes of innovation, commitment and motivation. It will be based on surveys and in-depth interviews in four organisations, concentrating on employees working in **information** technology, personnel and training and probably finance. The research is funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council.

The Changing Employment Relationship and the State of the Psychological Contract.

This research is built around an annual survey or a random sample of 1000 UK workers. Its aim is to monitor changes in the employment relationship, including the individualisation of employment and its impact on the psychological contract. It is particularly concerned with the impact of growing flexibility at work and the impact of any decline in job security and loss of career prospects on the psychological contract and on commitment and motivation. The 1996 survey revealed that only a minority or the sample had been affected by job insecurity and that the psychological contract was in fairly good shape. Both this and the previous project provide an opportunity to develop theory and a critical perspective on the concept of the psychological contract. The study is funded By the UK Institute of Personnel and Development.

The Measurement and Impact of Partnership at Work

There has been much discussion in the UK of the need to forge a new partnership between employers and employees but the term is somewhat vague. However it is likely to become more important if there is a change of Government. This study will develop and validate a measure of partnership. The sample will be all the members of the UK Involvement and Participation Association. One of the objectives of the study is to determine the impact of partnership on employee satisfaction and organisational performance. It also provides an opportunity to re-visit the research on participation and employee involvement, developing new theory and evidence around the integrative concept of partnership. The research is funded by the Gatsby Foundation.

The Impact of Human Resource Management on Performance in the Health Service.

This project was completed in 1996. It examined the impact of "high performance" human resource management practices on performance, adopting a stakeholder perspective where the stakeholders included management, employees, patients and government. Papers are currently being written up.

John Hurley
Dublin City University

1.Organisation and scientific Discovery. A study was carried out from 1993 to 1996 of the organisational factors influencing scientific discovery. 16 Nobel Laureates were the focus of the research which involved exploring the nature and extent of the resources available to them for their early research, as well as the organisational dynamics in their teams. The study's findings do not support creativity theory, but lend weight to the view that organisational factors are important precursors of discovery in science. A theoretical explanation is given. The research continues.

2. The Introduction of Technology into the Work -place. Research has been carried out into the introduction of technology and its acceptance or resistance. A model for the most effective method and approach to the acceptable introduction of technology is proposed. Research is on-going to test this model.

Erich Kircher
Since 1992 professor for applied psychology at the department of Psychology, University of Vienna. Head of the unit of applied and clinical psychology.
Teaching activities concern industrial and organisational psychology, marketing and economic psychology. At present, 70 students are writing their masters thesis and PhD thesis, respectively, on applied topics. Research activities in the past were mainly psychological consequences of unemployment and household decision making.
Currently a major research project is carried through on the history of decision making. 40 married couples keep a diary for one year and fill in daily their experiences in mutual decision situations. The major hypotheses concern determinants of influence in economic decisions, influence tactics, models of interfamily interaction dynamics.
A second project investigates the meaning of money (EURO), acceptability of the chip-card. Moreover, psychology of taxes opens a new field of research.

Juhani Kirjonen

Current research activities: =

1. Research Programme on Learning and the Acquisition of Professional Expertise.

The programme focuses on the individual process of becoming an expert, a process that spans education and working life. Consequently, learning processes are to be studied not only in educational contexts but also in diverse business life situations, the twin arenas where expertise develops. =

The main object of the programme is to analyse the process of becoming an expert in terms of learning processes, self-regulation, motivation, tutoring, and learning and working environments. The purpose is to construct and compare different models of expert learning. Expertise, learning and teaching, usually studied separately, will be examined in their interconnections and interactions. For this purpose, the study aims 1) to compare persons who are, with regard to the central components of expertise, in different stages of the process of developing from novice to expert; 2) to analyse and evaluate different instructional methods and learning environments used in education and working life context; and 3) to forecast the long-term effectiveness of alternative models of promoting expertise. =

The specific topics addressed in the programme are as follows (researchers in brackets):
* Future readiness in expertise (Pirkko Remes)

* Project learning in the development of expertise (Anneli Etel=E4pelto)

* The development of knowledge structures in higher education and the shared cognition of students and teachers (Anita Nuutinen)

* Goals, experience and the acquisition of expertise; (Juhani Kirjonen)

* Writing as a tool of constructing expert knowledge in higher education (

* HRD roles and expertise in organizations (Tuija Valkeavaara) =

* Agents of change at an uncertain time - discourse, action, learning (Karin Filander)

* Expertise in social work (Ulla Mutka) =

* Information systems (multimedia) as tools in expert work (Irja and Eero Tourunen) =

The research programme will be carried out in 1995-1998. The programme is multidisciplinary and based on the utilization of a range of different methods. The subjects of the study are highly educated adults who are specialists in education or development and planning, primarily professionals with engineering, teaching or service expertise. =

Keywords: constructive learning theory, effectiveness, experience, expert knowledge, future studies, goal setting, higher education, human resources, metacognition, multimedia, qualitative method, training, work.

2. Explaining the Accumulation and Discharge of Professional Expertise.
Characteristic of today's working life and modern society as a whole is rapid change. A starting point of the study is the need to evaluate how present social change will affect the relationships between the educational system, working life and personal growth in the near future. A target of the study is the personnel of the Provincial Governement of Central Finland which has been downsized and integrated to a new large regional administrative area.
The theoretical foundations of the study derive from the research tradition of studies of expertise on the one hand, and from the theories of organizational change on the other. The integrating element is the viewpoint of the learning subject. Expertise, too, is seen as the construct of a maturing and learning subject, increasingly both able and willing to meet professional challenges, cope with novel situations and adopt the role of a conscious agent of change.

Keywords: experience, flow, future orientation, goal setting, health, leadership, learning, management, motivation, organizational change, life policy, self-steering, work

3. Mapping Emotional Orientations; Students' Experiences of Study, Leisure and Work Activities

In collaboration with the Tallinn Pedagogical University: Toivo Kitvel and Toomas Vitsut
Keywords: activity orientation, challenges, experience, flow, interest, intrinsic motivation, leisure, skills, study, work

Robert A. Roe
Tilburg University Work & Organisation Research Centre (WORC)Research Unit on W&O Psychology

My basic interest is in the development of concepts, theory and methodology, with the aim of better understanding the present reality of work and the possibilities for changing it.
Key notions are: ecology and technology (in the sense of the fundamental study of changeability).

Research areas
A. New forms of organizing

The focus is on:

- ecological trends: internationalization, growth of services, information technology

organizational forms: ISOs (Information Service Organizations), dispersed organizations, telework, organizations conceived as FSTT configurations (Functional Spatial-Temporal-Technical configurations)
features: leadership and communication.

Methods used include surveys, field studies, cases.

B. New forms of work activity

The focus is on:

- ecological trends: the growing importance of professional service occupations, in addition to trends mentioned under A.
- forms of work: MIW (Mental Information work), information experts, knowledge workers
- features: regulation of MIW, health hazards in new occupations

Methods include work analysis & design, performance appraisal, decision support.

C. Generality and validity of W&O theories
The focus is on:

- comparative, longitudinal study of person X situation interactions, i.e. ecological factors human characteristics, and behavioural (re)action patterns; more specifically: work motivation, quality of work, and work related stress.
- hierarchical modelling in theory development.

Methods used include comparative field studies (East-West), and mathematical modelling techniques.

D. Development of W&O methodology
The focus is on:
the design of integral procedures for assessment and selection
complex interventions, in particular organizational diagnosis and design

research modelling
other methods, including simulation.
Methods used include design methodology, organizational assessment, and group techniques.

The research is conducted in the context of the multidisciplinary, multilevel research programme of the institute WORC. Cooperation exists with several partners in Europe.

My main activity at the present moment is writing a textbook on W&O psychology that integrates theories and findings from Europe with respect to work, personnel and organizational psychology.

Claude LOUCHE
Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale
Universite Paul Valery,

The Work and Organizational Social Psychology research team in Montpelier is made up of 9 teacher-researchers. It also includes 8 Ph.D. students.

Regarding research, it has two concerns:
- first, to develop studies in response to requests received from the economic and social environment
- and secondly, to take the initiative for research in relation to developments in the discipline.

We can now give some examples of studies we are working on.

1) Exploratory study concerning managers in chosen shared-time work.

There is a real craze in France at the moment for the system of shared-time work (articles published in the press, seminars organized, books published...). It is a system where a manager has a part-time contract with several firms. He thus works full-time by holding simultaneously several part-time jobs. When we look in detail at the publications on this new form of activity, we can note some convergent and some divergent points. The similarities concern the advantages of shared-time work at an economic level: the system of multi-employment allows small companies to provide themselves with the necessary competence, while minimising employment charges (since the salaries are not for full-time work). Shared-time working is a source of job creation, which is all the more interesting to consider since France is a country of small firms.

But, we can also note some divergent points in the literature: they concern the psychological effects of shared-time work. For certain authors, this system leads to managers who are totally fulfilled. For others, it leads to an increase in the mental load and particularly to an absence of equilibrium between personal, social and professional life. We were contacted by an organization to study this question.

We carried out a study using the inventory grid of the System of Activities developed by the Social Psychology research team in Toulouse. We compared managers who had full-time jobs with those who had shared-time work. We were able to observe that the managers with shared-time work over-invested in the professional domain and neglected the social and family domain. For these managers, there is an absence of equilibrium between their personal life and their professional life.

2) The representation of the constraints of the environment held by company chief executives.

We were asked to carry out this study by an employers' organization. In the world of employers, we can note that chief executives, in the present-day context, are particularly concerned by the environment and its constraints. The constraints of the environment are numerous and were identified by a preliminary study. The aim of the study, which used J.C. Abric's central core theory,

was to see how the representation of the constraints of the environment is structured. The study was carried out in collaboration with the "Social Representations" team (C. Guimelli) at Montpellier University.

A comparison at an international level could be developed, and if any colleagues are interested, I can provide them with more detailed information.

Apart from these studies carried out at the request of organizations, we are also interested in explanations in organizations and in the role which they play in personnel recruitment.

Studies show that in situations of recruitment, the recruiters prefer internal candidates to external ones, even if the "internals" perform less well. We are presently studying the role of factors which can affect this preference (type of job, structure of the company...).

Ivan Robertson
Professor of Occupational Psychology
Manchester School of Management

1. Personality and individual differences

For most of my career I have been interested in individual differences in disposition and mental ability. I am currently involved in setting up a longitudinal study, involving students at my own University. The first phase of data collection took place last year, where we collected personality and other test data for an intake to the first year of the University of over 400 students.

The intention is to follow this group of students through their University career and onwards into working life.

2. Personnel selection and assessment

The interest in individual differences has over the years led to a significant amount of my research and consultancy work being focused on personnel selection and assessment issues. My current research interests within this area focus particularly on the criterion-related validity of personality.

I am currently involved in a series of studies which are based on the collection of personality data for large samples of people within organizations, and the linking of personality variables with work competencies, occupational choice, well-being and attachment.

3. Behavioural Interventions in organisations

Another stream of my recent research has focused on the use of applied behaviour analysis within organisational settings. One recently concluded research project was funded by the UK Health and Safety Executive and ran for over six years. the focus of this project was safety and accidents in the construction industry.

During the project we designed measurement systems and behaviour intervention procedures (using goal setting and feedback techniques), designed to improve safety and in the longer term reduce accidents on construction sites. This work is continuing and has expanded beyond the construction industry into process industries. We are looking for opportunities to move beyond the domain of safety.

Bernhard Wilpert
Research Interests:
'60's: Personnel in Technical Assistance. Cross-cultural communication.
'70's: International comparative studies of participative management: Eight country study of managerial decision making. Industrial Democracy in Europe: Twelve country comparison.
'80's: Industrial Democracy in Europe: replication study in 10 countries.

Meaning of Working: international comparison in eight countries; replication in four countries, Management in intercultural settings: Comparison of Japanese and European management development strategies in multinational companies. Study of German-Chinese joint ventures.
'90's: Human factors in safety and reliability of high hazard organisations (nuclear power plants, chemical industry); event analysis and incident reporting; systems safety. We have a little research centre systems safety in our university which I direct and from where we conduct presently several studies in the area of systems safety under which notion we also cover traditional aspects of work safety.

Mare Teichmann
1. Collaborative International Study of Managerial Stress. Co-ordinator Prof. C. Cooper, Manchester, UMIST;
2. Estonian Managers' Leadership Style, original questionnaire, research of ca 300 managers in Estonia;
3. Attitudes toward the teamwork in Estonia, original questionnaire, research ca 300 managers in Estonia;
4. Burnout among Estonian managers and municipality officers, General Burnout Questionnaire created by Prof. W. Schaufeli (Utrect University, The Netherlands);
5. Estonian Version of Big Five Questionnaire;
6. Quality of Life Study in Estonia, Co-ordinator WHO:
7. Quality of Working Life in Tallinn and Helsinki, collaborative study with one trade union of Finland.

2. REPORT ON RESEARCH EVALUATION IN I/O PSYCHOLOGY

Tony Keenan: Heriot-Watt University
After the symposium on research evaluation in March 1996, Tony Keenan had agreed to contact ENOP members with a request for information on systems of research evaluation which existed in their countries.

During this session Tony summarised the replies received from ENOP members. It was clear from the replies that the UK has the system which is most highly developed. There is a relatively formal system in the Netherlands. Most other countries, with the exception of Finland, do not have national evaluation systems.

Summary of survey results

In March 1996, all ENOP members were circulated with a request for information on research evaluation systems in their country.

Replies were received for the following countries:.

Spain; Germany; Czech Republic; Holland; Estonia; Switzerland; Sweden; Slovenia; and Denmark. Some of these were nil returns, in the sense that they simply stated that no evaluation scheme existed. In addition prior information was already available from the March 1996 symposium for the UK, Holland, Russia, and Poland. Details of the research evaluation systems in these last four countries have already been reported in the Newsletter.

The nature and format of the replies was vary varied and therefore difficult to summarise. However, I have done my best to do so below:

The UK

Details of the UK system have already appeared in the Newsletter and interested ENOP members should consult this. However, very briefly, the key features of the UK system are as follows:

· it is clearly the most highly developed of all the systems.

· its sole purpose is resource allocation based on previous research performance

· it is formula based

· the sums of money involved are very significant.

· it is based on peer review

Holland

Information on The Netherlands is also available in the Newsletter.

Important features of the Dutch system include:

· it is based on **international** peer review
· comparisons are made across different fields of psychology
· the focus is on the evaluation of research programmes
· five aspects of research are evaluated - research quality; research productivity; relevance; viability; management
· the relationship to resource allocation is not clear

Russia

The situation is summarised in the Newsletter. There does not seem to be a formal system as such at the present time.

Poland

Once again information is provided in the Newsletter and again there does not appear to be anything resembling the Dutch and British systems.

Czech Republic

There does not appear to be a formal evaluation system, other than a scheme for evaluating individual research projects.

Germany

The data received relates to a scheme operating at The Berlin University of Technology. The system described appears to be used for cross-discipline comparisons within the institution. There is a numerical weighting system for different types of "Scientific Effort" and "Managerial Effort". There are various achievement classes including:

· publications
· research grants
· scientific community
· co-operation
· tutoring

Additional staff may be allocated to high performing departments as an incentive.

Sweden

There are currently no general systems of evaluation covering all disciplines. However, some assessments have been carried out by the Swedish Council for Research Evaluation into cognitive psychology and biological psychology. These are essentially narrative reports produced by a small international group of "eminent" psychologists.

Switzerland

No formal system

Finland

There is a national evaluation system for teaching and research. Key features of the system include:

· much of the focus is on evaluation of teaching programmes
· some emphasis on self-evaluation
· evaluation is carried out by an international team of experts
· cost-effectiveness seems to be emphasised more than quality
· extra resources (3 - 4%) are allocated based on cost-effectiveness

Denmark

To-date evaluation has been qualitative. but standardised models are likely in the future. There is a Council for Research Policy which has evaluated research in health and agriculture. Evaluations have been based on:

· need for a national research strategy
· scientific quality
· dissemination of results
· relevance to society

The emphasis seems to be on the determination of national priorities for research, rather than to reward excellence.

Estonia

No formal system

Slovenia

No formal system other than for evaluating individual research projects.

Spain

A system is in place for evaluating the research of individual professors. Key features include:

· the system is voluntary
· the evaluation committee is composed of peers
· evaluations can have a small influence on salary

Parameters for research evaluation

It is clear from the above that research evaluation can take a variety of forms and can be carried out for a number of different purposes. Any attempt to identify the most appropriate system(s) of evaluation for I/0 psychology must somehow take account of these factors. Four relevant factors would seem to be:

1. **The purpose of the evaluation.** What should evaluation be used for? What is it trying to achieve?

2. **The assessors.** Who should carry out the evaluation? Should it be peer review? Should it be an international group?

3. **The comparison group** What should I/O psychology be compared with? Other fields of psychology? Other disciplines?

4. **The criteria for evaluation and their weighting.** What should we count and how should we weight the different elements?

Each of these is considered below and, some proposals are put forward in order to stimulate discussion.

Research evaluation and I/0 psychology

The Purpose of Research Evaluation

A key issue is whether or not research evaluation should be used for resource allocation. We should not only accept this as inevitable, but should welcome it if we believe that good performance should be rewarded. The amount of resource allocated on this basis should be sufficient to act as an incentive. However, it should not be so areas that a poorly evaluated unit is so damaged financially that it can never recover.

Research evaluation should also be used developmentally to provide feedback to units, to help them identify where they need to improve, to provide advice, and to help set future performance targets.

The Assessors

Despite its flaws, the system of peer review has much to commend it and should be a cornerstone of any evaluation system. There are advantages in drawing from an international pool of psychologists for this purpose, especially in the case of small countries.

However, I/O psychology claims to be an applied discipline and as such, unless our research has real influence on organisations and how they are managed, it is of little value. It is therefore proposed that our customers - i.e. practising managers - should also be part of the evaluation process. If our research does not have real world impact why are we doing it?

Although there is the obvious danger of self-serving bias, an element of self-evaluation should also have a place in any comprehensive system of research assessment.

The comparison group

Presumably few would argue with the suggestion that different I/O research groups can be compared meaningfully with each other. Close comparisons with other fields of psychology is more problematic. For example, if we wish to be judged by the real world impact of our research, then publication in professional journals assumes more importance than might otherwise be the case. Also, laboratory based psychology is likely to generate more papers in a given time frame than more time-consuming field based studies.

It seems, then that close comparisons with other areas of psychology for purposes such as benchmarking is inappropriate.

Criteria and weighting

Scientific publication is central to research activity and the quality and quantity of published output should be the single most important criterion for evaluation. Given the pedestrian nature of so much of our research, special credit should be given for innovative work.

The scientific impact of research publications should be taken into account. Also, as an applied discipline, the impact of research in the real world should also be emphasised.

As an input measure, the value of research income should be a minor factor in evaluation. Management of research is in a similar category.

It is possible to attach weights to the various evaluation criteria, such as a points system for different categories of publication, or a weighting according to the amount of research money generated. However, there are a number of problems here, not least of which is the arbitrary nature of the weights. How can we say how much a referred paper is worth compared to a non-refereed one? Also, we need to learn the lessons from attempts to
apply MBO in organisations i.e. if targets are set in terms of quantifiable elements of the job, equally important qualitative aspects are ignored as people "play the game". What better way would there be to stifle creative research than to reward People for playing a numbers game?

It is proposed that we should argue against artificial quantification in favour of a more qualitative approach. This would be particularly appropriate if the focus of evaluation was developmental rather than resource allocation.

Tony Keenan 27th February 1997

Report on the discussion session on research evaluation in work and organisational psychology

During the ensuing discussion, It became clear that a variety of different perspectives on research evaluation existed amongst the members of ENOP. Despite these differences in perspectives, it was also clear that the issue was likely to become increasingly important in most member countries. With this in mind it was agreed that the topic of research evaluation should remain on the agenda for future annual meetings.

ENOP ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM 1997. Paris, MSH 20-22, March

Dissemination of knowledge in W&O Psychology: *From Science to Practice and Back Again*

INTRODUCTION

-Jose-Maria Peiro

The generation of knowledge and its dissemination and use in the professional practice involves many roles and processes. If we focus on the process of knowledge generation, researchers play a central role but this is also the case of gatekeepers of communication systems in the scientific dissemination process. It is also of interest to address the sources of inputs (clients, Public administration policy makers,...) which influence research decisions in terms of topics, approaches and type of research researchers are engaged in.

Other roles are also involved in the process that brings research outcomes into practice. However, it can not be taken for granted that practice is always properly and sufficiently influenced the research outcomes.

In the practice or professional intervention area one can also find several relevant roles: The developer focuses mainly on developing tools, strategies, intervention models, instruments, etc. and on selling them to the professionals or the users in consultancy firms, free-lance consultants or users in the companies and other organisations. The professional or practitioner has also a central role. We mean here the work and organisational psychologists working in the field and carrying out a range of interventions for internal or external clients. These interventions can vary in function of the level at which scientifically generated knowledge and/or technologies developed by others are used. The client also plays an important role in the system in making demands and looking for services of different kinds. Some of them raise research issues, others are oriented basically to the development of new, *ad hoc* strategies and technologies and most of them require practitioners' services.

One can also find within this system several hybrid roles. For instance, the researcher role is in some cases combined with the one of the developer and of the consultant - practitioner. In fact, a number of research projects extend their activities to the development of methods, strategies, instruments and tools for interventions. Some researchers also act as consultants for companies or other clients. On the other hand also, the development role is often hybridised with the one of practitioner and consultant.

Within this complex system, many relevant issues can be addressed and discussed during the symposium. As a starting point, here are some of them:

1) Recent changes in the world of work that have been generated by changes in the economy, technologies, markets, cultures etc. modify the demands from organisations in our discipline and make some of the developed tools in work and

organisational psychology obsolete (see Cascio, *American Psychologist, 1995).* How could research and development activities cope with the new demands '?

2) What are the facilitating Factors that foster the processes which bring sciences into practice and stimulate inputs from practice into the scientific research activities in the Field of Work and Organisational Psychology?

3) What are the main barriers that make it difficult for all these interactive processes of information and influence to happen ?

4) What are the processes that contribute to the misapplication of scientific knowledge into practice ? How to prevent or correct it ? Mechanisms of quality control? Accreditation or practitioners '?

5) What are the main issues at the European level concerning the dissemination processes across countries and across cultural boundaries ?

Pascale Jost/ Vincent Rogard

Research in social science within S.N.C.F: an on-going learning process

PRESENTATION OF S.N.C.F

There are 175,000 staff on S.N.C.F's pay-roll including:

- some 96,000 staff fulfilling functions in connection with railway safety:
- 17,600 drivers,
- 27,000 staff in charge of traffic-control in signal-boxes and train-movement/shunting,
- 51,000 staff in charge of maintaining fixed works (tracks, signalling equipment, signal- boxes....) or traction and rolling stock,
- 19,000 staff who provide customer-service in some form.

S.N.C.F's organisation

It is based upon activities:

- Business activities for medium and long or short-distance passenger services and freight services,

Each business-sector is responsible for its functions/jobs: sales staff, train commercial staff.

The provision of traction-units and drivers as well as the delivery of maintenance tasks - and the corresponding functions/jobs (maintenance-staff and drivers) come under the Delegate Director-General <Business>.

- The infrastructure sector is responsible for designing, operating and maintaining fixed installations and managing the corresponding functions/jobs (signallers, shunting staff, fixed works maintenance staff).

The Human Factors Department

The Human Factors Department (Human Resources HQ) was set up in January 1995 by merging several entities which used to be spread out in the Human Resources HQ, ie:

- the service for psychology,
- the service for ergonomics,
- the division for the prevention of industrial hazards,
- the management and organisation unit,
- the Human Factors unit, now known as <Development Unit>.

The appended paper sets out the terms of reference of the Human Factors Department.

The group of such entities was aimed at enhancing this approach and addressing human factors issues in a more professional way in order to promote synergies and pluri-disciplinary approach.

Research in human and social science: historical background

In the eighties, S.N.C.F had to face a series of serious railway accidents, which prompted an audit into railway safety conducted by a group of experts who did not belong to S.N.C.F.

This analysis led to some conclusions and recommendations for the management of the safety-system and the inclusion of the human factors approach which was considered as sub-optimal in a labour-intensive industry.

Hence, top managers decided to set up a Human Factors' unit in order to promote and develop the human factors approach and they realised the need to open up he organisation to the external environment, notably with a view to establishing contacts with social science researchers.

The impact of the agreement on research

SNCF anticipated that research in social science was likely to lead to fruitful findings (but did not know which) and was wondering how to make contacts to this end, because this approach was seen as a major opportunity.

At that time, the Ministry for Research and Technology wanted to foster research initiatives in the field of social science and develop co-operation between researchers and industry on such topics.

This is the background against which a <research -agreement for work to be performed during several years in the field of social science in order to meet corporate concerns and to contribute to more dynamic research> was signed by the Ministry of Research and S.N.C.F in 1989.

A steering group comprising representatives of the Ministry for Research and Technology as well as of research-teams was set up in accordance with this agreement.

This agreement included a clause whereby the Ministry would fund research conducted within this framework (up to 25% of costs).

The financial incentive associated with the agreement was not negligible to start with but, more importantly, the steering group played a key-role in that it helped S.N.C.F clarify their main concerns among a list of topics which could become eligible for research, and more importantly, the names of research bodies which were likely to give a favourable response to these needs.

Four topics were short-listed initially:
1. Organisational and human aspects in connection with safety,
2. Human and social aspects in connection with technical systems design,
3. Snapshot of professional groups and identities,
4. Health condition at work.

Regarding the first topic, two teams were involved with two subjects: a team of ergonomists and a team of psychologists.

Regarding the second topic, a team featuring experts from various disciplines (organisation, management, ergonomics, sociology) was called upon to focus on one topic.

Regarding the third topic, two researchers (both being sociologist) worked on two different subjects.

Finally, a single research-initiative was taken concerning the fourth topic in the field of medicine.

Note: the responsibility for the implementation and monitoring of the agreement was given to the new Human Factors Department rather than to the Research Division - the latter being entrusted with the responsibility for technical research-work; the Human Factors unit was thus entrusted with the task of managing the corresponding budget.

Working of the agreement: stock-taking exercise

This assessment was carried out by a team of sociologists.

This gave us the opportunity of highlighting the various difficulties encountered while the agreement was effective, with its share of successes and failures. This has shown that research is based upon two converging factors: a genuine concern for a company and a research-subject put forward by a laboratory. Sometimes, the converging point cannot be

found immediately: this requires discussions, refocusing, redrafting. The organisation may be puzzled by this process to start with but, at the end of the process, it is so rewarding.

This analysis has highlighted that proper research-work could not be conducted without a relation of trust between the researcher and the subjects under consideration: this relation can be established because the researcher s not within the company, he/she has a professional code of conduct when performing his/her job.

The assessment has shown some of the major weakness in this sort of enterprise, or at least within S.N.C.F: this project was not always fully supported by all concerned at HQ level; managers being ill-informed, they did not show sufficient involvement, the de-briefing sessions were hastily organised or no action was taken as a result of such sessions and overall, the findings were not sufficiently capitalised upon.

Benefits derived from the agreement

Understandingly, this research programme gave us a more thorough insight into human factors issues. The company was prompted to adopt a more professional approach in this respect.

This agreement was also an impetus for further research-actions: although the validity of the agreement came to an end two years ago, eight research-contracts were entered into, six of which are currently in hand and two due to be entered into, shortly.

In other words, it is fair to say that research into social science is now part of the railway setting.

Where have we go so far?

Each problem needs an appropriate response. When a railway service is faced with an issue or a problem which requires a human factors approach, the answer may come from:

- specialists within the company: psychologists, ergonomists, etc..
- a consulting firm,
- a research team.

We tend to go for the first option when a diagnosis is needed or when a project needs to be taken on board and monitored within the organisation.

As a rule, we call upon external resources when specialised skills are not available in-house on a permanent or temporary basis.

In this case, if the problem and the objective are clearly identified and if an answer is needed pretty urgently, we would rather call upon a consulting firm. Conversely, when the issues at stake are diversified, ill-defined, when reasonable timescales are available for such investigations, we prefer to call upon a research-team who is expected to help us express our needs more clearly, will take time to consider the problem from various angles and will be more inclined to play the neutrality/objectivity card than consultants.

The route and its destination are more uncertain with a research-team than with a consultancy firm but we can cope with it because we consider that the subject-matter demands it.

Involvement of the various sectors within the company

The overall approach taken by S.N.C.F to human factors and social science research in particular has been favourably influenced by the guidelines made by the Ministry for Research in 1989 and strongly advocated by the experts who issued the audit-report on safety. Nevertheless, the degree of involvement of the various players tends to vary.

Some services which were involved in the research-programme are henceforth capable of formulating potential research themes and can now be regarded as autonomous in this respect. This includes services in charge of safety-related jobs, which seems logical because such issues were addressed in the research-programme, following the recommendations made in the safety audit-report. It is clear that the managers concerned were convinced of the validity of such approaches after having been able to appreciate the value of research-findings from their own point of view.

Managers in other areas cannot fully perceive the benefits to be derived from social science at this stage if only because they have never been involved in such processes.

Such managers/services are known to work regularly in conjunction with consultants, namely on the marketing side.

The majority of corporate services are to be found in-between those groups: they acknowledge that social science research could usefully contribute to their thinking process and lead to some valuable solutions.

However, they need a strong incentive in order to embark upon a research exercise because they are worried about the level of input and support required on their part and they resent the risk of being strongly challenged.

Management systems

Although our organisation has made much progress with regard to human factors and social science research in particular, it is fair to say that it still engineering-orientated.

This is the reason why the Human Resources HQ have managed the budget for social science research from the outset (2% of S.N.C.F's Research budget, ie. Slightly more than 3.5 million French Francs).

Today, the Development Unit is responsible for encouraging and fostering social science research within the engineering functions or the business-sectors; it has to help them support this process, analyse research findings and fund such work. However, we do not want to take over their steering role: should a given department not wish to embark upon a research-initiative, we will give up the idea, at least provisionally, even though we think it is worthwhile.

We think that this policy is worth pursuing and we want to remain in control of the social science budget because we feel that it may be used for totally different purposes if another department or sector of the company, or even the research division, were to manage it.

In summary, social science research is currently regarded as necessary but not as essential: its status is not all that strong within the organisation!

Conclusion: a few research themes for the future

S.N.C.F has underlined the importance of human resources for corporate development. Due regard to human factors is essential, more than ever and social science research plays a vital role in this perspective.

Some research themes are still to be focused upon and others are emerging such as:

- population ageing and impact on skills
- adapting people (staff or customers) to new technology,
- effectiveness of new teaching methods and means (eg: virtual reality),
- responsibilities and competence of supervisory and management staff,

Report by the editor of APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY: An International Review on communication through journals, future trends and challenges: gate-keepers

Michael Frese, University of Amsterdam, Dept. of Psychology, Roetersstraat 15, 1018 WB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Having been an editor for about six years now, I must admit that I felt less like a gate-keeper and more like a facilitator although, of course, one of the functions of the editor is to provide a journal with high quality articles and ultimately that means that articles with an inadequate research design have to be rejected. On the other hand, it also means that articles that have not been well-developed but that have a good research design should be revised (more often than not two or three times) to produce an article that contributes to science.

In terms of future trends and challenges I would like to concentrate on issues that are near to my heart and have something to do with a European focus:

1) In terms of nationality of reviewers, American and British reviewers are still the best ones. Most European countries don't have a long tradition of reviewing and therefore many reviews are not as good as they should be. A good review attempts to find out what the most important issue of a manuscript is and starts to work from that, whether the theory on this issue is really well-developed and how one can improve it, whether the design actually speaks to the issue and whether the data contribute to the issue, and how the analyses can be improved. Finally, it looks at the discussion in the same way. A bad review takes an outside standpoint

and says "..that is what I think ought to be done about an issue in this area". So, bad reviews very often say "...the following articles have not been cited and therefore the article is not acceptable" instead of saying why the manuscript should take notice of certain published articles and how it would improve the manuscript. In short, good reviews use the objective of the article as the reference point and give reasoning for each of the criticisms made.

Of course, the review also has to catch potential problems of an article. The most frequent problems are design issues and the pursuit of trivial questions. Design issues that frequently lead to a rejection of an article are related to using a cross-sectional questionnaire approach without any reference to some objective feature, some aggregated scores, some additional source of information, etc. While cross-section questionnaire research is acceptable in some cases (e.g. when a new issue is to be developed), it is not acceptable if one is working in a well-developed area. Trivial issues are not replications. As a matter of fact, replications are very useful, particularly when they are done in other cultural environments (in APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY we therefore introduced the International Replication Note). A question is trivial when it is a simple translation of something that has been done before with a small change in the procedure. In some cases, researchers may still be unlucky and get reliabilities that are too low or get results that are so confusing that one is not able to make a coherent article out of it.

The most important issue that I want to drive home here, is that reviewing needs to be taught. Therefore, we should teach our graduate students in Europe how to do reviews and I would appreciate if people would actively approach the editors to say that they have graduate students who should be given reviews from time to time. In such cases, I usually try out certain reviewers and with graduate students I was very seldomly disappointed.

2) I think there is a high need to keep up European journals. Quite obviously European journals have a tougher time than American journals. There is a tendency for Europeans not to cite each other and sometimes not to even take notice of other work in Europe but to be only oriented towards the United States. This leads to a lower citation rate for European journals than for American ones. Even very good European journals like the Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology have drastically lower citation rates than mediocre American journals. Since there is pressure on people to publish in high citation journals in some European countries, we really have to work very hard to keep up European journals.

A major reason why I would like to defend European journals is because of their content. As I see it, US journals are usually oriented towards maximization of internal validity with less regard to issues of external validity. Therefore, there are more studies on students, often smaller issues and smaller theories are preferred, etc. The European journal, as I see it, have a stronger focus on external validity that leads to articles with a higher emphasis on the selection of subjects (for example, blue collar workers), observational methods, longitudinal studies, and in certain cases qualitative studies. Often, there is a reference to some bigger theories, although this may lead to a relationship between the theory and the hypothesis that is not as tight as is customary in the U.S. Also, Europeans

frequently have a tendency to look at societally important issues. All of these trends should make us proud and should deepen our strengths.

Nevertheless, European journals in general have to be really on top in the competition for the best manuscripts. They should have a very quick turnaround time (we had about 90 days in APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, which was competitive to most other journals in the world), there should be constructive and good reviews, there should be interesting features, e.g. the point/counterpoint article in JOB, or the lead article in APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY: An International Review, or the type of special issues with a healthy mix of practitioner and scientific viewpoints as the European Journal of Work and Organizational psychology features. We also do not need to emulate rejection rates of 90%. A rejection rate of about 70%, as APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY has had, is completely adequate to produce a journal with good articles.

Special feature articles like the lead article in APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY actually lead to enormously high citation rates. Some of these lead articles are cited more frequently than typical Psychological Review or Psychological Bulletin articles. However, the author always has to help in the process and it pays to send an article once it has appeared to those people who have been cited in the article.

3) It is a sad fact that one future trend will be that the non-English European journals will not do as well anymore as the English-language ones. This will mean that these non-English journals will have to reorient themselves and service important national niches, for example giving overviews for professionals on important scientific areas providing practitioner-oriented articles on issues of validity and reliability of measurement methods, case studies, reports on innovative practical methods, e.g. in training, selection, organizational development, etc. More likely than not, the typical scientific article on a research project or on theory development will appear in the English-speaking journals in the future. This trend already exists in the smaller European countries like The Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden but surely this will also happen in the larger countries like Spain and Germany. It is better to take notice of this trend rather than to lament it.

Sebastian Barajas, Andersen Consulting, Barcelona, Spain.
Linking research outcomes and interventions. A management consultant standpoint.

Is Organisational Psychology an independent field? Does it belong exclusively to the psychology domain or can it be considered as an important management discipline?.

In a perfect world three different roles would supposedly be interconnected in a seamless process: Researcher, consultant and manager/practitioner. But this is far from reality.

Only recently some of the outcomes of OP research and theories that have been alive for the last 4 decades are being seriously taken into account in management. Most of them, leadership, organisational culture, motivation, resistance to change and others, are being introduced through business schools by *management gurus* .

My short contribution in the following paragraphs is a personal reflection as well as some of my opinions based on my experience as a consultant, in the development of a new field of practice (change management) in Andersen Consulting, an international professional firm.

In my everyday contact with managers, I have realised that most of them are paid for doing and not for thinking. Despite the possible implications that this could have in the development of a management theory, my point of interest is the assumption that management techniques and tools in use form a static *frame of reference* that determines a business context in which the management activity is developed. Thus, a common set of shared models and standardised solutions configure the limits of a community of practice in any point of time. To change this *FOR* , a cognitive process of re-framing is needed, and the effort and energy to do it massively is costly and uncertain.

We, as consultants, have the opportunity of playing some key role in this re-framing process, but as in any other *cognitive therapy* some pre-requisites are needed before starting the process.

The foremost requirement is the identification of what we call a *business imperative* to distinguish it from a *good idea*. In a strict business logic the willingness to be re-framed will depend only on whether the cost of not doing it is higher than the cost of staying. In other words, it will only happen when a crucial business problem cannot be properly managed within the current business context. While *good ideas* are nice to have and are to be found mainly in the world of conversations and pending issues for the next budget, *business imperatives* trigger real change.

The gradual introduction of new management concepts drawn on OP is being made by leading companies that identify crucial business problems and do not find the proper answer within the common knowledge . On the other hand, for most companies, organisational culture or leadership development, to use a couple of examples, are still in the list of *good ideas*.

The other requirements, if the initial re-framing process is successful at the adequate level of the organisation (usually Top Management), are the capabilities the organisation has to acquire and share with the individuals and groups which it is composed of. This is a second level issue but it can imply a fundamental barrier in implementing the new approaches, for creating these capabilities is very costly and time consuming.

Summarising this first point, the introduction of new management concepts based on the findings of OP research will imply the necessity of a cognitive process for those people with enough power to force their organisations to go into a new paradigm and a subsequent massive process of education and learning to fully develop it towards its ultimate consequences. For this process is very costly, it will be started and maintained only when facing a *business imperative* kind of situation.

Our experience as consultants is that there is only a handful of leading companies that are already prepared to initiate this journey and an important number of others that are intellectually interested in this field but lack the requirements to sustain the efforts.

My second point is that there is a disconnection and a lack of common language between the work researchers do at university and the real needs practitioners have in the business arena. What drives research? How is it evaluated and rewarded?. Who cares about the applicability of the outcomes?. The logic of scientific research is not immediately applicable for final users. As in other disciplines, a second level of research closer to the real needs and driven by those ones is possibly needed.

Everybody knows how tough it is to study and understand theoretical concepts and try to convert them in sound and applicable business solutions. Practitioners seldom have the time nor the willingness and capacities to do it and it is not their job indeed.

As consultants we are interested in developing applicable concepts, models and tools to bridge the gap between the basic research and the final needs. Our own vision is that OP has a fundamental role to play in the world of business and organisations as marketing, accounting or engineering have played in the past. The pure essence of the discipline, understanding the dynamics of people at work, will be crucial to the development and success of most organisations in the 21st century. The key questions are: How can a practical field be defined inside OP? What activities will it encompass? How can the contribution and impact that this activities will have on the business be measured?.

In our internal approach we call this new practical field Human Performance Management and it encompasses all the knowledge, models and tools that will allow any management team to address the people's issues towards specific business outcomes in any work situation.

OP has the opportunity to add value and even reformulate the current set of management concepts, tools and techniques. But before doing so and becoming a well understood and broadly accepted applied discipline there are still some challenges that it has to face:

1.- To define part of its activity from the final desired results, e.g. to improve and manage human performance in the organisations, in addition to just understanding the general laws that govern the dynamics of people at work.

2.- To continue integrating the knowledge in a systemic model. Although analysing motivation as an isolated research issue is perfectly sensible, activities to simply improve motivation amongst the work-force are sometimes difficult to implement and seldom yield lasting effects on the final business outcomes.

3.- To devote a restless effort to the development of tools that quantify the problems and measure the results. You only get what you can measure.

Finally, I am completely sure that OP has a golden future and that there is a *win to win* relationship between scholars and consultants identifying areas of priority for empirical research and building the consulting practice based on sound scientific knowledge as well.

Bjorn Zakarias Ekelund. An invitation to present from a practitioner's view the problem of dissemination of knowledge: from science to practice and back again.

Professional background

- Leader of Norwegian Society for Organisational Psychology, since 1995.
- Managing director of Human Factors (Nor) AS, since 1993, Scandinavian branch of Human Factors International, consultants in business psychology and strategy development.
- Part time working for University of Tromsoe, Department of Psychology, since 1985.

A) From university to the practical world

1) **What did you learn in school today?**
What is of special interest to practitioners considering what they have learned at universities? The most dominant answers among psychologists are:
Positive: Methodology, qualitative methods excepted
Understanding of personal/social/contextual behaviour, terminology
Communication
Minus: Cross professional interest/respect/understanding/exchange
Co-operation, project-organising themselves and other modern didactic, involvement, empowerment of students

II) **Then you start working in the real world, outside universities**
When psychologists start practicing - what they do not know is the most visible, resulting in a critique of psychology courses. Their first attitudes form the way they integrate later experiences. The challenge is to promote an attribution differently, in order to create a life- long interest in the academic field.

B) The academic construction of reality

I) **From science to practice, and back again**
Was science our starting point? To me practice come first. Opinions differ in what is our starting point. This dialectic questioning might have a mental model trapping our thinking. It might be that social knowledge is more creative, relevant and easier to implement, if developed among people taking part in the process. Is social science a question of generic results or local knowledge? This post-modernistic, perhaps a bit social anthropologican, question is crucial. To the practitioner the N=1 concept, the case study, capture the complexity better than advanced precise models.

A classical critique directed to academics: write in a way we understand, and tell us in abstract what is relevant to know. Another critique is that the way scientific results are presented in journals has an artifical format, and do not reflect the way

knowledge is developed. For practitioners who do not take actively part in this academic tradition this often feels uncomfortable and not true.

Dissemination through journals takes too much time. Often 6-10 years have passed from questions being raised until empirical results are presented in journals. Why not arrange conferences where practitioners and academic people can meet, update and communicate?

II) **Where is knowledge developed and stored? In books, heads or bodies?**
The academic develops his knowledge in interaction with a few international colleagues with common interest in the same problem. Their knowledge is accumulated in scientific literature and their own heads. For practitioners knowledge develop interacting within the real world, experience integrated with personal history. The development of questions and knowledge is a story of unique complexity. How might isolated academic knowledge grasp this complexity? Will a perception of this contextual situation from an academic angle not only catch glimpses of the knowledge relevant to the practitioners?

C) **Context for usage**

I) **Right ideas, wrong contexts**
Academic criteria for certain knowledge are often based upon precision, though they often lack relevance; ecological validity. Significance is often minor, too. Genuine change processes are complex and involve the whole production field. The management field encompasses only few elements which might be facilitated by psychological knowledge. Among psychologists humbleness is scarce, and omnipotence on behalf of own knowledge is a challenge for academics as well as practitioners.

II) **The art of creating uniqueness**
High performing consulting and empirical knowledge are in their nature different. In consultation we often stimulate development of a competitive advantage; unique solution to unique situations that are not easily copied. Empirical knowledge is often more general, main stream, established knowledge. What are the consequences for use of empirical knowledge?

D) **Personal level**

I) **What is the meaning of life?**
Theoretical/empirical knowledge being the major important phenomena is a well known attitude among academic elite. In this field they are the champions. Their theoretical positivistic view some times result in arrogance towards arguments based on feelings, impressions, unique experiences, values, individual mastery etc. For

most people; love, happiness and doing the right thing are more important than a precise empirical based understanding of the world.

II) Practitioners don't like to communicate with professors

To practitioners meeting the academic elite is often a repetition of "the professor knows better than me", "he does not respect my work", and "the arguments come from the position of expert power, as always". Taking part in this kind of conversation does not facilitate positive professional self development. An attitude of acknowledgement, respect, understanding and care might be more facilitating. The practitioners are often successful consultants who get good feedback, and often create unique results. Why take part in academic discourse when feeling of failure is often a result?

E) The future of universities?

Is university as a model, with it's organisation and culture, optimal to develop knowledge? There are certainly some elements functioning in the opposite direction. Do models exist for managing know-how companies which might bring better results to the development of both basic and applied knowledge? At the same time, we must respect approximately 600 years of university tradition, and not start re-engineering due to market oriented critique in the 1990-ies. How do we build organisational openness in universities leading to development of knowledge more relevant to practitioners' field? Perhaps the most radical solution will develop outside universities; organisations giving more equal exchange of empirical experience and new ideas, settings where both clients, practitioners, academics and students work together? Perhaps this kind of context will reduce the attitudinal problems between practitioners and academics in the future.

Dublin City University

Multiple roles make the interaction between research and practice easier? The perspective from a researcher consultant.

Hurley outlined in this presentation his view that the organisational psychologist is a scientist practitioner. He or she is firstly a scientist, but is also a person who can a transfer science to practice via consultancy or advisory work. It is recognised that this combination is difficult to achieve. It is made more difficult by the perception among many people that these two roles are exclusive domains. Certainly it is very difficult to combine both roles particularly if there is conflict in the level of the consultancy involved and the level of the scientific expertise of the organisational psychologist. Consultancy is often low level and repetitive and is not appropriate to the serious scientist. On the other hand some consultancy is challenging and difficult and poses questions which push out the margins of our field beyond what we already know or are competent in. It is the latter type of consultancy that can be stimulating and valuable to the scientist.

Other tensions exist too; often the values and perspectives of management consultants are different from those of organisational psychologists. Organisational psychologists have long-term perspectives and take into account a wide view of organisational effectiveness. There is also an expectation among client organisations that we will be scientific and objective. This is a great advantage that we have over traditional management consultants .The Japanese after the second world war; adopted those principle which organisational psychologists were proposing in their text books at the time, and accepted it as the best available approach in designing and organising and managing their organisations. These same text books were regarded in the United States and Europe largely as being rather theoretical and not necessarily to be taken very seriously. The Japanese took them seriously and found it worked effectively.

The organisational psychologist -developed in the traditional mode- will however find pressures to remain within the scientific role and not to move outside it. These pressures include the pressure to publish and do rigorous research; the pressure to teach ,pressure to develop new courses. But there are also negative forces placing pressure on the organisational psychologist to remain within the scientific domain which may relate more to a certain limited area of competency than to any pressure to publish.

We are looked upon as the sources of new ideas in organisational thinking, yet it is ironic when one considers the fields of selection, training, organisational design and development, to realise that the major contributions to these fields have been made not by management consultants but by organisational psychologist.

A small example of the interlinking nature of research and consultancy can be taken from a recent study which Hurley conducted in scientific discovery. This in large part derived from earlier studies into the impact of new technologies in the workplace and the growing awareness of the changing nature of the highly skilled and professional organisation, This has become known as the knowledge organisation. A paradigm of this is the scientific research laboratory . This led Hurley to carry out a study on the organisational environment surrounding the Nobel Laureates in the sciences and draw conclusions of a general and organisational nature. A theoretical explanation is provided and a methodology for future research suggested.

At this point experimental advisory work to scientific laboratories is being carried out based on the findings of these studies and the results of experimental changes made in the laboratories is being monitored.

This case history illustrates the cyclical nature of research and consultancy provided the consultancy is at a stimulating and demanding level.

If we believe with Lewin, that there is nothing so practical as a good theory, then we need not only to develop these theories within a sound methodology of science, but we need to pass on the knowledge we have developed to organisations which can appreciate that knowledge. And we need to be able to test the validity of such theories and reflect and develop new insights on them.

We need to avoid becoming involved at a routine level in organisational problems or in repetitive advisory work such as occupational testing or training. The funding available may well be attractive and we may argue that such monies may fund other more interesting research. But the danger of the loss of genuine and important scientific insight is very real . He closed by suggesting some issues that we need to think about

1. Should the integration of science and practice take place within individuals or between individuals?

2. Do we have a role in educating our postgraduate students in consultancy competency?

3. Do management consultants have a role in educating us?

4. Given the diverse value systems of consultants and organisation psychologists is collaboration a realistic possibility?

Saturday, 23 March.

Business meeting.

A preliminary discussion took place during which the minutes of the last meeting were agreed, and the Agenda for the Business Meeting drawn up. The agreed Agenda is as follows:

AGENDA

1. Four Year Plan.
2. Work and Organisational Psychology Evaluation.
3. Symposium 1998.
4. Workshops
5. Summer Schools.
6. Library Project.
7. Curriculum Development.
8. Erasmus etc.
9. Research.
10. Publications.
11. Elections to Coco.
12. Membership.
13. Budget.
14. Any other business.

1. **Four Year Plan.**

V. Rogard negotiates the contract between MSH and the French ministry and reminds that financial support is limited. B. Wilpert prepared a program of ENOP activities in the future including topics such as networking, curriculum development, exchanges, interdisciplinary co-operation, evaluations, etc., which should be used as a base for negotiating the next contract.

2. Work and organisational psychology evaluation: The topic was discussed extensively at the Thursday-afternoon-meeting and needs to be re-discussed in future. A. Keenan will prepare a list of possible criteria for evaluation which can then be discussed. E. Konrad is willing to collect ideas for evaluation via Delphi-technique. R. Roe proposes rating importance of scientific Journals as a base for evaluation of publications.

3. Conference symposium 1998: Several topics are proposed: Evaluating qualitative research, applicability of theory, standards for curriculum development, future work etc. Agreement can be reached concerning qualitative research. J. M. Peiro and R. Bouwen will prepare statements for discussion at the symposium 1998.

4. Workshops: Various planned activities are mentioned (workshops in Utrecht on healthcare, a workshop on transition, a workshop in Bad Homburg on technological change and safety). B. Wilpert proposes a workshop on innovative teaching techniques. The group concerned with curriculum development might take the initiative for some activities on teaching techniques.

5. Summer school: The 1997 summer school in Budapest will become a successful 3-weeks event: 31 applicants were counted, 25 participants were selected. The invited teachers have agreed to participate. The financial situation is satisfying and the rest under control.

Places for upcoming summer schools are Scandinavia, perhaps Finland in 1999. In the next future Paris might like to organise a summer school.

6. Library Project.

A report was provided by Miklos Antalovits of the successful implementation of the ENOP Library book project in his University.

Report on the
experiences of the ENOP Library Support project in Budapest

1. To date, out of the 53 books included in the list compiled by ENOP 49 have arrived at the Central Library of the Technical University of Budapest. The books were forwarded in three phases. Four items were classified by the supplier as "out of prints' and thus were not supplied. (All four books belong to the "D" - desired - category on our list.) These are:

Bass, B.M.- Drenth, P.J.D. (1987) Advances in Organisational Psychology. An International Review. Newbury Park: Sage.

Frese, M., - Ulich, E. - Dzida, W. (eds) (1987) Psychological Issues of Human - Computer Interaction in the Work Place. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Helander, M. (1990) Handbook of Human-Computer Interaction. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Montgomery, H.- Svensson, O. (eds). (1989) Process and Structure in Human Decision Making. Chichester: Wiley.

2. Books have been registered and processed on the computer. The bibliographic record of each book contains the information that the book was provided for the TUB Central Library by the ENOP Library Support Project.

3. I have made a preliminary agreement with the library management that until August 1997 these books cannot be borrowed by the university population but will be made available for us for the purposes of the ENOP Graduate Summer School between August 10-31, 1997. After that event the books will be placed in one block in the reading room of the library where everyone can have free access to them. Names of donators will be marked on the bookshelf (ENOP, VW Stiftung).

4. According to the contract with the library, the books will be made available to psychologist students of other universities, too. They will have access to the books under the rules and regulations of the library.

5. The Department of Ergonomics and Psychology of the Technical University of Budapest will in both written and electronic forms inform the Hungarian psychologist community (students and graduated experts) of the list of this collection of professional literature and the possibility of having access to it. Our department intends to enlarge this valuable collection from its own resources as well as from others gained through applications.

7. Curriculum Development.
a/ The next step in this project is to develop core courses of a recommended nature.
b/ It was reported that there is a growing interest in EU and in EFPA in Organisation Behaviour and in W/O Psychology.
c/ It is understood that EFPA is suggesting a Diploma in Psychology and seeking funding via Leonardo for it.
A number of concerns were expressed about this. Is this Diploma outside the existing University system? How long would it take? What effect would it have on the standing of existing qualifications? Is the EFPPA Agenda t transform Clinical Psychologists into W/O Psychologists as painlessly as possible?

d/ EC has rejected our proposal for a thematic network. This seems to contradict b/ above.
However a letter of protest and a resubmission is planned.

8. It was agreed that a letter be sent to Socrates about the increased bureaucratisation of the system.

9. Research. No new research was reported.

10. A: Text book proposal.

John Hurley outlined a major text-book project on Work and Organisational Psychology, and sought the collaboration of all the ENOP colleagues and possibly colleagues of theirs in its execution. A publisher is willing to publish this proposal.

In fact he proposed two books; the first is outlined here and would be a relatively short introduction to the field. (c. 200 pages)

The second would expand the same structure and would probably consist of three volumes, one on each of the major subdivisions.

The proposal was received enthusiastically by those ENOP members present, and it was agreed that a group be set up to steer this project to completion, and identify people for each subsection. Members were also encouraged to write with their suggestion also to John Hurley.

A project such as this could have the advantage of creating a conceptual unification of the field throughout the wider Europe. Organisational Psychology (in Europe)
by John Hurley and other ENOP colleagues

The first book would be an introductory book for students in this area, and would consciously treat each of the areas briefly; it would however give a clear picture of the field, and direct readers to further, more advanced texts.

Possible structure:

	Pages:
Introduction	10
Part One:	
Organisational Psychology (main responsibility Hurley)	80
-Research -illustrated by reviews of existing theory	
-Interventions -illustrated by case histories	
-Professional Training (Stages) -illustrating implied competency development	
Part Two: *Work Psychology (main responsibility ??)*	80
-Research -illustrated by reviews of existing theory	
-Interventions -illustrated by case histories	
-Professional Training (Stages) -illustrating implied competency development	
Part Three: *Personnel Psychology (main responsibility ??)*	80

-Research -illustrated by reviews of existing theory

-Interventions -illustrated by case histories

-Professional Training (Stages) -illustrating
implied competency development

Summary and Conclusions 10

Sample content:
Part One:
Organisational Psychology (main responsibility Hurley)

Section 1:
Research -illustrated by reviews of existing theory

The nature of organisations, their role in society.
Differing metaphoric views of organisations
Differing organisational types, based on their functions, whether production related or service, or knowledge based.
Groups in organisations
The individual in the organisation
Motivation and frustration
Leadership
Organisational effectiveness

Section 2:
Interventions -illustrated by case histories
Section 3:
Professional Training (Stages) -illustrating implied competency development

B: The ENOP Newsletter.

John Hurley indicated that having had had editorial responsibility for the Newsletter since 1991, that it was time to hand this on to some other ENOP member. It was noted that during Hurley's stewardship, the Newsletter had become a more comprehensive account of our proceedings and had now a standard expected format. Its blue colour was a help in identifying it from other documents. ENOP members expressed their strong appreciation of the work that Hurley had put into the Newsletter. It was agreed that a new Editor would be found to start with Issue 35 in March 1998. In order to begin the process of transition in an orderly way he sought and received the assistance of two new members Erich Kirchler and with this issue.

A general discussion took place on the Newsletter and it was suggested that we might experiment with and Email version with this issue and see how that worked. Hurley will send the completed Newsletter to Anne Rocha who will Email it to colleagues. This will be reviewed next year. Volunteers for the Editorship -which carries with it enormous status, an unlimited budget, and *very little work*- are sought.

11. No new election to the CoCo took place.

Bernhard Wilpert
49 30 31 42 29 15 49 30 31 42 52 74
Home:
49 30 8262133
email: wilpert@zrzsp3.gp.tu-berlin.de

12. Three new members were elected; Willy Haukedal -Norway; Erich Kirchler -Austria; and Kjell Ohlsson -Sweden.

During a discussion it was agreed that not more than three members should be possible from each country; also that members who do not participate should have their membership lapsed.

Consideration should also be given to those countries still not represented on ENOP.

13. October is the deadline for any proposals which would have budgetary implications.
14. Next years Symposium: 26-28th March 1998, Paris.
15. AOB
Information was provided that the Americans are interested in joint conference or meetings with European W/O Psychologists. This will materialise during the 1998 San Francisco conference.
It was proposed that during future ENOP Symposia, dinner should be arranged for the group as we did successfully this time.

Information for East-European colleagues

The Maison des Sciences de L'Homme runs two visiting scholarship programs:

(1) Bourse Diderot postdoc colleagues from Russia and former SU members. Scholarships up to one year are offered. Applications with full cv and publications list to the Scientific Secretariat of the Maison. Decisions are always made in November.

(2) Mellon: Postdoc scholarships to social scientists from Poland, Hungry, Tchequia, Slovenia up to three months. Applications as above. Decisions are made always in March/April.

Publication Opportunities

Anne Rocha Perazzo edits the Journal Social Science Information and calls for papers to be submitted to her. ENOP as a group supported by the MSH has certainly a responsibility to offer relevant papers.

Communications with CoCo members:

	Telephone	Fax
Miklos Antalovits		
	36 1 4632654	36 1 4632106
	Home:	
	36 1 1623938	
	email: antalovits@tttk.bme.hu	
Rene Bouwen		
	32 16 326056	32 16 326000
	Home:	
	32 16 259502	
	email: rene.bouwen@psy.kuleuven.ac.be	
John Hurley	353 1 7045 224	353 1 7045 446
	Home:	
	353 1 2880763	353 1 2886899
	email hurleyj@vax1.dcu.ie	
Gunn Johannson		
	46 8 16 39 00	46 8 15 93 42
	email: gj@psychology.su.se	
Tony Keenan		
	44 131 4495111	44 131 4513190
	Home:	
	44 131 3313004	44 131 3313004
Anna Leonova		
	7 095 2033123	
	email aleon@chair.cogsci.msu.su	
Claude Levy-Leboyer		
	33 1 40 51 98 12	33 1 40 51 99 19
	Home:	
	33 1 45 00 34 28	33 1 45 00 02 36
	email: levy-leboyer@lpe.msh-paris.fr	
Vincent Rogard		
	33 1 42061860	33 1 4242961858
	email: rogard@ergo-info.univ-paris5.fr	
Branimir Sverko		
	385 1 620216	385 1 620037
	Home:	
	385 1 564417	
	email: branimir.sverko@ffzg.hr	

Bernhard Wilpert
49 30 31 42 29 15 49 30 31 42 52 74
Home:
49 30 8262133
email: wilpert@zrzsp3.gp.tu-berlin.de