

Psychology 882
Occupational Health Psychology
Fall, 2008
W 6:15-9:00PM
Brackett Hall Room 214

Instructor: Robert R. Sinclair, Ph.D.

Office: 319 Brackett Hall
Office Hours: MWF 10-11am; W 5-6pm
Phone: 656-3931
e-mail: rsincla@clemson.edu

Course Description

This course serves as a graduate level introduction to the field of Occupational Health Psychology (OHP). According to the Society for Occupational Health Psychology (www.sohp-online.org), OHP "involves the interdisciplinary partnerships of psychological and occupational health science professionals seeking to improve the quality of working life, and enhance the safety, health, and well-being of workers in all occupations." The course adopts a scientist-practitioner perspective on these issues, emphasizing theory and research as the necessary foundations of practical efforts to create safer and healthier work organizations. As an introductory seminar, the course provides a broad survey of many topics in OHP in order to provide students with a solid base from which to explore topics of interest in greater depth.

Readings

A list of assigned readings is presented later in this document. These two books represent a good starting point for students interested in learning more about OHP and I will assign several chapters from them in this course. I view these books as "required" for students interested in OHP, and "recommended" for I/O or HF students interested in learning more about OHP.

Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & Frone, M. R. (Eds.) (2005). *Handbook of Work Stress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Quick, J. C., & Tetrick, L. E. (2003). *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*. Washington DC: APA Books

Course Objectives

After completing this course, students should be able to:

- Discuss the general history and objectives of the field of OHP
- Describe the field of positive psychology, including causes and consequences of well-being at work.
- Discuss the importance of work place safety and the influence of management on safety behavior.
- Describe basic physiological and psychological mechanisms underlying reactions to work
- Describe prominent personality frameworks related to stress resilience and explain how such individual differences affect workers reactions to occupational demands.
- Describe several "organization of work" factors that contribute to occupational health.
- Discuss the current state of the literature pertaining to occupational health interventions.
- Write a research proposal and give a professional-quality presentation on a scholarly topic of interest in OHP.

Academic Integrity

"As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson's vision of this institution as a 'high seminary of learning.' Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we cannot earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form. In instances where academic standards may have been compromised, Clemson University has a responsibility to respond appropriately and expeditiously to charges of violations of academic integrity."

Please refer to the graduate academic integrity policy, approved March 26, 2007 by the Provost's Advisory Council, at <http://gradspace.editme.com/AcademicGrievancePolicyandProcedures#integritypolicy>. Each graduate student should read this policy annually to be apprised of this critical information.

Course Components & Grading

Grading System

90-100% = A 80-89% = B 70-79% = C 69% = F

Grade Components (see below)

Exam 1	20%
Exam 2	20%
Presentation	20%
Research Proposal	20%
Class Participation	20%

Exams

The exams will be essay based written exams. I will provide you with a study guide consisting of several (approximately 8-12 questions) potential questions. For the actual exam, I will select 5 of these questions and ask you to answer four of them. Your answers will be graded based on your demonstrated knowledge of the relevant material and your ability to present clear and cogent arguments to support any particular position you take. If a question requires you to take a position on a particular topic, your grade will be based on the degree to which you provide thoughtful support for your answer based on reference to course material and/or other scientific literature. It will not be based on the degree to which your opinion/perspective is consistent with mine.

Student attendance and participation

I understand that students occasionally have legitimate reasons to miss classes and I do not take attendance per se. However, this is a graduate seminar. As such, I expect you to attend all classes, complete the assigned reading before class, come to class prepared to discuss the relevant material, and participate in class discussions. Your participation grade also will reflect your effectiveness as a discussion leader in relation to your facilitated discussion assignment (discussed below) and your peer reviews for the research proposals (also discussed below).

Unannounced Quiz Disclaimer

If, in my judgment, it is necessary to give additional quizzes on the readings (i.e., if I get the sense that students are coming to class unprepared), I will give quizzes at the beginning of class. Grades on such quizzes will be weighted as 50% of the participation grade.

Guidance for participation in class discussions:

- **Students receiving a participation grade of A** come to class prepared; contribute readily to the conversation without dominating it; make thoughtful contributions that advance the conversation; show interest in and respect for others' views; participate actively in small groups; pushes discussion to a "deeper" level of analysis.
- **Students receiving a participation grade of B** come to class prepared and make thoughtful comments when called upon; contribute occasionally without prompting; show interest in and respect for others' views; and participate actively in small groups. These students may show interest in the discussion, listen attentively, take notes, and attend class regularly.
- **Students receiving a participation grade of C or lower** miss multiple classes, show evidence of minimal or no preparation for class, provide incorrect or irrelevant answers to questions and/or avoid voluntary participation in class discussions. These students also may talk too much, make rambling or tangential contributions, and sidetrack the discussion. Students in this range may also continually interrupt others with digressive questions, failing to acknowledge cues of annoyance from instructor or students.

Source: Adapted from Bean, J. C., & Peterson, D. (1998). Grading classroom participation. In R. S. Anderson and B. W. Speck (Eds.). *Changing the way we grade student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Facilitated discussion assignments

The most important component of your participation grade will be your role as a discussion facilitator. For most (although not all) weeks of the course, I will assign one empirical study that is meant to spark some discussion among the class. Each week, we will have one facilitated discussion leader selected in advance. All class members are expected to read and be prepared to discuss that study. However, as a facilitated discussion leader, you will read the article approximately 10 days before class and one week before the class, you will distribute 3-4 discussion questions to your classmates. We will use those questions as the taking off point for our discussion of the article. You should be prepared to offer answers to your discussion questions and/or to ask probing questions when necessary (I will help out with this as well). The questions can pertain to specific information discussed in the paper, critical analysis of the theory and methods, practical applications of the issues addressed in the paper, or any other topic that is reasonably connected to the paper. Generally speaking, they should not deal with questions of fact (e.g., who were the subjects, what was the hypothesis, how did they test the hypothesis).

Presentation

Your presentation will consist of a 20-25 minute formal presentation on research, theory, practice, etc. on a topic directly related to OHP followed by approximately 5-10 minutes of time for discussion, debate, questions, and answers. For the class, the purpose of the presentation is to familiarize the class with topics of interest in OHP, but that extend beyond the material I cover. For the presenter, the presentations will give you experience synthesizing material, communicating to a professional audience in a limited time frame, and leading your peers in discussion. Upon request, I will be happy to discuss possible topics with you, recommend readings where I have some, and address any questions you have about preparing a presentation. However, I expect you to be responsible for the structure and content of your presentation. I expect the presentations to be given in power point.

Examples of presentation topics (Any topic related to OHP is fine with me, ask if you have a question)

1. OHP demands of a particular occupation (e.g., mining, agriculture, retail, nursing)
2. Younger (esp. teens) and older (esp. retirees) workers' job attitudes, job behavior, and/or occupational health
3. Domestic violence issues in the workplace
4. Work and family conflict, Work-family positive spillover, and managing a Family-friendly workplace
5. How does participative management benefit employees? How does it benefit organizations?
6. How does electronic performance monitoring affect employee attitudes and behavior?
7. Nature, antecedents, and consequences of a specific form of stress (i.e., pick one)
8. Negative effects of organizational politics
9. Emotional processes at work; emotional labor and customer service
10. Team dynamics, stress, & group effectiveness
11. OHP aspects multicultural and international issues in the workplace
12. Health promotion, health care, health benefits, etc.
13. OHP aspects of stigmatized (i.e., dirty) jobs.

Presentation Grading & Peer Feedback

I will provide feedback on your presentations using the rubric below. I also will assign a numerical grade from 0-100 based on the overall quality of the presentation. You also will provide (anonymous) peer feedback on each presentation using the same system. The peer feedback will be used for developmental purposes, although I may consider it in my grades of your presentations. However, you will not be grading each other.

√ +	<i>Outstanding:</i>	<i>Substantially exceeds expectations in most aspects of presentation</i>
√/√+	<i>Very Good:</i>	<i>Exceed expectations in at least some aspects of presentation</i>
√	<i>Good:</i>	<i>Meets expectations for students in this course</i>
√/√-	<i>Needs improvement:</i>	<i>Somewhat below expectations for this course.</i>
√ -	<i>Poor:</i>	<i>Not acceptable performance for this course level</i>

Name of Presenter:			
Presentation Attribute	Rating	Presentation attribute	Rating
Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides thorough coverage of topic ▪ Focuses presentation appropriately for the time frame of the presentation ▪ Provides clear explanations of material (e.g., defines relevant terms) ▪ Demonstrates sufficient (i.e., graduate level) understanding of material ▪ Effectively answers questions ▪ Avoids excessive use of jargon 	_____	Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uses engaging speaking style. ▪ Demonstrates enthusiasm/interest in topic. ▪ Avoids long pauses in presentation. ▪ Avoids reading directly from slides or notes. ▪ Uses appropriate body language/non-verbal communication. 	_____
Organization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentation is of appropriate length (not too long or too short) ▪ Presentation is coherently structured (i.e., logically arranged to 'tell a story') ▪ 	_____	Visuals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Slides reinforce message. ▪ Slides convey an appropriate amount of material (i.e., are not wordy) 	_____

Comments:

Research Proposal

Overview

The overarching goals of the research proposal are to (1) identify a gap in current literature on a practical or socially-significant issue related to OHP, (2) develop hypotheses that fill that gap, and (3) describe a set of methods and measures that appropriately test those hypotheses. You may choose any project or topic that suits your interests as long as it is (a) clearly linked to OHP, (b) not a straight replication of a published study or of other work you (or anyone else) already have completed, and (c) not primarily focused on a methodological/statistical issue. The literature review should be approximately 70-75% of this content with your hypotheses set off from the text and stated in a testable form (*The Academy of Management Journal* (AMJ) provides a good example of this form – just note that AMJ does not use the required APA citation style). Approximately 25% of the content should be a method section that describes a plausible (hypothetical or real) study that would test your hypotheses, including (a) participants, (b) measures, and (c) analyses, followed by a brief (1-2 pages at most) discussion of the theoretical and practical significance of your proposed research.

General Requirements

The main body of your paper should be a maximum of 20 pages of double-spaced text (i.e., not including title page, 120 word abstract, references, tables, and figures). Papers should be typed and double-spaced (tables, figures, and references, etc. may be single-spaced) with 1 inch margins all around. All text should use 12 point Times New Roman Font (or a very similar font). All papers should include a reference section and should cite other sources according to the **5th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association**. You should focus on the quality of your writing and substantive content, not on the uniqueness of your creative presentation. Accordingly, it is not necessary to use color print, clip art, or other creative devices, unless they are somehow central to research on your chosen topic.

Grading Procedures

I will assign your paper a grade from 0-100 using two general criteria:

Quality of Writing concerns your ability to express yourself effectively in writing. These standards are clearly articulated in the 5th edition of the APA Publication Manual. High scoring papers will (a) use proper English, (b) avoid technical errors (e.g., grammar, spelling, and punctuation), (c) consist of well constructed and well organized prose, and (d) strictly follow the citation style of the American Psychological Association. If you are not familiar with this citation style, you should use this paper as an opportunity to familiarize yourself with APA style, but this is not something I cover in class. Low scoring papers typically include several technical errors and/or are poorly written. **Because you can avoid many of these errors by carefully proof reading your paper, my standards for “A” level work in this domain will be reasonably high.**

Depth of Analysis concerns the thoughtfulness of your paper, the breadth and depth of your presentation of concepts and research, and quality of your ideas and hypotheses. High scoring papers will (a) present a thorough, but focused review of relevant literature; (b) describe a well-conceived set of hypotheses that clearly follow from the literature review; (c) describe a feasible set of research participants and procedures; and (d) generate information of clear applied value. Perhaps the most critical component of this dimension of your grade is the extent to which you present a clear and cogent defense for your ideas, methods, etc.

Late papers will receive a 5% penalty each day that the paper is late, beginning immediately at the end of the class the assignment was due.

Peer Feedback on Papers

As part of the grading process, your paper will be reviewed by two of your colleagues, much as if you were submitting a research paper to a conference or to a journal. You and your classmates will act as reviewers for this process. Thus, you will receive written feedback from two of your colleagues to help you improve your paper. The reviewing process will be blind so that all raters and writers will be identified by numerical codes that I will assign.

You will turn in **two copies** of a draft of your research proposal on the indicated date. All late paper policies will apply to this process. Any necessary late penalties will be applied against your paper grade for late drafts or your participation grade for late reviews. One copy of the draft should have a title page with your name and the title of the paper on the front, so that I can identify the authors of each paper. Both copies should have a separate title page with only the title of the paper (i.e., prepared for blind review). The paper should include a 50-100 word abstract.

As reviewers, you will rate each paper on several dimensions. Then, you will supplement your ratings with detailed written feedback (approximately 1-3 pages) on the writing, ideas, methods, etc. The purpose of the ratings and the written feedback is two fold (1) for the author, it is an opportunity to receive some developmental feedback that s/he can use to improve the quality of the paper (2) for you, it is an opportunity to hone your skills in providing peers with feedback (an important aspect of most jobs in psychology, academic or otherwise).

As a reviewer, you will be expected to return to me, a typed copy of your remarks on the paper (a normal expectation of the peer review process is that the submissions are destroyed after the review). I will return your remarks back to their original authors. I do not expect you to make copy-editing style remarks on the paper itself, but you are welcome to and your colleagues might find it helpful if you have suggestions for them.

As an author, you will receive the comments and address them as best you can in your final draft. Your grade will not be related provide a recommended grade for the quality of the feedback you received on the paper from each separate reviewer. These recommendations will be used to assign grades to reviewers for their reviews. I will expect you to provide a brief written justification for the grade recommendation you provide. Note that "quality" is not synonymous with "positive" – that is, you should expect to receive constructive suggestions to improve the paper, not necessarily all compliments (unless, of course, you deserve them!).

Additional guidelines for reviewers

From Paul Spector's OHP course downloaded from www.sohp-online.org

The purpose of a journal review is twofold. First, it helps the editor decide whether or not to publish an article. Editors need to know what's good and bad about an article, so decisions can be based on a fair and impartial review. Second, feedback to authors is helpful in improving/refining a paper, and in helping them understand why their paper might not have been accepted. Concrete and specific feedback is most helpful. General statements, such as "this is really a crummy paper" are not at all helpful. Better would be a statement such as "the cross-sectional design used doesn't allow for the sort of causal conclusion the authors are trying to reach." Focus on those aspects where you have some expertise. It is not helpful if you "shoot from the hip" and note that something is wrong just because it doesn't "feel right". If you aren't certain about something, either look up the answer, consult someone who knows the answer, or be honest and say that something doesn't seem quite right to you, but you aren't sure why (or even if you are right). If you aren't comfortable commenting on statistics, focus your attention on more conceptual issues. Finally, always remember that being a critic is easy, but doing a good piece of research is very difficult. There are innumerable constraints on I/O research, and what author's publish is typically the best that they could do under the circumstances.

Reviewer Guidelines from Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (OBHDP)

The scientific contribution and reputation of OBHDP depend on attracting and publishing the best available research... Therefore, we offer the following guidelines as reminders of what makes a review beneficial to authors and helpful to the editorial process.

THOROUGH. *We seek reviews that are thorough, meaning they provide a complete evaluation of all aspects of a manuscript. Thorough reviews address the importance of the research question that motivates the manuscript, the degree to which relevant theory and research are incorporated, the strength and persuasiveness of the conceptual reasoning, the soundness and rigor of the research methods and analytical procedures, and the overall contribution of the manuscript. We also welcome reviews that comment on issues of presentation, such as writing style and the structure and organization of the manuscript. Good ideas lose their impact if they are not communicated clearly and effectively.*

CONSTRUCTIVE. *We encourage reviewers to provide comments that are constructive. Reviews should be critical, but criticism should be accompanied by suggestions for solving problems, even if those solutions might not be feasible for the manuscript under review. Criticisms should also focus on attributes of the manuscript, not on characteristics of the authors of the manuscript. Constructive reviews also provide a balanced evaluation, identifying weaknesses as well as strengths associated with a manuscript. Typically, even manuscripts that cannot be salvaged have some redeeming qualities, and it is appropriate to highlight these qualities as the foundation for future research. Finally, constructive reviews provide specific feedback, thereby helping authors understand the basis for the evaluation of the manuscript and how to respond if a revision is invited.*

TIMELY. Authors are naturally anxious regarding the fate of their manuscript, and journals that provide prompt feedback are more likely to attract the best manuscripts. Therefore, please complete and return your review promptly. One late review stalls the entire reviewing process and negates the promptness of other reviewers. If you are unable to review a manuscript within the specified deadline, please notify us immediately so we can assign another reviewer. However, we hope you can find the time to review manuscripts we send you. We are very selective in choosing reviewers and truly need your feedback.

We would also like to offer some general suggestions for your review. First, please number your comments and indicate the page number or section of the manuscript to which each comment refers. Doing so facilitates communication with authors and helps guide revision if one is requested. Second, please rate the manuscript online based on the criteria of the manuscript evaluation form... Third, do not include a publication recommendation, because other reviewers may express different views that must be reconciled by the editor. Please convey your publication recommendation to the editor using the drop-down menu online, or if you send your review via e-mail, on the manuscript evaluation form. Fourth, we use a double-blind review process. If you know or suspect the identity of the authors and therefore feel you cannot provide an objective review, please notify us and we will assign another reviewer. Fifth and finally, remember that a manuscript under review is a confidential document. Therefore, please do not discuss the manuscript with anyone other than the editors; do not use materials from the manuscript in your own research, and guard the manuscript from misuse by others.

**Advanced Applied Organizational Psychology
Reviewer Checklist**
(Do not put your name or other identifying information on this paper)

Paper number: _____

Reviewer Number: _____

Editorial Recommendations

Evaluation	Unacceptable	Marginal	Acceptable	Excellent
<u>Purpose/Gap Statement</u> - The purpose is clearly stated – the gap in the literature addressed by the paper is socially, theoretically, or practically significant.				
<u>Literature Review</u> - Review is thorough and linked to the problem of interest - Review clearly connects prior literature to current problem of interest				
<u>Hypotheses</u> - Hypotheses are testable - Hypotheses logically follow from literature review				
<u>Methods</u> - Measures are appropriate for key constructs - Stated analyses provide a reasonable test of hypotheses				
<u>Discussion</u> - Implications of potential findings for theory and/or practice are identified				
<u>Quality of Writing</u>				

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION (Is this a viable idea for a research study?)

- _____ EXCELLENT (only minor changes are needed)
 _____ ACCEPTABLE (one or more significant, but fixable, problems that can be addressed in a revision).
 _____ MARGINAL (one or more major flaws that may be difficult to address in a revision).
 _____ UNACCEPTABLE (numerous and/or devastating concerns that are unlikely to be able to be addressed in a revision)

COMMENTS FOR REVIEWS:

Please type your comments for the authors and attach them to this page. Your comments should specifically address issues raised in your ratings above as well as suggestions you have for the authors to improve the paper. Your comments should be positive and constructive but also developmental. That is, your comments should address both the strengths and weaknesses of the paper in a professional manner that provides specific actionable feedback without being excessively negative or demeaning when there are problems. If you have a few editorial-type suggestions, simply add type-written notes in your review. If you have many editorial suggestions, you may attach a copy of the paper with those issues noted, but you still need to address your major concerns/issues in a type-written report.

OHP Part I

Topics & Assignments

HOHP = Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology

HOWS = Handbook of Work Stress

Week	Date	Topic	Assignment notes
1.	8/20	Introduction to Course <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Scope of Course- Presentation Planning- Emergence of OHP- Public Health Model	*Readings (skim HOHP Ch 1 & 2)
2.	8/27	Positive Psychology <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Positive Organizational Behavior- Affective Well-being- Intrinsic Motivation	* HOWS Ch. 23 + Readings
3.	9/3	Physiological pathways <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Endocrine System- Immune System- Cardiovascular System	* HOHP Ch 13 + Readings * Guest Speaker: Dr. James McCubbin: <i>Work Stress, Health Psychology, and Cardiovascular Disease</i>
4.	9/10	Workplace Safety <ul style="list-style-type: none">- OSHA- Safety performance- Safety climate	* HOHP Ch 3 & 6; HOWS Ch. 10 + Readings * Presentation Brainstorming * Facilitated discussion: <i>Unintended consequences from work practices (Kaminski, 2001)</i>
5.	9/17	Mental Health & Work life <ul style="list-style-type: none">- PTSD- Conservation of Resources Theory- Burnout & Engagement;- The triple match principle	* HOHP Ch 12 + Readings * Facilitated Discussion: <i>Emotional labor in call centers (Goldberg & Grandey, 2007)</i>
6.	9/24	Individual differences in resilience <ul style="list-style-type: none">- What is personality?- The Five Factor Model- Personal POWER	* Readings * Study Guide 1 distributed on 9/25 * Facilitated discussion: <i>Psychological capital training – (Luthans, Avey, & Patara, 2008)</i>
7.	10/1	Mid-term exam	

OHP Part II

Topics & Assignments

HOHP = Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology

HOWS = Handbook of Work Stress

8.	10/8	The changing employment relationship: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exchange Theory - Organizational commitment - Organizational support - Psychological contracts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Readings * Facilitated discussion: <i>Profiles of employee turnover (Maertz & Campion, 2004)</i>
9.	10/15	Organizational justice and the changing organization of work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ERI - Organizational Justice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * HOWS Ch. 4 + Readings * Facilitated discussion: <i>Lean production (Landsbergis, Cahill, & Schnall, 1999)</i>
10.	10/22	Nonstandard Work Arrangements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contingent work - Shift work - Long work hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * HOHP Ch 8; HOWS Ch 3 + Readings * Facilitated discussion: <i>Not all part-time workers are alike (Martin & Sinclair, 2007)</i>
11.	10/22	Leadership: Good & Bad <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leaders as the problem - Leadership as the solution - Leaders as the victims 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * HOWS Ch 5 + Readings * Facilitated discussion: <i>Abusive leadership (Tepper et al., 2008)</i>
12.	10/29	Unions & OHP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Union attitudes - Union member behavior Economic stress <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Job Insecurity - Financial Stress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * HOWS Ch 11 + Readings * Guest speaker: <i>Economic Stress (Lindsay Sears)</i>
13.	11/5	OHP Interventions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Health Framework - Specific Interventions - Intervention challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * HOHP Ch 15; 16 + Readings * Facilitated discussion: <i>Evaluating organizational-level work stress interventions (Cox et al., 2007 & Sharf et al., 2008)</i>
14.	11/12	Enduring challenges (Time permitting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Science to practice issues - Design issues - Levels of analysis issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Any assigned reading will be announced approximately one week before this class.
15.	11/19	Presentations (1-5)	* Proposal Draft Due
16.	11/26	Thanksgiving Vacation	* Peer Reviews Due Monday
17.	12/3	Presentations (6-?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enduring Challenges/Course Wrap-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Final Proposal Due * Study guide 1 distributed
		Final Exam	Study Guide

Reading Assignments

Introduction to OHP

Quick, J. C. (1999). Occupational Health Psychology: The convergence of health and clinical psychology with public health and preventative medicine in an organizational context. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 30, 123-128.

Macik-Frey, M., Quick, J. C., & Nelson, D. L. (2007). Advances in occupational health: From a stressful beginning to a positive future. *Journal of Management*, 33, 809-840 **[Note: Focus on pp. 809-827]**

Positive Psychology

Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 57-72.

Lucas, R. E., & Diener, E. (2003). The happy worker: Hypotheses about the role of positive affect in worker productivity. In M. R. Barrick & A. M. Ryan (Eds.). *Personality and work: Reconsidering the role of personality in organizations* (pp. 30-59). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Physiological pathways

Sapolsky, R. M. (2004). *Why Zebras Don't Get Ulcers: An updated guide to stress, stress-related disease, and coping (3rd Ed.)*. New York: Freeman. **[Note: Chapters 2, all; Ch 8 pp 127-139 page numbers from 1st edition]**

Schwartz, J. E., Pickering, T. G., Landsbergis, P. A. (1996). Work-related stress and blood pressure: Current theoretical models and considerations from a behavioral medicine perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 287-310.

Taylor, S. E. (2006). Tend and befriend: Biobehavioral bases of affiliation under stress. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 273-277.

Workplace Safety

Kaminski, M. (2001). Unintended consequences: Organizational practices and their impact on workplace safety and productivity. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 127-138.

Mental Health & Work life

Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Buckley, M. R. Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, 30, 859-879. **[Note: Focus on pp. 859-867]**

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513-524.

Penk, W., Drebing, C., & Schutt, R. (2002). Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). In J. C. Thomas & M. Hersen (Eds.) *Handbook of Mental Health in the Workplace* (pp 215-247). Beverly Hills: CA: Sage.

Goldberg, L. S., & Grandey, A. A. (2007). Display rules versus display autonomy: Emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and task performance in a call center simulation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 301-318,

Individual differences in resilience

McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new big five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, *61*, 204-217.

Sinclair, R. R., Oliver, C. M., & Deese, M. N. (Forthcoming). Personality-based resilience: Individual differences in the stress response process.

Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Patera, J. L. (2008). Experimental analysis of a web-based training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *7*, 209-221.

Baumeister, R. F.; Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 351-355.

Employee commitment and retention; Psychological contracts

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Topolnytsky, L. (1998). Commitment in a changing world of work. *Canadian Psychology*, *39*, 83-93.

Eisenberger, R. (n.d.). *Introduction to Organizational Support Theory*. <http://pos.psych.udel.edu/theory.asp>

Maertz, C. P., & Campion, M. A., (2004). Profiles in quitting: Integrating process and content in turnover theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*, 566-582.

Harman, W. W., Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Felps, W. O., & Owens, B. P. (2007). The psychology of voluntary employee turnover. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 51- 54.

Rousseau, D. M., & Ho, V. T. (2000). Psychological contract issues in compensation. In S. L. Rynes & B. Gerhart (Eds.). *Compensation in organizations: Current research and practice* (pp. 273-310). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Organizational Justice and stress

Sauter, S., et al. (2002). *The changing organization of work and the safety and health of working people*. DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 2002-116. (Available on-line: <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/pdfs/02-116.pdf>). **[Note: Chapter 1 Only]**

Greenberg, J. (2004). Stress fairness to fare no stress: Managing workplace stress by promoting organizational justice. *Organizational Dynamics*, *33*, 352-365.

Landsbergis, P. A., Cahill, J., & Schnall, P. (1999). The impact of lean production and related new systems of work organization on worker health. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*, 108-130.

Nonstandard Work Arrangements

Johnson, J. V., & Lipscomb, J. (2009). Long working hours, occupational health and the changing nature of work organization. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, *49*, 921-929.

Quinlan, M., & Bohle, P. (2003). Contingent work and safety. In J. Barling, & M. Frone (Eds.). *The Psychology of Workplace Safety*. Washington DC: APA Books.

Martin, J. E., & Sinclair, R. R. (2007). A typology of the part-time workforce: Differences on job attitudes and turnover. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 301-319.

Leadership: Good & Bad

Arnold, K. A., Kelloway, E. K., McKee, M. C., Turner, N., & Barling, J. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*, 193-203.

Britt, T. W., Davison, J., Bliese, P. D., & Castro, C. A. (2004). How leaders can influence the impact that stressors have on soldiers. *Military Medicine, 169*, 541-545.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications*. New York: Free Press. Note: Chapter on Stress & leadership: pp. 634- 657.

Tepper, B. J., Henle, C. A., Lambert, L. S., Giacalone, R. A., & Duffy, M. K. (2008) Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 721-732.

Unions & OHP

Kelloway, E. K. (2004). Labor unions and occupational safety: Conflict and cooperation. In J. Barling & M. R. Frone (Eds). *The Psychology of Workplace Safety* (pp. 249-264). Washington DC, APA Books.

Newton, L. A., & Shore, L. M. (1992). A model of union membership, instrumentality, and opposition. *Academy of Management Review, 17*, 275-298.

Economic stress

Probst, T. (2004). Economic stressors. In J. Barling, E. Kelloway & M. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress* (pp. 267-297). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

McKee-Ryan, F., Song, Z., Wanberg, C., & Kinicki, A. (2005). Psychological and physical well-being during unemployment: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 53-76.

OHP Interventions

Sharf, T., Chapman, L., Collins, J., Limanowski, J., Heaney, C., & Goldenhar, L. M. (2008). Intervention effectiveness evaluation criteria: Promoting competitions and raising the bar. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13*, 1-9.

Cox, T., Karanika, M., Griffiths, A., & Houdmont, J. (2007). Evaluating organizational-level work stress interventions: Beyond traditional methods. *Work & Stress, 21*, 348-362.