

SGM 2022

Building the future of work and organizational psychology: Developing a practical toolkit

ACTIVITY REPORT

1. Event General Information

Date and Local Organizers

The FoWOP Small Group Meeting 2022 was held from 21st to 23rd of September 2022 at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Campus Etterbeek. The conference venue was the “U-Residence” at Generaal Jacqueslaan 271, 1050 Elsene.

The local organizers were: Theresa Leyens and Tim Vantilborgh (both from the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium). The other (non-local) organizers were: Severin Hornung (University of Innsbruck, Austria), Franziska Kößler (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), John Mendy (University of Lincoln, United Kingdom), Francesco Tommasi (Verona University, Italy), and Yvonne van Rossenberg (Radboud University, The Netherlands).

In addition to the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP), the SGM received funding or support by the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology (EAOHP), Associazione Italiana di Psicologia (AIP), Belgian Association for Psychological Sciences (BAPS), and Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek – Vlaanderen (FWO).

Participants overview: Number; diversity of institutions; diversity of countries

Overall, the meeting had a highly international character, attracting 26 participants from 17 Universities based in 9 countries, namely, Belgium, The Netherlands, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. The vast majority of these attended in person.

2. Program Overview and Course of the meeting

The program and schedule of the SGM was communicated to participants in advance and was made available online (<https://www.futureofwop.com/program>). For additional details to the information provided below, please refer to the program.

General and Specific Topics' overview

The general theme of the FoWOP Small Group Meeting 2022 was: “Building the future of work and organizational psychology: Developing a practical toolkit”. The program was divided into two tracks: “Building tools to improve WOP research” (Track 1); and “Building tools to improve life in academia” (Track 2). Sessions were allocated to one of these tracks, which are described in more detail below.

Track 1: Building tools to improve WOP research

This track focused on taking a critical stance to how we do research in WOP—both in terms of theory and research methods—and to develop tools that help WOP members to improve the quality of their research and practice. Participants drew on perspectives from various critical traditions, to address the dominance of neopositivist epistemologies in WOP, thereby enabling us to grapple with fundamental questions about the nature of what and how we do research. Simultaneously, participants built on the notion of

substantive-methodological synergy, emphasizing the need for a close match between research questions and research methods. Participants were invited to reflect on methodological pluralism and to link this topic to open science practices and other best practices.

Track 2: Building tools to improve life in academia

Within this track, we capitalized on the expertise of participants to develop tools that help improve life in academia. On the one hand, participants were encouraged to use their expertise to make academia a healthier workplace, for example by developing tools that can help deal with job uncertainty or burnout within an academic context. On the other hand, participants were asked to reflect on practices that promote equality in the workplace, to improve wellbeing for everyone in academia

Meeting Format/organization

The meeting was organized as an in-presence meeting over the course of two and half days, from Wednesday morning (September 21st, 9:30) until Friday early afternoon (September 23rd, 14:00). Only in a few exceptional cases (i.e., short-term travel restrictions), we gave participants the opportunity to join the SGM online. Participants were continuously provided with a variety of refreshments, fruits, and snacks, refilled for the 5 official coffee breaks. On all three days lunch was served directly at the conference, including vegetarian and vegan options. An attractive conference dinner was offered to participants free of charge at nearby restaurant on the first day of the conference and a more modest reception with snacks and drinks was organized on the second evening at a student bar on campus

Keynote speakers

The opening (un-)keynote session featured three keynote speakers:

- Edina Dóci from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- Yvonne van Rossenberg from Radboud University, The Netherlands
- Matthijs Bal from the University of Lincoln, United Kingdom

Rather than looking back at past academic achievements and individual tributes, which are central to traditional keynote speeches, the (un) keynote format was based on personal stories and reflections on current WOP. In addition, the three speakers each discussed their visions for future WOP practice, whilst engaging the audience in the discussions.

Number of papers

The program comprised overall 15 session in different formats: 1 Opening and keynote session; 2 moderated workshops; 7 interactive unconference sessions; 4 lightning talk sessions; 1 Closing discussion. In the course of the 4 lightning talk sessions, altogether 12 oral presentations were given. Overall, 21 proposals were accepted and presented in these different formats.

3. Short description of the SGM topic discussion

In this SGM, we were aiming to address the current crisis in work and organizational psychology, which includes, among other problems, the lack of research replicability, questionable research practices, the increase of mental health issues in academia, rampant inequalities, and the fact that quantitative, positivistic methods and results that support a managerialist “performative” agenda are typically favoured over more unconventional and critical approaches. In different conference formats, we were able to bring together ideas for meaningful change and discuss the adoption of alternative research practices and topics to improve the social relevance and impact of the discipline.

Main conclusions/Lessons learned related with the Meeting Topic

With two thematically different tracks, we were hoping to contribute to developing tools and practices that can be used to build a more sustainable future in WOP, specifically, one

that has more societal relevance, promotes equality, embraces diversity, makes academia a healthier environment, and builds on rigorous scientific methods and a more reflexive and critical approach to issues of power, inequality, and exploitation in work organizations. In summary, the SGM did tackle the abovementioned issues and provided participants with both theoretical insights as well as practical ideas and inspiration to work our way out of the psychology crisis. Participants contributed creative, insightful, critical, and visionary submissions, while focusing on real solutions and forming bonds and collaborations. Among the lessons learned were, that our topics are diverse, yet have a common core. In practical terms, it became clear that more frequent networking opportunities, common projects, and mutual support is needed to develop alternatives to current closed-shop publication, collaboration, and career systems. With regard to substantive issues, research needs were identified relating to elaboration, refinement, adjustment and application of critical theories of work and employment, alternative research approaches and the exploration of new methodologies. Several initiatives to allow this were discussed and implemented, such as regular meetings, follow-up events, and research collaborations.

Contributions for a Research Agenda

One take-away message from the SGM was the insight that our topics are diverse and heterogeneous, comprising issues such as inequality and discrimination, precariousness and marginalization, the critique of neoliberal ideology, and health and well-being in the workplace and work and organizational psychology as an academic discipline. These issues are complemented by concerns over epistemological and methodological issues as well as research practices. Trying to integrate these issues and concerns into a coherent research agenda will most likely fail because it can hardly ever be comprehensive and therefore might exclude relevant approaches and topics. Therefore, the overwhelming consensus was to continue to adopt a pluralistic and open agenda around our shared visions and values for the world of work and academia. A task force for developing a positioning statement on visions and values was initiated and has since convened several times.

4. Meeting implications/outcomes

Although the SGM was not primarily geared to be an instrumental but rather a communal effort, several potential scientific and applied outcomes were identified or emerged, including contributions to the upcoming EAWOP Conference as well as ways to better connect with practitioners. However, an emphasis was put on networking development to further establish and institutionalize the FoWOP initiative. These three main areas of outcomes are elaborated below.

Scientific expected outcomes

One emphasis of the SGM was to coordinate and bundle contributions of the network to the next EAWOP Conference in Katowice, Poland in 2023. A central activity will be organizing a full-day preconference workshop (FoWOP-day) as a sequel to the one convened at the last EAWOP Congress in Turin (2019). Further, the overall group has compiled submitted proposals for 3 symposia and 1 panel discussion as well as several individual oral presentations to the Congress.

Further, several groups of authors are working on individual journal papers, based on or related to contributions presented at the SGM. Plans regarding the proposal of a position paper or a special issue are currently still being discussed.

Knowledge transference---applied expected outcomes

A recurring topic of the conference was how to increase engagement with and involvement of organizational practitioners, for instance, in the course of research, consulting and change projects, as well as with regard to inclusion in the FoWOP network. Several suggestions and strategies were shared in this regard. A particular focus was on increasing contacts and connections with labor unions, both with regard to work and organizational research contexts as well as employee rights and working conditions in academia. Specifically, the participants discussed particularities of and differences between national systems of employee representation and collective bargaining in Europe and beyond.

Networking development

An overall implication of our SGM was that we need to stabilize our opportunities for exchange and distribution of our research. Although this concerns the form rather than the content, this is an important result because we noted several problems and inequalities related to the existing research and publication culture throughout the meeting. Both the planned FoWOP day and the projected Special Issue are supposed to be platforms in which researchers can discuss and publish their theoretical and empirical works concerning major topics of this SGM. Topics resulting from the first track include blind-spots, both methodologically and theoretically, such as neoliberal ideology in workplaces and work and organizational psychology; Open Science but also general publishing practices; and the neglect of marginalized groups and their needs. The second track highlighted a strong need for developing and practicing collective approaches to improve health in academia. Such efforts are probably best met in strong sustainable support networks that require continued work and exchange. In the last closing discussion of the SGM, we specifically developed ideas on how we can continue our discussions and increase the strength of the network. Among others, we decided to create a platform that offers events (e.g., future small group meetings but also regular virtual meeting opportunities) and resources (e.g., newsletters). For example, in the spirit of communal effort and community support, we (or some of us) have launched the FoWOP Café, a weekly online meeting on the zoom-platform, where people associated with the FoWOP network and those interested can join the group, catch up on their latest activities, share ideas for future events and paper development, and discuss topics of research and teaching interest from the field of WOP. Other ideas relate to the consolidation of email lists and membership directories, the FoWOP website and joint research and writing groups and projects.

5. SGM Evaluation

Several measures were taken to evaluate the success of the meeting and identify areas for improvement for future events. First, impressions and feedback from participants were gathered at the meeting in oral form and afterwards invited via email. Second, several post-SGM meetings by the organizing committee were conducted to discuss our own assessment and impressions as well as the gathered feedback from participants.

5.1 Self-assessment of the SGM

What went well

All aspects connected to the organization of the SGM went really smoothly and even exceeded our expectations. The location and rooms at VUB were ideal for the purpose in terms of a central location, contained space, room sizes, equipment, public areas etc. Coffee and lunch breaks offered all that was needed and the conference dinner was very

well received. Also, the scientific program was focused, well integrated, and sessions complemented each other, creating synergies.

What were lessons taken from the SGM organization, what you would change, do it differently?

The SGM was planned and conducted as an in-person event. However, a small number of participants could not travel physically due to personal health or other important reasons. These were accommodated for by using hybrid technology to allow virtual participation. This “hybridization” worked surprisingly well and without causing significant disruptions. In hindsight, we might have advocated this option more widely to increase inclusiveness and outreach to interested researchers not actively presenting but still interested in the program. In fact, it would not have incurred any extra costs or efforts and could maybe have been offered free of charge. We understand, however, that this would have created an additional category of “listening” virtual attendants, beyond the limited number of active participants of an SGM. Thus, there would still be pros and cons to be considered regarding such a virtual extension.

We tried to avoid parallel sessions as far as possible. Yet, in a few cases, it was unavoidable, creating the need for participants to decide between sessions. Next time, we would try to avoid any parallel sessions altogether.

Overall, we were quite satisfied with the mix of more conventional oral presentation sessions, structured workshops, and more open “unconference” sessions. However, for the future we would consider experimenting with additional novel and unconventional session formats.

5.2 Participants assessment of the SGM

After the SGM participants were asked via email to evaluate the SGM in terms of features they enjoyed most and points for improvement. Below is a compilation of representative opinions and feedback provided by SGM participants.

What I enjoyed most:

- I find the program very enriching, interesting and thoughtful.
- It was a wonderful opportunity to meet with researchers from different institutions that I had no chance to meet before.
- It was also a great to catch up with colleagues whom I work on different projects.
- Overall, I enjoyed the opportunity to present, share and discuss the future of WOP with researchers who work on very interesting, eye-opening topics.
- The non-traditional session formats that allowed for in-depth discussions and debates about important topics. This also allowed for other types of (interactive) presentations that really engaged all participants.
- The small scale of the SGM, allowing to engage and connect with all participants.
- The open atmosphere of the meeting. It was my first time to participate in this community and I felt really welcome in the group. And all opinions are valued.
- The opportunity to join remotely, if travels are difficult in times of COVID-19. But I would not recommend to have a majority of participants joining virtually, because it alters the dynamic.
- Thank you and the organizing team for the effort. It was so much fun and I enjoyed myself at your conference.

- I very much appreciated that people were waiting in the lobby, welcoming us, when arriving, it was comforting and beautiful. I think even the food was inclusive.
- I don't work with any other work psychologists at my institution, so I always deeply value being able to spend time with the colleagues I saw at the SGM. We meet in other contexts too, such as EAWOP for example, but at the SGM we were able to sit together, listen, and talk at leisure. This is very nurturing, creating a different quality of connection and personal development. More than that, we were invited to imagine how things might be different in our field and work on ideas and plans for change together. This is how change might move from a hope to a reality.
- I left feeling re-energised for my work, inspired about the future, and grateful for the opportunity of re-connecting with this wonderful group of people.
- Being in Brussels was ideal because of how easy it is for so many of us to get there.
- Having plenty of space in the programme for breaks was good - lots of important chats happened 'in the margins' and it helped me pace my energy and brainpower throughout the event.
- I liked that the timekeeping was a bit flexible too because there was enough space for conversations to continue when it felt important.
- The diversity of session topics was excellent. It was fabulously organised throughout.
- The conference dinner was amazing!
- Since Covid and Brexit, many of us in the UK have felt worried that we will struggle to maintain our connections with European colleagues, limiting the contributions we can make to European work psych, and extending the tendency for UK psychology to go its own way. There were several UK colleagues at this event, which felt like a hopeful sign that we are still able to collaborate meaningfully (across western/northern Europe at least), which ultimately will benefit us all.
- The conference was very good. It had very positive ambience, very well-structured program, and many excellent and insightful talks and workshops, offering a wide range of perspectives
- It offered a fantastic opportunity for building connections and community among FOWOP scholars, and was also organized in a way that generated these experiences.
- It gave me a very profound experience, characterised by inspiration, community, shared values and purpose, and lots of intellectually stimulating perspectives.
- Very well organised, a good balance of discussion and presentations, openness and supportive atmosphere
- A good range of perspectives and viewpoints that stimulated debate (e.g. the discussion around concept precision that prompted lively debate)
- The small group meeting offers an open space to discuss different perspectives on WOP research. The interactive elements (e.g., workshops) distinguish it from other conferences.
- The small group meeting focuses especially on research with great societal impact, and gives a platform to discuss topics that are in urgent need of discussing with a wider community (e.g., work pressures, inequalities).

Points for improvement:

- I really couldn't say.

- Your conference worked with the wording of "unkey note", "unconferencing sessions" etc. In that context, I was disappointed with some of the talks, with scholars who ignored that format and got away with it. I think we could be more strict with our aims and style, given our workload and conditions. I suggest, even interrupting talks. I attended a conference once, where that was the rule, and it was put through with a bell, and it was a lot of fun and worked very well and positively (we laughed a lot, and it was not hateful or mean). This is just an idea, also to break our own habits and challenge ourselves and each other and take ourselves seriously
- Publicise the hybrid option further in advance and more often to the FOWOP network - I have the feeling that many more would have joined if they knew how good that option was going to be! This could have enabled more people from E/S Europe and elsewhere to be part of what was happening, which would enrich the event.
- What I would do differently next time: I would make the sessions more interactive, more 'creatively' designed (like in Breda [the first EAWOP SGM by FoWOP], with many different alternative session formats, unlike other conferences)
- The discussion about future plans was at the end of the programme – I had run out of steam by then and felt I didn't contribute much! Perhaps the forward-looking discussions could have been embedded in small sections throughout the programme?
- People started to drift away from the 2nd afternoon. It would be useful to understand why this happened. I wonder whether people might have committed more fully to a 2-day main programme?

6. Annexes

6.1 Final program

Overview

Wednesday 21.09.2022			Thursday 22.09.2022			Friday 23.09.2022		
	Track 1	Track 2		Track 1	Track 2		Track 1	Track 2
09:00			09:00	Lightning 2	Lightning 3	09:00		
09:15			09:15	Green room	Black room	09:15		
09:30			09:30		Un-	09:30		
09:45	Un-Keynote session		09:45		conference	09:45	Workshop 2	
10:00	Green room		10:00		session 4	10:00	Green room	
10:15			10:15		Green room	10:15		
10:30			10:30	Coffee		10:30		
10:45	Coffee		10:45			10:45		
11:00			11:00	Un-		11:00	Coffee	
11:15			11:15	conference		11:15		
11:30	Un-conference session 1		11:30	session 5		11:30	Un-	Un-
11:45	Green room		11:45	Green room		11:45	conference	conference
12:00			12:00			12:00	session 6	session 7
12:15			12:15			12:15	Green room	Black room
12:30			12:30			12:30		
12:45	Lunchbreak		12:45	Lunchbreak		12:45	Lunchbreak	
13:00			13:00			13:00		
13:15			13:15			13:15		
13:30		Un-	13:30			13:30		
13:45		conference	13:45			13:45		
14:00		session 2	14:00	Lightning		14:00		
14:15		Green room	14:15	talk session		14:15		
14:30			14:30	4		14:30		
14:45			14:45	Green room		14:45		
15:00			15:00			15:00		
15:15	Coffee		15:15			15:15		
15:30			15:30	Coffee		15:30		
15:45		Lightning	15:45			15:45		
16:00		talk session	16:00			16:00		
16:15		1	16:15			16:15		
16:30		Green room	16:30			16:30		
16:45			16:45		Workshop 1	16:45		
17:00	Un-		17:00		Green room	17:00		
17:15	conference		17:15			17:15		
17:30	session 3		17:30			17:30		
17:45	Green room		17:45			17:45		
18:00			18:00			18:00		
18:15			18:15			18:15		
18:30			18:30			18:30		

Wednesday | 21.09.2022

	Track 1: BUILDING TOOLS TO IMPROVE WOP RESEARCH	Track 2: BUILDING TOOLS TO IMPROVE LIFE IN ACADEMIA
09:00		
09:15		
09:30	Un-Keynote session	
09:45	<i>Matthijs Bal, Edina Dóci, & Yvonne van Rosenberg</i>	
10:00	Green room	
10:15		
10:30	Coffee	
10:45		
11:00	Un-conference session 1	
11:15	Systematic review of 10 years of WOP research	
11:30	<i>Mehmet A. Orhan, Yvonne van Rosenberg, Matthijs Bal & Zoe Sanderson</i>	
11:45	Green room	
12:00		
12:15		
12:30	Lunchbreak	
12:45		
13:00		
13:15		
13:30		Un-conference session 2
13:45		Problematizing Critical Theory Perspectives in Contemporary Organizations and Society
14:00		<i>John Mendy & Matthijs Bal</i>
14:15		Green room
14:30		
14:45		
15:00	Coffee	
15:15		
15:30		Lightning talk session 1
15:45		Building tools to improve life in academia
16:00		<i>*Details on p. 11</i>
16:15		Green room
16:30		
16:45		
17:00	Un-conference session 3	
17:15	Why are we vague? Towards conceptual precision in work and org. psychology	
17:30	<i>Bram Fleuren & Wilken Wehrt</i>	
17:45	Green room	
18:00		
...		
18:30	Conference dinner at Le Mess	

Thursday | 22.09.2022

	Track 1: BUILDING TOOLS TO IMPROVE WOP RESEARCH	Track 2: BUILDING TOOLS TO IMPROVE LIFE IN ACADEMIA
09:00	Lightning 2	Lightning 3
09:15	Stuck in precariousness: The resilience case <i>Sanne Nijs et al.</i> Green room	Managerial work organization and its impact on mental health in academia <i>Parisa Dashtipur, Nathan Gerard, & Duarte Rolo</i> Black room
09:30		Unconference session 4
09:45		Hypernormalization in academia
10:00		<i>Andy Brookes, John Mendy, Dieu Hack-Polay & Matthijs Bal</i>
10:15		Green room
10:30	Coffee	
10:45		
11:00	Unconference session 5	
11:15	Critical WOP session	
11:30	<i>Matthijs Bal, Severin Hornung, Gazi Islam & Zoe Sanderson</i>	
11:45		
12:00	Green room	
12:15		
12:30	Lunchbreak	
12:45		
13:00		
13:15		
13:30	Lightning talk session 4	
13:45	Research on neoliberal ideology – research as neoliberal ideology: Assembling a reflexive perspective	
14:00		
14:15		
14:30	<i>Session organizers: Severin Hornung & Francesco Tommasi</i>	
14:45		
15:00	<i>*Details on p. 11</i>	
15:15	Green room	
15:30	Coffee	
15:45		
16:00		
16:15		
16:30		
16:45		Workshop 1
17:00		Relieving work pressure in academia, an intervention instrument
17:15		<i>Roel Schouteten</i>
17:30		Green room
17:45		
18:00		
18:15		
18:30		
...		
19:00	Reception at Bar Pilar	

Friday | 23.09.2022

	Track 1: BUILDING TOOLS TO IMPROVE WOP RESEARCH	Track 2: BUILDING TOOLS TO IMPROVE LIFE IN ACADEMIA
09:00		
09:15		
09:30	Workshop 2	
09:45	Using tools to make science more open	
10:00	<i>Tim Vantilborgh</i>	
10:15	Green room	
10:30		
10:45		
11:00	Coffee	
11:15		
11:30	Unconference session 6	
11:45	Pardon My French: On Superfluous Journal	Unconference session 7
12:00	Rankings,	Men and Gender (In-)equality in Academia:
12:15	Incentives and Impacts on I/O	Listening to Men's Perspectives
	Psychology Publication Practices in French	<i>Carolin Ossenkop & Matthijs Bal</i>
	Business Schools	Black room
	<i>Mehmet A. Orhan</i>	
	Green room	
12:30	Lunch	
12:45		
13:00		
13:15	Closing discussion	
13:30	Green room	
13:45		
14:00	Farewell	

Lightning talk sessions | Details

*Lightning talk session 1 | 21.09.2022 | Green room

15:30 | Building tools to improve life in academia

- 15:30 | **Imagining a critical theory of change: making an impact on real world problems**
Andy Brookes
- 15:45 | **Online presentation: Excavating and cultivating the political within academia?**
Stefan E. Huber
- 16:00 | **Work-related suffering in academia: Toolkits are great, but what about collective action?**
Parisa Dashtipur, Nathan Gerard, & Duarte Rolo
- 16:15 | **Online presentation: The Big Gay Garden: Cultivating healthy university working and learning conditions through collective action**
Susannah Mulvale
- 16:30 | **Online presentation: Tools and good practices for a sustainable and healthy academic workplace: the experience of the Italian QualityofLife@Work research team**
Paola Spagnoli, Margherita Brondino, Vincenza Capone, Daniela Converso, Emanuela Ingusci, Amelia Manuti, & Francesco Pace

*Lightning talk session 4 | 22.09.2022 | Green room

13:30 | Building tools to improve life in academia | Session organizers: Severin Hornung & Francesco Tommasi

- 13:30 | **Following up on neoliberal ideology I – emerging research and ideas**
Severin Hornung, Thomas Höge, & Christine Unterrainer
- 13:45 | **Following up on neoliberal ideology II – measurement development, preliminary results and critical outlook**
Thomas Höge, Christine Unterrainer, & Severin Hornung
- 14:00 | **Getting to the root of the matter: Institutional, legal, economic, and ideological foundations of the employment-health dilemma**
Franziska J. Kößler
- 14:15 | **Neoliberal ideology and intimacies: Urging resistance by further educating teachers on LOVE**
Johanna L. Degen
- 14:30 | **Online presentation: The use of fiction as a distinctively critical research approach to debunk work and organizational psychology constructs: initial thoughts**
Francesco Tommasi, Johanna L. Degen, & Matthijs Bal

6.2 List of participants (including Affiliation/Country)

Bal, Matthijs	University of Lincoln, United Kingdom
Brookes, Andy	University of Lincoln, United Kingdom
Dashtipour, Parisa	Open University, School of Psychology and Counselling, United Kingdom
Degen, Johanna	Europa Universität Flensburg, Germany
Dóci, Edina	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, School of Business and Economics, The Netherlands
Fleuren, Bram	Maastricht University, The Netherlands
Gerard, Nathan	California State University, Long Beach, United States
Höge, Thomas	University of Innsbruck, Austria
Hornung, Severin	University of Innsbruck, Austria
Hofmans, Joeri	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Huber, Stefan	University of Innsbruck, Austria
Kößler, Franziska	Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany
Leyens, Theresa	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Manuti, Amelia	University of Bari, Italy
Mendy, John	University of Lincoln, United Kingdom
Mulvale, Susannah	York University, Canada
Nijs, Sanne	Tilburg University, The Netherlands
Orhan, Mehmet A.	EM Normandie Business School, Paris, France
Rolo, Duarte	Université Paris Cité, France
Sanderson, Zoe	University of Bristol, United Kingdom
Schouteten, Roel	Radboud University, The Netherlands
Searle, Rosalind	Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom
Tommasi, Francesco	University of Verona, Italy
Van Rossenberg, Yvonne	Radboud University, The Netherlands
Vantilborgh, Tim	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Wehrt, Wilken	Maastricht University, The Netherlands

6.3 Abstracts

Lightning Talk Session 1

Title: *Imagining a critical theory of change: making an impact on real world problems*

Author(s): Andy Brookes

Despite the extensive body of knowledge produced by critical scholars in both management and WOP it remains the case that socially unsustainable organisational practice is widespread. There is extensive evidence that socially unsustainable organizational practice has a direct impact on the health and morbidity of people working in organizations⁶. For example, the World Health Organisation recognises the phenomenon of work-related mental illness to the extent that burn out due to occupational factors is now included in the international classification of diseases. It is important to develop a deeper understanding of why socially unsustainable practices are so resilient and resistant to change¹. Critical scholars recognise that inequality and injustice are deeply embedded, or institutionalised, in mainstream organisational practice and that the organisational elites that benefit from the prevailing situation have little incentive to change³. Is it ethically defensible for scholars to remain on the sidelines, simply building on this existing body of critique or is there a case for a critical performativity approach that seeks to have a greater real world impact⁷? This opens up the research agenda to involve work that explores, and experiments with, alternative organisational modes and forms that are socially sustainable and do not leave such destructive social footprints^{2, 4, 5}. This paper will argue that if the explanations for the resilience of unsustainable organisational practice are primarily political then critical scholars need to adopt a more active and political approach for producing and disseminating knowledge⁶. What might this more active and political approach for disseminating and producing change look like? In the second part of the paper the outline of a critical theory of change will be explored and developed. The paper will make the case for a metatheory of organisational and societal change. This metatheory is used to inform a broader critical theory of change that addresses the limitations of under-socialised mainstream approaches. There will be a particular focus on the psychological dimension of societal and organisational change.

Lightning Talk Session 1

Title: *Excavating and cultivating the political within academia?*

Author(s): Stefan E. Huber

With this presentation I would like to offer a perspective on academia from which a humanist point of view emerges not as an arbitrary choice among a multitude of interchangeable others but of constitutional importance for institutions aspiring to free research and its teaching, both from an ethical and an epistemic angle. By reflecting on foundational prerequisites necessarily required to be met by communities in order to form particularly epistemic (or artistic) communities, I shall argue (i) that academic practice must incorporate political aspects and (ii) that not recognizing, appreciating and cultivating this facet is likely to drive corroding both its intrinsic meaning and its legitimacy as a public good.

Building tools to improve life in academia (and also building tools to improve WOP research) needs to be practically embedded in an academic framework such that both the tools themselves and the practices involved in building, refining and reinventing them can persistently withstand present-day managerial or simply bureaucratic counter-forces functionally aiming to reduce the political responsibility of people within academia in its current form. I hope that with this presentation I can illuminate that the question how the political may be cultivated within academia (instead of extinguished or marginalized) is of central importance for the goals of the event.

My motivation for running this lightning talk comes from my personal experiences with and within academia. While working as a basic researcher in various scientific domains for twelve years up to now, I could experience first-hand (and also first-soul, first-heart etc.) the impression that all I (myself, as a person) can at best represent in academia is being a valuable asset in someone else's plans and that the probably only reason to get some kind of permanent residence within academia is to become very efficient in appearing just like this: something(!) valuable to somebody else (i.e. a commodity of some external utility). When I realized what "normal" aspect of everyday-practice within academia that has become, I got sick, depressed and just wanted to quit. Frankly, my expectations for academia to change its presently mainly "neoliberal" practices from within have grown very low. However, I still consider the ways things are done within academia presently as something that can be changed and my hopes remain high. That is because my hopes do not reside with institutions or ideas but with people and what remains incomputable in them. My motivation for taking part in this meeting is actually to get to know such people and to see if there is anything I can offer in order to explore together different ways of doing academia; and eventually less harmful ones, maybe even more.

The goals of this contribution are primarily Socratic: people engaging in thought, people sharing the experiences they make in thought, people engaging in conversation, and people (re-)discovering the public happiness in devising other and different ways of world-making by, for and with each other. And people realizing that all this is not so much a question of knowledge, but – of what actually? Well, I would love to understand that better together.

Basically, I wish to present an outline of an essay in progress entitled "A plea for the cultivation of academic practice as a political practice". In essence, it is an attempt to

rethink the origins, purpose and meaning of (institutionalized) research and its teaching, exploring along the lines the role of the arts as a complement to the factuality of scientific approaches and of the inherent political aspects of academia. These theoretical considerations are then contrasted by typical, recent developments of academic institutions, mainly the employment of the three ubiquitous governmental tools of performance, resilience and excellence embedded in a framework of limitless competition and protected from subversive elements by an ever-growing bureaucratic apparatus implementing ever further formal routines primarily in the name of objectivity and fairness (but don't worry, sustainability and diversity are currently incorporated efficiently too). The (incomplete) work ends with some (very limited) attempts to imagine alternatives to the emerging vanishing-point represented by the abandonment of human agency in the organization of research and its teaching and its implications. The presentation thus will not result in answers but culminate rather in questions such as: What can we (as academics) do? And should we actually?

Aspects of the lightning talk that could pose challenges for delegates with specific communication or accessibility needs. The only challenges I am aware of at the moment in the framework of my presentation could be related to challenges regarding visual (text) or auditory (talk) perception. I hope presenting the content both visually (slides) and acoustically (speech) can provide enough structural support that everybody can participate. If not, I am confident that together we are capable of spontaneously finding both viable and appropriate solutions.

Lightning Talk Session 1

Title: *Work-related suffering in academia: Toolkits are great, but what about collective action?*

Author(s): Parisa Dashtipur, Nathan Gerard & Duarte Rolo

As in other workplaces, the development of interventions to help deal with job uncertainty and burnout can have a considerable impact on the mental health of academics. Yet, as critical scholars, we recognize that addressing work-related suffering through “developing tools” risks perpetuating what we see as a neoliberal turn inward and toward “psychologizing” problems, and thus away from a shared sense of community and collective action. Moreover, organizational psychology’s fraught inception as a field intended to serve as a managerial “tool” of sorts for curbing the “union threat” (Gillespie, 1991; Gerard 2017) must be interrogated in the context of creating healthier workplaces. In this paper, we want to question the managerial methods of intervention on work-related suffering. Insofar as they tend to reproduce the same individualising biases as the work organisation methods that produce suffering, they have limitations that must be pointed out here. Thus, the prevention of workplace suffering requires, in our opinion, a parting from the managerial logic, which implies developing another conception of action. Furthermore, as FoWOP/critical people, we need to reflect on the origins of the terms and concepts we use, and consider how we ourselves may unwittingly reproduce neoliberal language on dealing with suffering.

This paper offers a contribution to Track 2 of this small group meeting. It aims to discuss theories of action in the field of mental health at work, adopting a critical point of view towards managerial methods. It is thus fully in line with the objective of this conference, which explicitly states as one of its objectives to discuss the methods of action on suffering at work in academia.

As indicated in track 2, one of the objectives of the day is to propose methods of action against the deterioration of mental health in academic environments. Our presentation is part of this objective, to which we hope to contribute.

The objective of this presentation will be to discuss methods of action and prevention of work-related suffering in academic settings. This objective implies, in part, a critical discussion of managerial methods of managing work-related suffering, and alternatives to these methods.

Lightning Talk Session 1

Title: *The Big Gay Garden: Cultivating healthy university working and learning conditions through collective action*

Author(s): Susannah Mulvale

This lightning talk will describe the Big Gay Garden (BGG), an anarcho-communist community garden that was built by a small group of student-worker members of the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 3903 (CUPE 3903) during a 138-day strike at York University in Toronto, Canada in 2018. The garden was constructed on the university entrance lawn to revitalize union members who in general were feeling defeated and exhausted. Strikers occupied the space as an act of protest to add pressure to the university administration to bargain in good faith. The BGG was diligently cared for and grew an abundance of flowers, fruits, and vegetables. It was also a space where workers found joy and respite, built community, and organized solidarity actions with other labour unions and grassroots movements. The garden remained intact for several months after the strike ended until it was unceremoniously bulldozed by the university after the fall harvest.

Although CUPE 3903 did not win the 2018 strike, union members gained strong friendships and allyships on foundations of solidarity and trust. The BGG is an example of how labour unions can provide tools and resources for engaging in transformative collective practices that go beyond the bargaining table. Labour unions can be spaces that provide community to and build capacities of workers and students who are often socially isolated and precariously employed. Not only has collective bargaining led to sector-leading contracts at York University, but union participation has been personally transformative for many CUPE 3903 members. In alienating work environments, which increasingly characterize post-secondary institutions, collective actions like the BGG can be psychologically and socially beneficial – in the academic context and beyond.

Short-term teaching contracts are replacing full-time faculty positions, while administrator positions with inflated salaries increase continuously. How can unions effectively resist the neoliberalization of the university - if they can at all? I am interested in using the BGG as a springboard for dialogue about strategies and tactics for workplace organizing in academia. The goal is to convey lessons from the BGG about alternative organizing structures, and to stimulate discussion about the benefits and limitations of academic labour unions generally. By joining together, university workers can fight back against trends toward austerity, corporate governance, and neoliberal administration, while also creating community and meaningful workplace experiences. Moreover, being active in the union is a way for critical scholars engaged in transformative research practices to also have a direct impact on improving their own immediate political economic milieu.

In the presentation I will show photographs of the BGG in its various stages and of collective actions that took place at and around it. I will discuss the role of the garden within the larger union structure and identify some of its successes and failures. I will reflect on the difficulty of resisting the neoliberalization of the university and what might be gleaned from the BGG regarding possible “lily pads” or “lines of flight” that can help cultivate healthier university workplaces.

Lightning Talk Session 1

Title: *Tools and good practices for a sustainable and healthy academic workplace: The experience of the Italian QualityOfLife@Work Research Team*

Author(s): Paola Spagnoli, Margherita Brondino, Vincenza Capone, Daniela Converso, Emanuela Ingusci, Amelia Manuti, & Francesco Pace

Research on quality of life at work in academia has significantly grown during the last decades, although it remains rare or absent in many countries. With specific reference to the Italian context, the interest of scholars and practitioners toward the topic is still recent and although the rich variety of psychometric tools developed in the international panorama to assess health and well-being at work, a validated global Italian measure of quality of life at work in academia is still not available, also because of the high complexity of the challenging factors that are currently redesigning this professional context.

Indeed, it is evident that the pandemic and the recent changes occurred in work environments (technology advancements, enlargement on the work role's duties, blurring of the boundaries between work and non-work contexts, insecurity, students' demands, competition between colleagues) have invested also the academic context highlighting new psycho-social risks that can be deleterious for the academics' health and wellbeing, also considering the differences between teaching and administrative staff.

Consistent with this evidence, we adopted the Job Demands/Resources Model (JD-R) to understand the specific job demands inside and outside the working context considered the current turn to smart technologies (e.g. work pressure and emotional demands) and job resources (e.g. career opportunities, social support, role-clarity, and autonomy) featuring academic life in Italy in present times. According to the model the interaction between job demands and job resources is important for the development of motivation, engagement, and performance and job resources could be used to buffer the effects of strain and emotional exhaustion naturally deriving from high job demands. The core assumption of the JD-R model is that job strain develops when job demands are high and when job resources are limited. In contrast, work engagement emerges when job resources are high (also in the face of high job demands). These conclusions clearly show the potential of the JD-R model in supporting human resource management interventions, also in the peculiar context of Public Academic work. In view of the above, because of the peculiar nature of academic work (its core being education of young generations), it is evident that to assess the quality of life at work of teachers and academic staff is not simply an effort aimed to enhance their personal well-being rather it entails important implications on the quality of life of students and consequently on the quality of their learning.

Therefore, understanding the risk and protection factors responsible for employees' well-being in academia in Italy was the first step to develop and validate a global measure of the quality of life at work in academia, especially focusing on the target of teachers. Adopting this tool could be useful to promote consistent positive and sustainable people management interventions, leading to a wider improvement of the whole academic system. This study is part of a national project; it has been developed by the QualityofLife@Work (QoL@Work) thematic research group, which is national network of academic experts in the field of work and organisational psychology affiliated to the Italian Association of Psychologists.

Objectives: The present study aims : 1) to adopt the JD-R model to the study of specific job demands and job resources featuring academic work in present times, specifically focusing on the target of university teachers; 2) to introduce a new reliable validated tool to investigate the quality of working life in Italian academics, the Academic Quality at Work Tool (AQ@workT) and 3) to explore possible interactions between job demands and resources useful to manage work-related stress risk assessment in academia.

Methodology: Drawing on the core assumptions of the JD-R model the study developed a global measure of quality of life at work in academia in the Italian context. The main psychometric properties of the scale (reliability, validity, measurement invariance), were assessed in three studies with a large sample of researchers, and professors: an initial pilot study (N = 120), a calibration study (N = 1084) and a validation study (N = 1481).

Results: The validation study confirms reliability and content, construct and nomological validity of the tool, as well as measurement invariance with job role (researchers, associate, and full professors) and gender.

Research/Practical Implications: Results indicated that the proposed tool is reliable and could be used for describing university researchers/teachers' health, wellbeing, and working conditions in the Italian academic context. Moreover, the crucial phases and processes in the implementation strategy could represent useful insights for developing organizational interventions could also be obtained. Accordingly, in light with the results, some universities involved in data collection carried out a job crafting intervention aimed at improving work engagement and in supporting change management.

Lightning Talk Session 2

Title: *Stuck in precariousness: The resilience case*

Author(s): Sanne Nijs, Kornélia Anna Kerti, Brigitte Kroon; Sjanne Marie van den Groenendaal; Marloes van Engen, Amber Kersten, Jamie Breukel, Kristýna Odstrčilíková

Description of the topic

Current literature assumes that resilience is a positive trait that can help individuals achieve positive career and life outcomes. In the current body of literature, the importance of resilience is even more emphasized for workers in precarious positions as it is believed that it can assist them in overcoming the difficult circumstances they face. In contrast with previous literature, we claim that resilience works differently for people in precarious versus non-precarious positions. We argue that approaching resilience univocally as a positive trait that can help people to improve their situation is an inaccurate representation of how resilience works for precarious workers and that solely investing in their resilience will not improve, but rather worsen the situation they are in.

Outline of what will be presented

Based on narratives of different precarious workers (i.e., migrant workers, solo self-employed workers, flexible workers, disabled workers) we show that for precarious workers resilience negatively affects the sustainability of their career and the decency of their work. While resilience for people in non-precarious situations can help them to further optimize their context, resilience for people in precarious situations often means adapting to an unhealthy context. The lack of resources the latter possess means that they are unable to change their context and are thereby forced to individually work around setbacks, worsening rather than improving their situation (e.g., working more hours in light of low income; working when having a burnout due to the lack of a safety net). We need to become more aware that resilience does not always lead to positive career and life outcomes. As such portraying resilience univocally as a positive trait that can help people to agentically improve their situation is an inaccurate representation of how resilience works for precarious workers. Even worse, this approach legitimizes the status quo and draws attention away from the main issue; being that precarious workers need more systematic change and that solely investing in their resilience will not improve, but rather worsen the challenges they face.

Relevance for the event & motivation for the talk

With this topic, we criticize the individualized theorizing that has characterized our field. We claim that in order to create a sustainable future for precarious workers, we need to more critically challenge the assumptions underlying resilience and we need to rethink what a resilient society actually means. By focusing on groups that have been traditionally forgotten (at least in mainstream Work and Organizational Psychology research), we get a clearer picture of the mechanisms behind 'investing in resilience', and the different outcomes this investment generates for the 'lucky few' and the 'unlucky many'.

Lightning Talk Session 3

Title: *Managerial work organization and its impact on mental health in academia*

Author(s): Parisa Dashtipur, Nathan Gerard, & Duarte Rolo

1. Brief description of the topic

Academia is hardly spared from mental health problems. During the time of the pandemic, the mental health of students worsened considerably, largely as a result of radical changes in teaching and learning conditions. Before the pandemic, however, there was already talk of work-related suffering in teaching and research institutions, this time among different categories of academic staff (Morrish, 2019; Nicholls H., Nicholls M., Tekin S., Lamb D., Billings J., 2022). As academics ourselves, we can testify to these deteriorating working conditions. Beyond this personal observation, clinical approaches to work in research institutions also make it possible to highlight the psychological damage of new forms of work organisation. In this “lightning talk,” we will try to show how the introduction of new public management methods in universities has had negative consequences for the mental health of workers in academia.

2. Relevance of the topic

In this paper, we will address the question of etiology of work-related suffering in academic environments. In other words, we will attempt to provide an analysis of the causes of work-related suffering, based on clinical work in academia. Understanding the etiology is an irreplaceable first step in any approach to preventing work-related suffering. Indeed, in order to act on mental health problems in the academy, it is first necessary to know their origins. The aim and interest of this presentation is precisely to discuss the relationship between work organisation and mental health, in order to better design the actions to be taken to fight against this problem.

3. Motives for the lightning talk

Insofar as our research work deals with suffering at work and one of the authors’ clinical practice largely concerns workers in the academy, it seemed relevant to propose a communication on this theme, which is one of the main areas of discussion at the EAWOP Small Groups Meeting. As indicated in track 2, one of the objectives of the day is to propose methods of action against the deterioration of mental health in academic environments. Our presentation is part of this objective, to which we hope to contribute by presenting our experiences.

4. Goals of the presentation

The first objective of this presentation is, as mentioned above, to provide conceptual tools to shed light on the etiology of work-related suffering. This first aim can then lead to a discussion on the question of prevention of work related suffering, which will address the question of collective action.

Lightning Talk Session 4

Title: *Research on Neoliberal Ideology – Research as Neoliberal Ideology: Assembling a Reflexive Perspective*

Session Organizers: Severin Hornung & Francesco Tommasi

This paper session aims to bring together, inform and engage work and organizational psychology (WOP) scholars who share an interest in the emerging topic of neoliberal ideology in contemporary workplace practices and academic research. As indicated by the session title, and following the seminal contribution by Bal and Dóci (2018), the assembled set of presentations addresses and integrates two distinct yet complementary perspectives, namely: a) research on neoliberal ideology addressing the pervasive interest-driven force influencing societal institutions and organizational structures, thereby shaping the belief systems and identities of individuals in contemporary workplaces; and b) research as neoliberal ideology, problematizing, exposing, and deconstructing the role of interest-guided economic logics in shaping theories, constructs, methods, and processes of WOP as an academic field.

The session includes five contributions by researchers from altogether five universities from four countries (Austria, Italy, Germany, United Kingdom). All of them transcend the conventional normative or functionalist paradigms of mainstream research. Employing different theoretical and epistemological approaches, ranging from radical humanism and radical structuralism to postmodern deconstructionist and post-structuralist, the five presentations incorporate the first perspective of psychological research on ideologies. However, simultaneously, they also reflect on the second perspective, that is, focusing on the biasing influences of neoliberal ideology on the research process in WOP.

Specifically, the first talk will draw on the tradition of radical humanism in seeking to expand theorizing on manifestations of neoliberal ideology in societies, organizations, and individuals (presentation#1 by Hornung et al.). The second presentation adopts more of a structuralist theoretical approach and will propose a new quantitative operationalization assessing internalized neoliberal beliefs of instrumentality, competition, and individualism of employees, based on quantitative methodology (presentation#2 by Höge et al.). The third presentation draws on qualitative data from semi-structured interviews with hospital workers to discuss the neoliberal institutional, legal, economic, and ideological underpinnings of the employment-health dilemma in the context of the COVID crisis and beyond (presentation#3 by Kößler). While the third presentation may broadly be called structuralist, the fourth contribution marks the transition to more post-structural and deconstructionist critical perspectives on neoliberal ideology. Specifically, this fourth presentation uses observations and qualitative data obtained in interviews with school teachers to interpretatively analyze dysfunctional societal developments associated with the governmentality of neoliberal ideology, combined with acceleration and ubiquitous technology use, presenting a critical intervention to induce teacher resistance and positive change (presentation#4 by Degen). Finally, the fifth and final presentation is aimed at debunking and deconstructing neoliberal ideology in the one-sided, interest-guided and performative conception of influential research constructs in WOP, such as work engagement and job crafting (presentation#5 by Tommasi et al.). Using fiction analysis as an alternative critical methodology, this contribution also reflects more of a post-modern and

deconstructionist approach with a stronger emphasis on the impact of neoliberal ideology on the research process itself. The self-reflexive integration of the two broader perspectives of research on ideology and research as ideology constitutes a cross-cutting theme of the compiled presentations. Reflecting on this issue reveals an epistemological dilemma or even paradox, stemming from the pervasiveness and hegemonic tendencies of neoliberal ideology. Precisely, how can a research process, which is ideologically flawed, be reoriented to conduct a meaningful research program on the very influences assumed to be responsible for its biases and blind spots?

By suggesting to capitalize on alternative research methodologies and processes, the compiled presentations provide valuable hints in this direction across different scientific paradigms. Moreover, the critique of ideology has a long tradition in the social science, offering additional pathways to theoretically approach this epistemological conundrum. The session will conclude with an open debate on these and related issues. Specifically, participants and presenters will engage in debates on the substantive and practical complications facing researchers that subvert the status quo in WOP by problematizing ideology to varying degrees, in different forums, diverging research paradigms and areas of scholarship, and at different stages of their academic careers.

Lightning Talk Session 4

Title: *Following up on neoliberal ideology – emerging research and ideas*

Author(s): Severin Hornung, Thomas Höge, & Christine Unterrainer

Providing critical momentum for the Future of Work and Organizational Psychology movement, a notable achievement of its core proponents has been to spark debate within the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology regarding pervasive and widely unrecognized, unchallenged influences of neoliberal ideology on contemporary workplace practices and research. In a discipline plagued by double-binds between humanistic ideals of employee wellbeing and personal development, and the normative power of economic imperatives demanding perpetually increasing performance and profits, calling out socially, morally, and intellectually corrosive consequences of subservience to particular political-economic interests, apparently has struck a nerve. This became observable in the role of the formulated criticisms as a galvanizing element for activities of a growing group of critically oriented researchers and can also be inferred from defensive responses of leading scholars. A common sentiment is that, to acknowledge the detrimental role of neoliberal ideology in contemporary workplaces and research, associated tendencies and underlying mechanisms would need to be conceptualized, operationalized, and analyzed in accordance with established theories and methods in work and organizational psychology. This is a somewhat paradox injunction, as an ostensibly biased process is predetermined to examine the forces assumed to be responsible for its own interest-guided preconceptions, deformations, and blind spots. This epistemological conundrum aside, research on concepts and processes related to neoliberal ideology (e.g., content, dissemination, internalization) seems worthwhile to further the debate and call attention to the outlined phenomena. This presentation summarizes research activities inspired by and drawing on the mentioned article and ensuing discussion. Three streams are briefly outlined, reflecting conceptual, empirical, and practical applications of the critique of neoliberal ideology. Pervasive multimodal influences of neoliberal ideology have been conceptualized as matrix of political, social, and psychological or fantasmatic logics, systemically orienting workplace practices and biasing their scholarly evaluation through a dogmatic trinity of individualism, competition, and instrumentality. In a conceptual contribution, this taxonomy was applied to research on workplace flexibility, specifically the construct of idiosyncratic deals, to contrast organizing principles of humanistic management practices with neoliberal power tactics and economic rationalization strategies. Based on this analysis, criteria for evaluating and implementing employee-oriented approaches of individualized workplace flexibility are derived. A current empirical project centers around the development of a self-report scale on the psychological internalization or endorsement of neoliberal ideologies, preliminary psychometric properties and correlational patterns of which are promising (and will be dealt with in more detail in the second proposed talk). Lastly, ways in which the analysis of neoliberal ideology can make a practical impact on organizations and people's working lives, including those of academics, are speculated about. Detrimental influences and trajectories of individualism, competition, and instrumentality are contrasted with ideals of and potentials for individuation, solidarity, and emancipation at work. Envisioned is a dual approach of critiquing challenging, and counteracting socially corrosive neoliberal ideologies by positioning, promoting, and practicing opposite humanistic ideas.

Lightning Talk Session 4

Title: *Following up on neoliberal ideology II – measurement development, preliminary results and critical outlook*

Author(s): Thomas Höge, Christine Unterrainer, & Severin Hornung

Building and elaborating on the conceptual ideas presented in the first proposed lightning talk “Following up on neoliberal ideology I – emerging research and ideas” by the same group of researchers, this second presentation will provide some more details of the development, psychometric properties and empirical correlates of a new self-report survey instrument for analyzing the psychological internalization of socially corrosive neoliberal ideological beliefs. Theoretically, the introduced scale is based on the three-dimensional conceptualization of neoliberal “political logics” presented by Bal and Doci (2018). These three dimensions capture the adoption of personal beliefs regarding (1) instrumentality, (2) individualism, and (3) competition. This talk will include a brief description of the multi-stage development process of the instrument and present the final 18-item version. The three-dimensional factor structure and psychometric properties of items and scales were tested with data from a sample of N = 664 employees in Austria and Germany. Moreover, we identified characteristic correlations with political orientations (self-allocation of left-wing vs. right-wing politically views and general agreement with different political parties in Austria and Germany), emphasis of self-interest vs. other-orientation, and self-reported prosocial and moral behavior. Currently, a second data collection is in progress. In addition to the cross-validation of the preliminarily established factor structure of the new measure, we will explore the relationship between neoliberal ideological beliefs and relevant constructs, hypothesized to relate positively or negatively to the adherence to these ideologies: e.g., social dominance orientation, discrimination, group-focused enmity, economic system justification, dark triad personality, counterproductive work behavior, interpersonal trust, civic engagement, and pro-environmental attitudes. Finally, we will present an outlook foreshadowing the development of a complementary second measure, addressing dialectically opposed humanistic ideals of emancipation, individuation and solidarity. Last but not least, we will cast a spotlight on the limitations of a quantitative approach for analyzing the internalization of neoliberal ideology, especially with regard to addressing the deeper “fantasmatic” or psychodynamic logics of neoliberal ideological belief systems. We therefore argue for an epistemology of genuine methodological pluralism in critical research of work, organizational, and economic psychology, which considers and tries to compensate or reconcile the particular limitations of quantitative and qualitative approaches as well as their specific strengths.

Lightning Talk Session 4

Title: *Getting to the root of the matter: Institutional, legal, economic, and ideological foundations of the employment-health dilemma*

Author(s): Franziska J. Kößler

At the beginning of the COVID crisis, public figures (e.g., Madonna) claimed that the virus would affect everyone equally, regardless of wealth, power, or status. It quickly became apparent that COVID -19 exacerbated inequalities in terms of wealth and health along the lines of social class, race, and gender, among others. As the COVID crisis reduced job opportunities, especially in jobs that do not require formal job training (e.g., in gastronomy), the COVID crisis hit workers in these jobs particularly hard. In contrast, the health sector demanded more workers – including workers in non-medical occupations (e.g., cleaners). As these jobs require non-medical workers to work close to COVID patients, they are commonly associated with a higher virus exposure, which implies an elevated infection risk and additional job demands due to protection requirements. Therefore, non-medical hospital workers faced both an economic threat (i.e., unemployment without alternatives) and a health threat (i.e., Sars-CoV-2-infection). These threats forced them to choose between being (further) employed, which implies a potential health risk, or protecting their health, which might pose a risk to economic stability. In the context of the COVID crisis, this study explores health threats, economic threats, and the employment-health dilemma in non-medical hospital workers based on semi-structured interviews (N = 42). According to the Qualitative Content Analysis, factors at the societal, organizational, and individual levels gave rise to economic threats, while primarily organizational-level factors fostered health threats. Our analysis showed that economic threats often emerged from the labor market situation (societal level) but also from downsizing and outsourcing (organizational level) or financial responsibilities (individual level). The analysis further indicated a task-related variation in the virus exposure because cleaners and patient transport workers reported a high virus exposure relative to kitchen assistants. Additionally, protection measures varied considerably between hospitals and status groups (e.g., in some hospitals everyone had access to protective gear, while in others cleaners had to wear medical doctors' worn protective gear). The employment-health dilemma was reported only by workers who faced both economic and health threats. At the small group meeting, I want to discuss the institutional, legal, economic, and ideological underpinnings of the employment-health dilemma based on my study results. As the employment-health dilemma is not unique to the COVID crisis or the hospital context, I want to discuss possibilities for future studies.

Lightning Talk Session 4

Title: *Neoliberal ideology and intimacies: Urging resistance by further educating teachers on LOVE*

Author(s): Johanna L. Degen

Power and hierarchies are being reproduced in very intimate practices of the self. How it's done is shown by many classics, from Foucault, Bourdieu, and Fromm to Butler. Contemporarily, the mechanisms of socialization and norms have changed and possibly accelerated. What once was the interaction with others is nowadays structured and moderated by the digital, in the form of the smartphone glued to the subject's hands and in front of their eyes for up to 18 hours a day. This includes the very everything: from getting existential goods and work, to orientation regarding beauty, lifestyles, and role models to sex practices and finding a partner.

What this might mean is discussed in the public discourse, stressing that humans might become the raw material of capitalism and tech. Consequently, there is raising concern for the upcoming generations and the human condition in life, implanted with neoliberal ideology in the core of subjective existence. The current state of research supports some concerns, e.g. a severe decline of competence to maintain healthy and sustainable relationships, including the human-human and the human-nature relationship, and between species. A condition threatening not only health but possibly life in general.

Teachers are confronted with this reality in school -often on a more surface level like sexualization, pornification, and othering between hardened groups- and report growing discomfort, overload, and decline of health, stemming from a lack of (further-)education and being politically at risk. Conditions leading to negative dynamics in the everyday practices in schools dominated by insecurity and defense mechanisms.

This contribution, shows, firstly, what is happening nowadays in schools based on observation studies and interviews. Secondly, presents a critical intervention in the form of a further-education that was implemented and evaluated making a change for radically positive and value-based relationships, open dialogue, and a turn for the better in regard to satisfaction, confidence, competence, and resilience on the teachers' side and open communication, competence and knowledge on the youth side.

Based on the learnings from this study, I present an argument on how to urge resistance and change by further educating teachers in a critical tradition, starting (but not stopping) with love as a core value and positive driver in life.

Lightning Talk Session 4

Title: *The Use of Fiction as a Distinctively Critical Research Approach to Debunk Work and Organizational Psychology Constructs: Initial Thoughts*

Author(s): Francesco Tommasi

In this lightning talk, we will present some proposals regarding the potential usefulness of fiction as a distinctively critical research approach in work and organizational (W-O) psychology. Specifically, we aim to contribute to current critical debates around neoliberal ideology in W-O psychology by proposing a method to debunk (i.e., expose the hollowness of) some of the ubiquitous constructs of the W-O psychology object of research. Hence, we argue that current critical psychologists' scrutiny of neoliberal ideology in W-O psychology is a signal of the regressivity of W-O research programs and themes of research (Lakatos, 1976). With this idea in mind, we present the epistemological and pragmatical assumptions for the use of fiction (and linked thematic analysis) as a method to debunk the "inflated" W-O constructs. With respect to the epistemological assumption, we will present the potential of the use of literary fiction in W-O psychology research arguing that novels due to their epistemological freedom, their interdisciplinary nature, and freer language, can offer a richer lens through which we can explore complex W-O psychology dynamics and phenomena. With respect to the pragmatic assumption, then, narrative texts can be a fictional ambience to verify theoretical assumptions; thus, work and organizational psychologists can refer to fictional narratives to explore the meanings of their theories and models through the analyses of texts as if they were data collected by surveys (Phillips, 1996; Beyes et al., 2019). Ultimately, we will carry out these assumptions by taking into account one literary example from the realm of the Japanese proletarian literature (Hoston, 1986), namely, Hiroko Oyamada's *The Factory* (2013) to shed light on the very meanings of work. Drawing on our analysis, we will present a novel conceptualization on two over-inflated objects of study in W-O psychology, namely, work engagement and job performance, and the overestimated topic of job crafting behavior. In particular, our analysis will present the contradictory and dilemmatic nature of these phenomena taken into account the (neoliberal) subject at work. That is, literary stories and literary environments will offer indications to orient the conceptualization of these objects of study for what they are and could be independently of well-established mainstream theories. For example, Oyamada's novel is an attempt at denouncing the wish for work engagement as a tool of the modern capitalistic work environment (i.e., neoliberal machine) for performative (powerless) working class. These will offer the occasion to, on the one side, remark the regressivity of mainstream W-O psychology, and, on the other side, discuss some implications and prospects of the use of literary fiction for W-O research wishing to value people and work.

Unconference session 1

Title: *Systematic review of 10 years of WOP research*

Author(s): Mehmet A. Orhan, Yvonne van Rossenberg, Matthijs Bal & Zoe Sanderson

Brief description of the topic

In early 2020 we conducted a systematic literature review of articles published in the WOP in the past decade. In this session, we propose to share analyses and the review dataset with the wider FOWOP movement and jointly assess how we can draw from this data in future work.

The review includes (1) a Vosviewer analysis of all 4,957 articles published between 2010 and 2019 in the nine top WOP journals, and (2) a systematic review of a stratified sample of 10%, in total 496 articles. For the systematic review we worked with a team of three volunteers from UWE in Bristol analysing the following themes (1) the (presence of a) discussion of ontology in the paper, (2) the ontological approach taken in the study. For epistemology these are: (3) the positioning in the empirical cycle (deductive, inductive or abductive), (4) the design of the study, (5) the analytical approach, and (6) the type of data collected. This analysis has been reported in the position paper that is presently under review with EJWOP. Three more themes were analysed but have not been included in the paper, these are: (7) central topic of the study / dependent variable, (8) characteristics of the sample, (9) type of analysis used.

Relevance to event, motivation, and goals of session

Examining the current practice and normative framework of our field creates a springboard for developing targeted and useful ways of improving WOP research (track 1). In this session we seek to identify directions for future projects drawing on this data. These ideas will be followed up in the FOWOP task forces, most likely the (1) critical research in WOP and (2) substantive-methodological synergies in WOP, but we see also directions for the taskforces (3) healthy academics in WOP and (4) equality in WOP.

Examples of directions that could be explored further:

- (1) The dominance of positivism and underlying ontological assumptions in greater depth
- (2) The current extent and nature of methodological – substantive synergy in WOP
- (3) Why moderation-mediation models are so frequently used
- (4) How WEIRD WOP samples are (Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan, 2010).
- (5) Variable-centred versus person-centred approaches: the trouble with heterogeneous samples.

Exploring these (and similar) issues might involve:

- Extending the existing review dataset, e.g. looking at career stage or diversity of authorship teams.
- Augmenting the dataset with other methodologies or analytic tools, e.g. Automated Systematic Review
- Comparison of WOP trends over time
- Analysis of networks of authors / topics / citations in WOP

Organisation of the session

We will lead and facilitate this session, and expect it to take the following format:

- 1) A short overview of the review data and procedures.
- 2) An overview of our ideas for future directions.
- 3) A facilitated discussion in which participants can freely pitch and discuss ideas.
- 4) Dividing participants into subgroups to develop ideas
- 5) Pitching the resultant projects, to allow people to connect to their area of interest.
- 6) Placing the projects into the FOWOP task forces.

References

- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83. Doi: 10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Unconference session 2

Title: *Problematizing Critical Theory Perspectives in Contemporary Organizations and Society*

Author(s): John Mendy & Matthijs Bal

Critical Theory (CT) has recently become one of a growing number of important areas attracting worldwide academic attention. Its primary focus has been/is the liberation of people from conditions and technologies of enslavement in contemporary work and society. Given FoWOP's identification with similar goals, we focus on contemporary perspectives on CT, we problematize the notion by examining its different schools of conceptualization; firstly, the Frankfurt School of Marx, Horkheimer and Fromm, secondly, the second-generation contributors such as Habermas and Gramsci and thirdly, the Postmodern school that challenges and contests the domination of emerging meta-narratives on identities and rationality. We situate the perspectives by examining workplace performativity and productivity, the justification of war (e.g. the first & second Gulf Wars & Syrian War now), marginalization and exclusion of certain groups at work (including academia) and in society and political dictatorships, to name but a few.

We highlight the sociological and politico-philosophical ramifications of CT by focusing on the practical and pragmatic impacts of CT within the world of work (e.g. academia) and contemporary society (e.g. politics & social movements on war, fossil fuels, victimization & harassment etc...). To do so, we aim to examine and critique multinational corporations' (MNCs) and societal mega-structures that still promote conditions of enslavement to see the extent to which the technologies used to perpetuate such enslavement are contested and challenged. This provides a more overarching and comprehensive, deeper analysis of CT, which we define here as 'an outlet that enables resistance (through language(s), perceptions and performativity) against contemporary technologies of enslavement'.

Our multi-dimensional analysis of CT through specific examples from contemporary society and organizations surfaces the tensions and conflicts between the researcher as the external-knowledge creating scientist and the researcher as an internal-organisationally interested individual whose sentiments, frustrations and motivations are developed via the analytical usage and application of CT. We resist the temptation to reduce the notion to the examination of dualisms - e.g. a researcher's search for meaning/purpose in organisations and society vs the scientific demand to be rational and measurement/quantitatively-driven or the call to critique work processes vs succumbing to the maintenance of the very technologies for the preservation of societal enslavement. Therefore, the fundamental question for CT scholars in general and WOPPers in particular is 'is our research and scholarship serving a knowledge creation machinery or are we challenging the very machinery/technologies that tend to seduce us to docile bodies threatening wider societal emancipation?'

We extend CT by 1) providing a contemporary political perspective/alternative to the first and second Frankfurt Schools' sociological and philosophical approach; 2) highlighting the complexity and problematization of CT through sociological, political and philosophical lenses 3) highlighting outlets of resistance against political, ideological and philosophical authoritarianism; 4) showing how the internalization and unproblematic acceptance of CT could potentially lead to Yurcak's idea of a

'hypernormalized' external reification of the technologies of knowledge production as mechanisms for human enslavement in contemporary society and organizations.

References

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane

Fook, J. (2002). *Social Work: Critical Theory and Practice*. Sage.

Fromm, E. (2014). *The essential Fromm: Life between having and being*. Open Road Media.

Habermas, J. (2015). *The theory of communicative action: Lifeworld and systems, a critique of functionalist reason* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.

Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Critical Theory: Selected Essays* (Vol. 1). A & C Black.

Islam, G., & Zyphur, M. J. (2009). Concepts and directions in critical industrial/organizational psychology. *Critical Psychology: An Introduction*, 110-125.

Unconference session 3

Title: *Why are we vague? Towards conceptual precision in work and organizational psychology*

Author(s): Bram Fleuren & Wilken Wehrt

Conceptual precision is crucial in science as it facilitates identifying valid operationalizations and promotes the testability of theories. Conceptual precision refers to providing consistent and specific descriptions that demarcate what the concept is – and what it is not – and that suggest how the concept can be used adequately in research. Accordingly, conceptual precision is a cornerstone of adequate and meaningful research. However, maintaining conceptual precision can be challenging, as it requires careful thinking and a critical consideration of – sometimes ‘established’ – concepts.

We believe that the field of Work and Organizational Psychology exhibits conceptual imprecision to a relatively high degree. Thus, we aim to offer a discussion on conceptual imprecision, common field-specific examples and reasons potentially driving it. Moreover, the ultimate aim of the paper – and hopefully discussions related to this intended lightning talk – is to develop non-moralistic suggestions on how to handle and avoid conceptual imprecision at the individual, research group, and organizational level.

The first part of our intended lightning talk aims to discuss different manifestations and bases of conceptual imprecision. Specifically, we argue that conceptual imprecision manifests itself in several ways within our field. These include, for instance: i) aspecificity of theories and concepts; ii) sustaining vague but ‘established’ concepts; iii) presentation of categorizations based on frameworks or opinion as given facts; iv) imprecise naming of constructs; v) disconnects between concept and operationalization; vi) umbrella terming; vii) repackaging; and viii) using overly fancy language to explain simple ideas imprecisely. We highlight several potential reasons for these forms of imprecision, ranging from competition among researchers, suboptimal research practice socialization and peer-pressure in collaborations, to following buzzwords and practices to market a paper effectively. By making the lightning talk interactive, we hope to test our own aforementioned ideas and to collect further examples and perspectives from participants in spoken and/or written format.

In the second part of our intended lightning talk, we plan to move from observations to solutions. Specifically, we argue that raising awareness for the importance of conceptual precision may help to foster a more conceptually critical culture of debate within Work and Organizational Psychology. Such a culture would be (more) immune against the influx of imprecisely defined concepts. Instead, it may inspire constructive exchanges that promote conceptual differentiation and clarification and, consequently, clearer theorizing and empirical testing. To create such a culture, we aim to provide feasible suggestions for researchers on how to improve conceptual precision individually, but also in discussions and collaborations with team-members, supervisors, as well as with reviewers and editors. We also aim to provide suggestions for research groups, research organizations (e.g., universities) and journals on fostering conceptual precision. Further, a movement towards conceptual precision may open doors for a stronger acceptance of alternative methodologies (e.g. qualitative) by shifting criteria for judging the adequacy of methods from ‘what has been done and is established’ towards ‘what makes sense

and captures the phenomena under investigation adequately'. By discussing these ideas with attendants, we aim to modestly contribute to ongoing (meta-)debates about the state and goals of our discipline.

Our session can be attended as long as it possible for participants to speak or write down their comments and thoughts. We will present in person.

Unconference session 4

Title: *Hypernormalization in academia*

Author(s): Andy Brookes, John Mendy, Dieu Hack-Polay & Matthijs Bal

Hypernormalization is a concept that was coined by Russian-born anthropologist Yurchak to describe the dynamics between ideological discourse in the last decades of the Soviet Union and really existing practices. Lincoln-scholars Brookes, Mendy, Hack-Polay and Bal are currently translating the concept into an understanding of contemporary society and workplaces, and have redefined hypernormalization as 'the normalization of the absurd'. Taking an absurdity-lens to understand contemporary practices in society and workplaces helps to reveal and elucidate the ideological dynamics and persistent nature of certain practices (such as populism, rising totalitarianism, bureaucracy, and inertia towards climate change). In the current session, we will use the concept of hypernormalization to understand academia better, and in particular why change is not happening in universities, and what we can do to elicit positive change in academia to achieve our FoWOP-goals.

In this session, we will first talk about hypernormalization so that participants have an understanding of what we mean with it. Subsequently, we will provide some examples of our observations and personal experiences of hypernormalization in academia. We will then open the floor for discussion with the participants about their experiences, and jointly explore the dynamics underpinning our own experiences. We will then discuss with the participants how the absurdity in academic life (or the absurdity of academia) can be effectively countered (e.g., through the use of problematization, resistance and imagination).

Unconference session 5

Title: *Critical WOP session*

Author(s): Matthijs Bal, Severin Hornung, Gazi Islam & Zoe Sanderson

One of the main pillars of FoWOP is the Critical WOP stream. This has been successful in previous meetings and in FoWOP history, leading to the publication of the Checklist for Critical WOP research, and the upcoming Special Issue in *Applied Psychology: an International Review*, among other things.

However, critical WOP is still in its infancy. Many WOP scholars may not identify with the term 'critical' as it may convey undesirable meanings. For instance, Critical Management Studies (CMS) as a discipline has been criticized by 'mainstream' scholars as being overly critical without contributing to positive formulations of what management can actually mean for individuals in practice. Similarly, CMS has developed distinctly from - and in opposition to - conventional management scholarship, creating the impression that scholars must choose to identify as 'critical' or 'mainstream', rather than being able to move fluidly between both.

To avoid similar pitfalls for Critical WOP, we want to organise a session with participants around the possibilities of critical perspectives to enrich the work of any and all WOP researchers. This will enable us to design and develop Critical WOP activities in collaboration with WOP scholars that meets their needs and priorities.

Hence, we want to organize a session at the SGM with three main sections:

- 1) we will openly talk about our motivations to engage in Critical WOP, why we personally think it is important, interesting, and enriching for us as individuals and WOP-scholars at PhD student and full professor career stages, and why we do not merely 'escape' into CMS.
- 2) we will briefly talk about the achievements of Critical WOP so far
- 3) we will open the floor for a focus group-style discussion of participants' ideas, thoughts and wishes regarding the potential of Critical WOP. Depending on size of the group, we can split this up between us, or ask others to co-facilitate. Subject to ethical and participant permissions and your agreement, Zoe may gather data during this session for ongoing research into critical WOP in the context of the FOWOP movement. We will develop a more in-depth list of questions nearer to the date, but we expect to discuss:
 - a. participants' perceptions of what Critical WOP does/would/could mean to them
 - b. how critical WOP could play a role in their own research
 - c. what would be most urgently needed from critical WOP to have a meaningful impact on them and others
 - d. what critical WOP could do more broadly to play a meaningful role to WOP academics
 - e. what the challenges are for developing critical perspectives that are meaningful to their own research
 - f. participants' views on what critical WOP should be working on over the next years, in what areas, and how, can critical WOP make a contribution to WOP-scholarship, e.g, critical theories, critical research questions, critical methods etc.
 - g. how can critical perspectives enable WOP to contribute to wider questions of social relevance and importance

Unconference session 6

Title: *Pardon My French: On Superfluous Journal Rankings, Incentives and Impacts on I/O Psychology Publication Practices in French Business Schools*

Author(s): Mehmet A. Orhan

Publishing in prestigious journals is getting increasingly competitive. The industrial, work and organizational psychology (I-O psychology) field is not immune to this amplified competitiveness. However, the nature of competitiveness is quite imbalanced because the dominance of business schools largely influences the domain of I-O psychology and publication practices in the field. One of the immediate consequences is that not all I-O psychology topics receive the same attention. Previous research indicated that WOP scholars in business schools tend to calibrate their research by evaluating the prestige, fit, and relevance of management scholarship and its publication venues. While citation metrics, rankings, and relevant indicators signaling prestige often define publication behaviors, the prevalent use of reward systems for publication in business schools also shape these practices. As a result, we often end up reading more about the “business” and “management” side of the story rather than the “psychology” side. This paper examines the impact of rankings and associated reward systems on publication practices. Taking the French business school context as an example, I argue that prestige has equivocal meaning when financial incentives are included in the equation. As journals with similar metrics are treated differently by scholars residing at French business schools when choosing publication venues, the future of the field is heavily influenced by these mechanisms. Considering all these limitations of rankings and stigmas of superfluous metrics, we, as I-O scholars should focus on how we improve scientific communication and impact without fetishizing the (mis)use of metrics.

Note: This paper has been published in the meantime between the original date for this SGM and now. Please access here:

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/industrial-and-organizational-psychology/article/abs/pardon-my-french-on-superfluous-journal-rankings-incentives-and-impacts-on-industrialorganizational-psychology-publication-practices-in-french-business-schools/F202864636AFAB46580BB9449E01CB5D>

Unconference session 7

Title: *Men and Gender (In-)equality in Academia: Listening to Men's Perspectives*

Author(s): Matthijs Bal & Carolin Ossenkop

The idea for creating a “Workshop for Men” bears from the observation (and frustration) that usually, mostly women (and other socially constructed minorities) attend sessions on gender and diversity at academic conferences – and many of these sessions are also particularly designed to cater women’s “needs”. Whatever the reason, we do not see many men at these meetings. Of course, men are always welcome, and sometimes explicitly encouraged, to join “general gender and diversity meetings” – yet, the participation of men in these meetings is generally marginal. Noticeably, there is no intentionally created space for men to explore, discuss, and formulate ideas around gender and diversity considering men’s roles, needs, and questions when it comes to supporting equality and inclusion in academia. Acknowledging this void, we strive to offering such a space to men, who want to share thoughts and experiences concerning their role, and explore and discover opportunities as to what to (practically) do when it comes to supporting equality and inclusion in academia.

The session aims to introduce the notion of gender diversity in academia to men, and to discuss, using a semi-structured format, the topics, directions and approaches that we could undertake to further design workshops for men on gender diversity. While we have designed an initial format for a workshop, we want to use this session to brainstorm with the participants on the direction that such workshops could take. While there are many workshops, training format and interventions aimed at women in the workplace, there are almost no workshops for men. Hence, due to the novelty of the initiative, and the enormous relevance of it, we want to have a broad discussion and brainstorm among the participants to gather as many ideas and input as possible for further development of the equality-agenda, whereby the central focus of the current session is on the role of men in promoting gender equality.

Main points of discussion will be:

1. Create a safe space where men can share their thoughts and experiences concerning their personal role in supporting equality and inclusion in academia.
2. Generate ideas as to what men may practically do in order to support equality and inclusion in academia – and what they may need in order to do so.
3. Some examples of discussion points for the workshop are:
 - a. Recruitment, Selection and Diversity
 - b. Evaluating and Rewarding
 - c. Formal (social) settings (e.g. meetings)
 - d. Informal (social) settings (e.g. network drinks)
 - e. Activism (e.g., diversity networks)

Workshop 1

Title: *Relieving work pressure in academia, an intervention instrument*

Author(s): Roel Schouteten

The Roadmap 'Work pressure in academia' (see <https://www.dekoers.nl/product/workpressureacademia>) has been developed, at Radboud University and supported by SoFoKles, as an intervention instrument to relieve work pressure in academia. In essence, the Roadmap is a game to be played in a group of four to eight people. In a series of steps and questions, the participants map their own experiences regarding work pressure and work pleasure (happiness), explore the determinants of their work pressure and develop ideas for taking action in order to decrease high levels of work pressure. An important underlying viewpoint in this Roadmap is to investigate the issue and develop improvements at a group level. Whereas many interventions are aimed at individuals (time management, mindfulness), the ideas for improvements that result from this Roadmap are specifically aimed at tackling the sources, rather than the symptoms, of high levels of work pressure. Therewith, work pleasure can be improved.

The goal of this workshop is to help participants map their work pressure and its antecedents and to develop ways to relieve their work pressure. By discussing these issues in a group in a structured and guided way, the issue will become more clear and ideas and 'good practices' can be shared. The benefits of the roadmap are highest when played amongst colleagues, but it also works well when played amongst people from different backgrounds. Participants can use the insights and conclusions to take immediate action at their workplaces. As a result, this workshop can help to make academia a healthier workplace, because it potentially targets some of the structural and work related sources for high work pressure in academia.

The duration of the Roadmap is two hours, excluding a short introduction (by Roel Schouteten) on the topic and the contents of the Roadmap. It can be played by several groups of maximum 8 participants per Roadmap. When all groups have finished, experiences can be shared between the groups. In total, the workshop will last (at least) two and half hours

Workshop 2

Title: *Using tools to make science more open*

Author(s): Tim Vantilborgh

Description

Open science refers to practices that make research more transparent, reproducible, and replicable (Crüwell et al., 2019). Increasingly, scholars argue that open science practices should be adopted to help researchers deal with the replicability crisis in psychology. However, many academics—also in the domain of Work and Organizational Psychology—still struggle with implementing such practices in their own research. The goal of this workshop is therefore to introduce participants to a set of open science practices and tools. In particular, we will focus on:

1. Preregistering research via the Open Science framework
2. Making research more reproducible via Rmarkdown scripts
3. Sharing research via the Open Science framework

Motivation

As I am trying to adopt Open Science research practices myself as well, I understand the problems that researchers may face when they want to make their research more open. Based on this experience, I hope to help WOPs researchers to adopt some of these practices themselves, and thus improve the quality of our research.

Goal

By the end of this workshop, participants should be able to:

1. Fill out a simple preregistration form and know where to download preregistration templates and where to submit preregistration forms.
2. Create a simple Rmarkdown script, using the papaja package, in which they perform some simple analyses on simulated data.
3. Create a project on Open Science Framework in which they store and share their research.

How will the session be organized?

Participants will be asked to bring their own laptop, with R and Rstudio preinstalled. The workshop itself will last 2 hours and will be hands-on, meaning that I will demonstrate how to do things, while participants follow along and try it out themselves.

Challenges for delegates with specific communication or accessibility needs?

Participants will be asked to follow along and try things out on their own laptop. This might pose problems for participants who are visually impaired.

References

Crüwell, S., van Doorn, J., Etz, A., Makel, M., Moshontz, H., Niebaum, J., . . . Schulte-Mecklenbeck, M. (2019). 8 Easy Steps to Open Science: An Annotated Reading List. *ArXiv*. doi:10.31234/osf.io/cfzyx

