

Editorial
Angela J. Carter

Hello readers

Welcome to the 7th issue of EWOP In Practice with papers on the application of Work and Organizational Psychology (WOP). I am very happy to say that we are receiving some excellent material for the journal building on the success of our Congresses and another successful WorkLab held in Vilnius last year (described later in this edition). Our most significant achievement this year has been the recognition of In Practice by the Association of Business Schools (ABS). We have been recognised as *a one star journal* (appearing on p. 45 of the ABS list). I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who has been associated with In Practice who has enabled us to achieve this recognition. In acknowledgement of our achievement I thought current readers might like to know a little of the history of the journal which will be celebrating its *10th year anniversary* with the 2016 edition.

Some history of In Practice

Ute Schmidt-Brasse co-founded In Practice in 2005 when she gained the support of EAWOP at their General Assembly to publish a journal focusing on the application of WOP. Angela Carter joined as co-editor and together they developed the “zero” edition of In Practice published in 2006. Since that time there have been seven further editions of the journal.

Following the 2006 edition Ute and Angela continued encouraging content and editing the journal with Ute retiring in 2009. Salvatore Zappala joined Angela as co-editor later that year steering this and the next edition in 2011. Angela edited the next two editions of the journal alone and has prepared a majority of the 2015 content. Recognising the growing interest in the journal and moving forward we have expanded our editorial team and welcome two new co-editors: Diana Rus (the Netherlands) and Colin Roth (Germany).

In Practice aims to deliver:

“.....a more hands-on, strongly application oriented journal for WOP professionals. It was requested that there was quick and easy access to the journal, with possibilities to share knowledge and discuss approaches and experience. In addition, there should be opportunities to build networks in the field aiming to bridge the gap between scientists and practitioners and constituent and single members across Eastern and Western borders”.

p. 2 Schmidt-Brasse & Carter, 2006

and remains open access on the EAWOP web site.

In recognition of our new editorial team we have produced an opening feature article entitled *“What do your editors do?”* Following this article the current edition offers five further articles representing a range of WOP practice.

Anastasia Vylegzhanina & Mariya Bogdanova from Tyumen State University offer us and insight into entrepreneurial life in Russia. Their study explores questions of psychological health, stress and coping with a group of business people taking part in an educational programme. This positioning enables the authors to study their research questions and offer targeted interventions to their participants. There is a good deal of detail in this study that will be of interest to both researchers and practitioners.

Next, we have a rare evaluation study of a leadership development programme in the UK. *Chika Agabu* (recent master’s graduate from the Institute of Work Psychology, the University of Sheffield) conducted a qualitative study using the *TOTADO framework of evaluation* (Birdi, 2010) exploring the development of leaders in a local government organization. This paper offers a multiple perspective exploration of leadership development from participant, commissioner and delivery viewpoints offering insight and recommendations for further development.

Keeping with the topic of development our next paper by *Yasen Dimitrov* (doctoral candidate and organizational consultant from Sofia, Bulgaria) and *Ivo Vlaev* (Warwick Business School, the University of Warwick) offers an in-depth exploration of resistance to behavioural change. This paper will be of great interest to

practitioners providing training aiming to adapt, develop or change participants' workplace behaviours and it explores the role of *Emotional Intelligence* to facilitate lasting change.

The next feature is an illustrated description of *WorkLab 2014: A place where scientist and practitioners meet*. Participants of the WorkLab *Edita Dereškevičiūtė, Gintaras Chomentauskas and Solveiga Grudienė* describe the exploration of effective internal communication in organizations and the examination of many useful tools and techniques that were tried and evaluated in the WorkLab

To set the scene for the 4th WorkLab (<http://www.eawop.org/worklab-2015>) to be held on 12th to 14th November, 2015 in Nuremberg, Germany *Leanne Ingram* (WorkLab programme director and doctoral student from Sheffield University Management School) examines mindfulness interventions and research evaluating the effectiveness of these interventions in the workplace.

We intend that this collection of papers will interest you and enable you to examine your own and others' practice by extending your knowledge, attitudes and behaviours to develop and enhance our own and others' day-to-day working activities. We would like to thank the authors for their insightful contributions to In Practice and we look forward to further papers being presented for our next editions.

Hopefully these articles will inspire you to reflect and comment. Please contact the authors directly by email to continue the discussion; or use EAWOP's LinkedIn Group with the author's permission). I will ask the authors to summarise these discussions to be published in the next edition of In Practice.

In Practice is a journal that is for you, the EAWOP Practitioner and Scientist; and is also made by you. Think about writing for the journal yourself. The philosophy of the journal is to publish papers about the practice of WOP. We are interested in articles describing practices, procedures, tools, or even changes in organizational procedures stimulated by shifts in national economies and organizational processes. Some of these activities will be successful while others may not. We are as interested in what did not work well and reflections on why this may be; as well as

those projects that are successful. We will only learn as a community if we examine all aspects of our practice.

As for the length of article, a two to three page contribution is perfect; or more if you wish. The format for the papers is described in the style guide associated with this page. If you would like to discuss your ideas for a contribution or send us an outline we would be happy to comment on this and assist you in the preparation of your article.

Ioannis Nikolaou from Greece (inikol@aub.gr) is EAWOP's Constituent Co-ordinator on the Executive Committee and he would be delighted to hear from you with any news from your local professional association. Helen Baron (helen@hbaron.co.uk) from the UK is the Practitioner Co-ordinator and she would be very happy to hear about any further practitioner activities you think EAWOP should undertake.

Very best wishes for the coming year and we look forward to seeing you in Oslo and discussing your work. Enjoy this issue of In Practice and don't forget we look forward to your contributions.



		
Dr. Angela Carter Editor EWOP In-Practice a.carter@sheffield.ac.uk	Dr Diana Rus Co-editor d.rus@creative-peas.com	Dr Colin Roth Co-editor colin.roth@blackboxopen.com

What do your editors do?

With two new editors joining In Practice we thought it would be useful for you to know about the work we do and the research we are involved in.

Angela's work and research

Angela is a portfolio worker combining roles of: Lecturer in Work Psychology at the Sheffield University Management School; Researcher associated with the School of Health and Related Research, Sheffield; Principal of Just Development and voluntary worker with the British Psychological Society, the Division of Occupational Psychology and EAWOP. This work pattern enables Angela to combine research, consultancy, teaching and supervision of professional practice with masters and doctoral students.

Just Development is consultancy that combines evidence-based practice and development to enable individuals, teams and organizations to maximise their effectiveness. Much of our work is focused on leadership and management development often working with top management teams. Angela started this business in 1997 with her business partner Ian Greggor when she was completing her doctoral studies. The business is known as a consultant's consultancy often offering support, development and supervision to other psychological consultancies.

Angela began her career in the UK Health Service (the National Health Service, NHS) working as a radiographer, manager and internal consultant. While working she studied for her professional qualifications and also gained a degree in Psychology and a master's degree in Occupational Psychology, from Birkbeck College, London University. After being made redundant in 1993 she worked as an independent WOP and joined the research group at the Institute of Work Psychology, the University of Sheffield to undertake a large-scale investigation of stress in the NHS (Borrill et al., 2000; Wall et al., 1997). Her doctoral studies were nested within this project examining well-being in health care teams (Carter & West, 1999). She continues her research in health care organizations examining the: work of Emergency Departments (Mason et al., 2006, Goodacre, Campbell & Carter, 2015; Macintosh, Goodacre & Carter 2010; Weber, Mason, Carter & Hew, 2011),

implementation of angioplasty (Carter, Wood, Goodacre, & Stables, 2010); development of junior doctors (Mason, O’Keefe, Carter, O’Hara, & Stride, 2013), and currently, cross-boundary working to reduce avoidable admissions and attendances.

Four years ago (2011) Angela became alarmed and interested in the large number of young people (between the ages of 18 and 24) who were unemployed in the UK. While teaching on an undergraduate work psychology module and working with the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP, the UK government welfare agency) we explored the voice of young unemployed people and the value of welfare provision available to them. Our research described a group of active, motivated and planful young unemployed people who were more future-work focused than many of the students they were compared with (Carter et al., 2013). Participants articulated the need for more diverse welfare services, such as those using social media that would be more suitable for young people. These findings challenged the current literature that tends to describe young people as demotivated, lacking in self-esteem (Vansteen et al., 2005) and being unready for the work environment (CIPD, 2012).

Being a work psychologist I questioned what was keeping young people out of work and discovered a staggering number of UK organizations did not employ young people under 24 (Carter, 2015). Further, this was not necessarily the result of the current economic climate as there has been a steady reduction of young people moving into employment over the last 15 years (SKOPE, 2012). A second look at the literature suggested young people were not trained or ready for the workplace and lacked critical skills needed at work. Questioning this assumption I set out to understand why there were so few jobs available for young people (demand issue), causing so many young people to be out of work (a supply issue); using a see-saw model to depict the two sides of the problem (Carter, 2013). I was keen to find out about what factors would tip the slide towards providing more jobs for young people.

My initial thoughts have led me to consider a number of factors associated with job entry:

- Recruitment material that does not mention young people or demonstrate job roles attractive to them;

- Bias in short listing candidates; work with colleagues (Palermo & Bourne, 2013) examining the use of personality profiling in selection sift suggests many young people are being rejected too early in the process when certain traits have not yet matured (e.g., Conscientiousness);
- Lack of consideration of differences in temporal perspectives (Sonnentag, 2012) of young people (who look back on their education) and hiring managers (who look back on their work) causes a mismatch of information shared at interview;
- Inappropriate selection processes focusing on already formed work competencies rather than developing competencies.

However, these are a narrow range of factors associated with recruitment and selection and there are likely to be other economic factors complicating the availability of work for young people. In the UK, like many of economies in Europe and across the world, we are struggling to emerge from recession. Reduced output and sales along with cuts in services has led to fewer jobs being available. Job losses mean a crowded job market of people seeking work including those working reduced hours, or receiving low pay, seeking additional work and competing alongside young people looking for entry-level job roles. In addition, there are many more women in the workplace now, compared to 20 years ago; seeking and maintaining job roles whilst having a family. All of these factors have resulted in a ready supply of experienced and competent staff from which companies can choose to fill job roles rather than employing inexperienced young people. Growing globalisation of work over the last 20 years has resulted in the loss of more entry level jobs as they are now being undertaken outside the country (off-shoring); further reducing the availability of jobs to young people. Looking at this pattern it is of little wonder that the literature describes long and difficult transitions between education and work for many young people (Symonds et al., 2011).

It strikes me that there is one area that has been overlooked; the fact that young people have many positive attributes that they can bring to the workplace (e.g., they are happier, more change aware). This leads me to my current research study exploring the advantages of employing young people. I am interviewing a number of company stakeholders to explore these benefits and hope to swing the balance with

a more positive dialogue regarding youth employment. If you or another company representative would like to take part in this study I will be delighted to broaden participation outside the UK in 2016 (a.carter@sheffield.ac.uk).

References

- Borrill, C.S., Carletta, J., Carter, A. J., Dawson, J.F., Garrod, S., & West, M.A. (2000). *The Effectiveness of Health Care Teams in the National Health Service: Final report*. Department of Health.
- Carter, A.J. Chair (2013). Supporting Young Society. Symposium given at the DOP Conference, January 9-11, Chester.
- Carter, A.J. (2015, in press). Youth Employment – the missing facts. *The Psychologist*.
- Carter, A.J., & West, M.A. (1999). *Sharing the burden: Teamwork in healthcare settings*. In R.L. Payne and J. Firth-Cozens (Eds.), *Stress in health care professionals*. (p. 191-202). Chichester: Wiley.
- Carter, A., Wood, S. Goodacre, S., & Stables, R. (2010). Evaluation of the workforce and organisational issues in establishing primary angioplasty in the National Infarct Angioplasty Project, in England. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 15(1), 6-13.
- Goodacre, S., Campbell, M. & Carter, A. (2015). What do hospital mortality rates tell us about quality of care? *Emerg Med J* 2015;32:3 244-247
- Macintosh, M., Goodacre, S., & Carter, A. (2010) A case study of organisational influences on the activity of chest pain units during the ESCAPE trial. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 27, 672-676.
- Mason, S., Locker, T., Carter, A.J., Walters, S., Stride, C.B., & Casson, J. (October 2006). *What are the organisational factors that influence waiting times in Emergency Departments?* Report for the National Co-ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisation R & D (NCCSDO). <http://www.sdo.lshtm.ac.uk/files/project/49-final-report.pdf>
- Mason, S., O'Keefe, C., Carter, A. O'Hara, R. & Stride, C. (2013). An evaluation of foundation doctor training: a mixed-methods study of the impact on workforce well-being and patient care [the Evaluating the Impact of Doctors in Training (EDiT) study]. Report for the National Institute of Health Services Research. *Health Serv Deliv Res* 2013; 1(15). <http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hsdr/volume-1/issue-15>
- Wall, T. D., Bolden, R. I., Borrill, C. S., Carter A. J., Golya, D. A., Hardy, G. E., Haynes, C. E., Rick, J. E., Shapiro, D. A., & West, M. A. (1997). Minor psychiatric disorder in NHS Trust staff: Occupational and gender differences. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 171, 519-523.
- Weber, E.J., Mason, S., Carter, A., & Hew, R.L. (2011). Emptying the Corridors of Shame: Organizational lessons learned from England's 4-hour emergency throughput target. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 57, 79-88.

Diana's work and research

Not unlike Angela, my work spans across a number of different areas, ranging from consulting to teaching, research, supervision of masters' students and voluntary

work. To this end, I spend the majority of my time working as the Managing Director of Creative Peas. In this position, a large part of my activities revolve around developing organizational and leadership capability for innovation (see below for more information). Next to that, I also provide lectures on innovation management and leading for innovation as part of a number of European executive education programmes. In terms of research, I am involved in a number of projects that investigate the relationship between leader behaviour, Human Resource Management (HRM) practices and innovation. For instance, in a current project we are trying to identify high performance HRM practices that are conducive to employee innovative work performance.

As of June 2015, I will resume a more formal university position as a part-time Senior Lecturer in Organizational Psychology at the University of Groningen. In addition, I volunteer with EAWOP and participate in a number of international initiatives geared at identifying drivers of social innovation and classifying and spreading best practice in the management of open innovation. Whereas this may, at first glance, look like a seemingly wide array of activities, there is a clear red line running through all of them: my belief that science needs to inform practice and practice, in turn, needs to inform science.

The belief that science and practice need to inform each other, led to the founding of Creative Peas. Creative Peas is an innovation consultancy that uses evidence-based practice principles to help organizations create work environments that drive innovative performance and engagement. We work with companies interested in building innovation capability and achieving competitive advantage through HRM. In practice, this means that we enable leaders and HR professionals to diagnose, challenge, and spur positive change in existing management and organizational practices. A large part of our activities revolve around developing leaders for innovation, training employees in applying design thinking methods in their work, and aligning processes and practices with the corporate innovation strategy.

My interest in leadership processes and their effects on employee performance, engagement and creativity emerged, years ago, during my PhD project at the

Rotterdam School of Management and further crystallised while working as an Assistant Professor in Organisational Psychology at the University of Groningen. For instance, in one line of research, we investigated determinants of leader unethical behaviour (Rus, van Knippenberg, & Wisse, 2010; 2010; 2012; Wisse & Rus, 2012). Contrary to the often-held notion that power is the root cause of leader corruption, we found that the effects of power on leader self-versus group-serving behaviour are contingent on both features of the individual (i.e., internal belief systems) as well as on features of the situation (i.e., procedural justice systems and accountability constraints). More recently we have been looking at the role of top management in embedding open innovation in organizations (Rus, Wisse, & Rietzschel, 2015) and the effects of leader behaviour on innovative job performance (Schmidt & Rus, 2015). In this respect, we found employees are more likely to engage in innovative work behaviours if their leaders create a learning environment within the team and treat them respectfully (Schmidt & Rus, 2015).

A few years ago, I became fascinated by a number of companies, such as Pixar, IDEO, Procter & Gamble, Apple and Google that have been successful in creating sustainable innovation cultures. I set out to understand what differentiated these companies, as well as the more innovative organizations I worked with, from others that were less successful in this respect. Interestingly, some of the things that appear to drive success are aligned with the findings of more than five decades of psychological research on innovative work performance, some of which, I will outline below:

- They have taken to heart research findings showing that employee' attitudes, motivation and perceptions influence their innovative performance and that these can either be mobilised or crippled by their work environment (Hammond, Neff, Farr, Schwall & Zhao, 2011). Their leaders and HR professionals are using at least three different levers to enable employees to engage in innovative work behaviours: a) they tap into employees' *intrinsic motivation* to be innovative by promoting feelings of self-efficacy, control and meaning; b) they are mindful about structuring the *work context* in such a way that people feel psychologically safe, autonomous, and supported by their organization, peers and leaders; and c) they invest in developing employees'

job-relevant *expertise* and promote collaboration across departments. In other words, they have understood that for innovation to happen, people need to *want* to do it, *feel safe* to do it and *be able* to do it.

- They have understood that the key to sustainable innovation lies in investing in human capital and that it is imperative to develop innovation capabilities at all levels of the organization. In other words, these companies took a broader view of innovation and realised that *innovation is the responsibility of everyone* in the organization; from top management, to HR professionals and all the way down to the shop floor.
- The HR function: a) acts like a real business partner by actively engaging with the different constituencies in the organization to understand their internal needs and challenges; b) are open to re-examining HRM practices that are not conducive to innovative behaviour; and c) does not fall prey to fads and fashion, but instead are mindful about ensuring that HRM 'best practices' fit the local context.

In summary, embedding innovation in an organization won't just happen overnight. If it is to become an everyday part of working life, innovation needs to be constantly nurtured and deliberately managed. Innovation is no longer the sole responsibility of the Research and Development department. Rather, it is the result of the collaborative efforts of motivated individuals, spread across the organization, working in an environment that stimulates, encourages and protects new ideas and their implementation. As WOPs, it is essential that we take an active role in shaping this environment by developing our leaders and creating a context that facilitates experimentation, learning and innovative work behaviour.

References

- Hammond, M.M., Neff, N. L., Farr, J. L., Schwall, A. R., & Zhao, X. (2011). Predictors of individual-level innovation at work: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 5, 90-105.
- Rus, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. M. (2010). Leader power and self-serving behavior: The role of effective leadership beliefs and performance information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 922-933.
- Rus, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. M. (2010). Leader self-definition and leader self-serving behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 509-529.

- Rus, D., van Knippenberg, D., & Wisse, B. M. (2012). Leader power and self-serving behavior: The moderating role of accountability. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 13-26.
- Rus, D., Wisse, B. M., & Rietzschel, E. F. (forthcoming). An open invitation to open innovation: Guidelines for the leadership of open innovation processes. Forthcoming in A.B. Markman & H. P. Naquin (Eds.), *Open Innovation: Academic and Practical Perspectives on the Journey from Idea to Market*. Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, J. & Rus, D. (2015). Leader interactional fairness and learning orientation as determinants of employee innovative work behaviour. *Manuscript in preparation*.
- Wisse, B. M., & Rus, D. (2012). Leader self-concept and self-interested behavior: The moderating role of power. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 11, 40-48.

Colin's work and research

The EAWOP conference in Münster was a great experience. I really enjoyed the venue, the beautiful palace, the park, and a lot of walking miles. Those of you, who were there, might still feel their feet burning! I was on my way to a keynote about green behaviours by Deniz Ones, when a banner with the headline "EAWOP WorkLab 2013 in Amsterdam" distracted me; and this is how things started.

Discussions with Angela and Diana about how WOP can contribute to a better workplace inspired me from the very beginning. When Angela asked me to support her as co-editor for EWOP in practice I was honoured and motivated at the same time. I am convinced we will make a good team by combining our experiences and insights from different perspectives and career paths.

To some extent, my occupational life resembles Diana's. I am founder and managing partner of Blackbox/Open, a consulting firm with emphasis on evidence-based management, or EBM (Briner & Rousseau, 2011). We offer consulting to various types of organizations in Organizational Development, Personnel Development, and Employer Branding. Our vision is to create and install HR practices that both fit company values and that are based on solid empirical evidence. We support our clients in finding the 'right' people, identifying and training the best performers and driving the motivation of individuals and teams through participation, goal setting, and feedback. Our software 'Ability' is a web based, cutting edge tool, that facilitates team development, performance management, employee surveys, and 360° feedback (Pritchard, Weaver, & Ashwood, 2012). One of the core principles of EBM is open access and collaboration, thus we have created the ProMES European

Competence Center (ProMES ECC), information and networking platform for ProMES experts across Europe. ProMES is a highly effective management system for measuring and improving the productivity, effectiveness, and overall performance of people in organizations (Pritchard, 1990; Pritchard et al., 2012). Following the principle “work smarter, not harder” (Pritchard et al., 2012, p. 129), establishing ProMES leads to significant gains in productivity and noticeable improvements concerning job satisfaction, team climate and stress (Pritchard, Harrell, DiazGranados, & Guzman, 2008).

To bridge the gap between research and practice I hold a part-time post-doctoral position at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU). With my colleagues at the department of Work and Organizational Psychology, I conduct research on a variety of topics, such as Work Motivation (Pritchard & Ashwood, 2008), Job Crafting (Demerouti, 2014), and Psychological Capital (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). I also volunteer at the University of Central Florida (UCF) as an external dissertation committee member for doctoral candidates at the Department of Psychology and Management.

Angela asked me to describe my journey to become a WOP practitioner. I clearly remember a key moment, when I was attending a course on performance measurement by Klaus Moser, who later became my mentor and doctoral adviser. I must admit, I wasn't very motivated to join the class; I studied Social Sciences at the time and preferred to discuss Max Weber's theories on Capitalism rather than wasting time contending with questions concerning how to improve employee performance at work. However, I soon discovered the value and importance of such questions not only for organizational success but also for the well-being of individuals. Serendipitously, this course would also guide my future. I was late for class and consequently assigned the last available topic for my thesis, the Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System, or ProMES. Ironically, this seemingly Tayloristic expression became the core element of my research and career as a consultant.

After graduating in 2003 I started my professional career at GfK Media as an internal HR consultant. I had the chance to apply WOP tools in various business units in Germany but also with cross-cultural teams, especially in Eastern Europe. While conducting a project evaluation at a business division in Kiev, I experienced first-hand how dissimilar cultures can be within the same organization. When I asked some participants why their evaluations were so positive, they told me that they wouldn't report anything bad about the company even if they felt it. This was an extraordinary perspective and I wanted to understand it better. As such, I completed my doctoral studies at the Department of Psychology at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg in 2007. During this time, I investigated the effectiveness of team interventions in knowledge intensive services, and looked for drivers of team success (Roth, 2007; Roth & Moser, 2005, 2009).

My interests in teams and motivation extend to professional athletics. I have always been fascinated about athletes, their engagement, and their dedication to what they do. WOP psychologists can gain valuable knowledge by investigating professional athletes and sports teams. Conversely, sports organizations can particularly benefit from achievements of WOP research (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009). I had the great honour to work with Robert Pritchard, (Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980; Pritchard, 1992; Pritchard & Ashwood, 2008) and inventor of ProMES. We implemented ProMES with the women's collegiate basketball team at the University of Central Florida (Roth, Schmerling, Koenig, Young, & Pritchard, 2010). Analogous to applications in the organizational context we found a significant change in the team's performance. Moreover, we celebrated the team's first Conference USA championship after the 2008/2009 season (the winners of the 35 conferences proceed to the so called "March Madness" to play for the National Championships). Following this excursion into the athletic arena, I continued my work as a management consultant and WOP researcher at the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg.

To me, research must inform practice. In return, practitioners should share their experiences with research institutions. As consultants, trainers, and coaches we have to embrace our role as ambassadors between the two worlds. Organizational

consulting is a huge market, and a lot of dubious practices are sold and applied in our organizations. Thus, I encourage practitioners to embrace scientific evidence when developing and revising their products and to employ tools based on rigorous scientific research. I am excited to read and review submitted articles for the professional exchange with our authors, and learning about new insights in cutting edge research and practice in WOP across Europe. And of course intensive discussions with Angela and Diana!

References

- Briner, R., & Rousseau, D. M. (2011). Evidence-Based I–O Psychology: Not There Yet. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 4*, 3–22. doi: 1754-9426/11
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Job Crafting. In M. C. W. Peeters, de Jonge, J. & Taris, T. W. (Ed.), *An introduction to contemporary work psychology* (1st ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Fletcher, D., & Wagstaff, C. R. D. (2009). Organizational psychology in elite sport: Its emergence, application and future. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10*, 427–434. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.03.009
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Naylor, J. C., Pritchard, R. D., & Ilgen, D. R. (1980). *A theory of behavior in organizations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Pritchard, R. D. (1990). *Measuring and improving organizational productivity: A practical guide*. New York: Praeger.
- Pritchard, R. D. (1992). Organizational Productivity. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial/ Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 443–471). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Pritchard, R. D., & Ashwood, E. L. (2008). *Managing motivation. A manager's guide to diagnosing and improving motivation*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Pritchard, R. D., Harrell, M. M., DiazGranados, D., & Guzman, M. J. (2008). The Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 540-567.
- Pritchard, R. D., Weaver, S. J., & Ashwood, E. L. (2012). *Applied Psychology Series : Evidence-Based Productivity Improvement : A Practical Guide to the Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System (ProMES)*. London, GBR: Routledge.
- Roth, C. (2007). *Partizipatives Produktivitätsmanagement (PPM) bei Spitzentechnologie nutzenden und wissensintensiven Dienstleistungen. Ergebnisse einer Studie bei einem internationalen Marktforschungsunternehmen [The Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System (ProMES) among Knowledge Intensive High-Tech Services]*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac.
- Roth, C., & Moser, K. (2005). Partizipatives Produktivitätsmanagement bei komplexen Dienstleistungen [The Productivity Measurement and Enhancement System (ProMES; Management system PPM) with complex service tasks]. *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie, 2*, 66-74.

Roth, C., & Moser, K. (2009). Leistungsmanagement von Gruppen bei wissensintensiven Dienstleistungen [Performance Management with teams in knowledge intensive services]. *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie*, 1, 24-34.

Roth, C., Schmerling, D., Koenig, N., Young, B. L., & Pritchard, R. D. (2010). *Enhancing performance in sports teams with ProMES*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, Georgia.