15th Conference of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology Maastricht, May 25–May 28, 2011

Conference Theme and Committees

Theme: "Decent work and Beyond"—W&O psychologists' contribution to society

Our society has come at a cross road. The financial and economic crisis calls for radical decisions that will affect our lives, also in the workplace. The challenge will be to steer out of this crisis and to establish a sustainable society, in which everybody can participate. To achieve this many changes are required. However, the question is what kind of choices are we going to make? It is clear that labor participation needs to be increased to sustain prosperity. Making organizations and the labor market more flexible has become a key issue. But how can we renew our organizations, making them more innovative and competitive, while improving the health and well-being of the working population and protecting the environment? This translates into important questions that call for an answer: What does increased flexibility mean for the people in organizations? How does it affect job security? What does it mean for the opportunities for development of employees? How will it affect health and well-being? Where politicians and economists strive to create decent work for all, it is clear that the expertise of Work & Organizational Psychology is indispensable to make employees and organizations flourish and grow. With the theme of this conference we urge to look beyond economic rationality, because radical decisions often imply paradoxes. Such decisions have to be made constantly, day by day, and Work & Organizational Psychologists should contribute to make the right choices and to ensure that not only economic motives count, but that employees matter as well. Because, by the end of the day, the people in the organizations make the difference.

Conference Organizing Committee

Fred Zijlstra, Maastricht University, NIP, chair
Arnold Bakker, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, EAWOP
Neil Anderson, Brunel University, London
Robert Roe, Maastricht University
Michiel Kompier, Radboud University, Nijmegen
Nico van Yperen, Groningen University
Tinka van Vuuren, Open University, Loyalis, NIP
Evert Hummelen, Schouten & Nelissen, NIP
Wilmar Schaufeli, Utrecht University
Jan de Jonge, Eindhoven University of Technology

Local Organizing Committee

Fred Zijlstra, chair
Robert van Doorn
Ute Hülsheger
Jonas Lang
Sandra Lasek
Mariella Muermans
Philippe Nelissen
Margje van der Wiel
Conference Office: Annemie Capellen

Scientific Committee

Fred Zijlstra, Maastricht University, chair
Arnold Bakker, Erasmus University, Rotterdam
Neil Anderson, Brunel University, London
Frans Nijhuis, Maastricht University
Alessia D'Amato, Kingston University, London
Robert van Doorn, Maastricht University
Mary Waller, York University, Toronto
Ben Emans, Groningen University
Barbara Wisse, Groningen University
Ute Hülsheger, Maastricht University
Jan de Jonge, Eindhoven University of Technology
Michiel Kompier, Radboud University, Nijmegen
Jonas Lang, Maastricht University
Annet de Lange, Radboud University, Nijmegen
Hans de Witte, Catholic University Leuven

EAWOP Executive Committee

Arnold Bakker, president
Henry Honkanen, treasurer
Angela Carter
Ann-Louise Holten
Vicente Martínez-Tur
Ana Passos
Salvatore Zappala
EAWOP Secretariat: Christine Goffinet

Reviewers

The following people have been involved in reviewing the submitted abstracts to the 15th EAWOP conference 2011:

N. Anderson, F. Anseel, C. Antoni, P. Argentero, A. Bakker, P. Bal, D. Beckers, C. Bell, J. Bell Crawford, L. Bernhardt, M. Bertolino, C Binnewies, R. Bledow, J. Bosak, l. Brebels, W. van Breukelen, S. Brouwer, L. ten Brummelhuis, A. Chughtai, E. Conway, C. Cortese, AC. Costa, A. Crescentini, A. D'Amato, KJ. Daniels, JF. Dawson, N. De Cuyper, E. Demerouti, D. Derks, K. Dewitte, J. Dikkers, M. Dollard, R. van Doorn, C. Dormann, P. Eisele, BJM. Emans, J. Felfe, A. Fischbach, C. Fredette, S. Geurts, JMP. Gevers, D. Gijbels, G. Grote, H. Guenter, Z. Gurabardhi, J. Hakanen, S. Harinck, W. Helms, AC. Homan, LML. Hooff, EAJ. van Hooft, AHB. de Hoogh, L. ten Horn, I. Houkes, I. Houtman, L. Hovath, X. Hu, U. Hülsheger, M. Infanger, P. Jansen, O. Janssen, J. de Jonge, S. Kaplan, M. Kersting, U. Kinnunen, E. Kirchler, M. Kirrane, U. Kleher, A. Koenig, C. König, TAM. Kooij, M. Kouchaki, J. Kramer, S. Krumm, J. Lang, JWB. Lang, AH. De Lange, K. LaPort, PM. Le Blanc, P. Lichtenthaler, Linden, G. Maier, A. Mäkikangas, D. Martínez-Iñigo, S. Mauno, L. Maxin, J. McCarthy, P. Muck, A. Müller, L. Munduate, F. Munir, A. Mursula, KM. Nielsen, F. Nijhuis, BA. Nijstad, K. Niven, A. Notelaers, A. Nübold, W. Oerlemans, S. Ohly, M. Peeters, G. Pheiffer, A. Pitariu, PM. Poortvliet, J. Randall, F. Rietzschel, T. Rigotti, FA. Rink, DC. Rus, M. Salanova, F. Salvador, W. Schaufeli, A. Schewe, M. Schippers, C. Schoel, B. Schreurs, B. Schyns, S. Sczesny, R. Searle, J. Seelandt, FW. Siero, S. Siu, G. Sohrab, S. Sonnentag, EMB. Spoor, D. Stam, Standifer, J. Stouten, Tasa, R. Thomas, Toubiana, K. Truss, D. Truxillo, F. Tschan, S. Uitdewilligen, T. Vanderelst, T. Vogus, H. Voigt, RE. de Vries, M. Waller, F. Walter, M. Weigl, M. Westman, M. van de Wiel, BM. Wisse, H. de Witte, G. Wittenbaum, M. van Woerkom, HG. Wolff, D. Xanthopoulou, JF. Ybema, I. Zettler, FRH Zijlstra,

changes affected employees' commitment, motivation and satisfaction. We were interested in the differences between the HRM practices and the managerial motivation techniques of Best Employers and average companies. The results are organized and presented according to industry, size of the organizations, characteristics of the organizational culture, the leadership style, and the employee profiles. The practical issues of the findings highlight the importance of managerial human focus at the time of economic crisis.

Organizational Justice and Collective Efficacy: Can Justice Perceptions of Employees be Antecedents of Collective Efficacy?

Arikan, S., *Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey*; Çaliskan, S.C., *Haliç University, Istanbul, Turkey*

Abstract: The previous studies on collective efficacy have showed its positive relationship with positive organizational outcomes like performance, satisfaction, organizational commitment and effectiveness (Arikan, 2009; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, Petitta and Rubinacci, 2003; Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi and Beaubien, 2002), however studies on the antecedents of collective efficacy are rare. Former studies demonstrated that perception of leader, perception of top management and perception of group, self efficacy beliefs of group members, organizational culture, leadership efficacy, climate, leader's behaviors and leader-member exchange can be antecedents of collective efficacy (Borgogni, Petitta, Mastrorilli, 2010; Cali°kan, Arikan and Deger, 2010; Chen and Bliese, 2002; Hoyt, Murphy, Halverson, and Watson, 2003), but we are still in need to conduct studies on the potential antecedents of collective efficacy. On the other hand a great deal of studies on organizational justice and its dimensions revealed that justice perceptions are related with organizational outcomes like satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, leader-member exchange, trust, motivation and performance (Cohen- Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng, 2001). These studies show that there is a positive relationship between organizational justice perceptions and employees positive attitudes to their work and organization. Since some researches suggest that organizational justice perceptions have impact on employee motivation and performance it is possible to expect that justice perceptions might affect efficacy beliefs of employees and groups. The aim of this research is to quest whether dimensions of organizational justice perceptions can be antecedents of collective efficacy. It is hypothesized that organizational justice perceptions will influence employees' perceptions of top management and their immediate manager, and through those perceptions organizational justice will affect employees' perceptions of collective efficacy. Moorman's (1991) Organizational Justice Scale, and Perception of Leader, Perception of Top Management and Collective Efficacy scales of Italian researchers (Borgogni, et al., 2010) are employed to measure the relevant constructs. The present sample includes 130 employees working in academic environment and health sectors but the process of data collection still continues. The results will be discussed in comparisons of previous findings in organizational justice and collective efficacy literature.

Predicting potential job motivation under the condition of economic crisis

Barabanshchikova, V., *Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation*

Abstract: Potential job motivation is one of the major factors influencing turnover rate. In this study, the relationship between potential motivation and characteristics of work situation were assessed after controlling for potential confounds. The data were collected in Moscow, Russia, in January, 2009, which was the time of serious economic difficulties in Russia. Methods. Employees of a large European bank operating in Moscow (N = 317) were given Managerial Stress Survey (Leonova, 2003). MSS assess characteristics of work situation (subscales 'Work conditions and organization', 'Subjective appraisal of work tasks', 'Job rewards and social climate') and consequences of work-related stress (subscales 'Acute stress manifestations', 'Chronic stress manifestations', 'Personality and behavioral deformations'). Potential motivation was assessed via Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, Russian adaptation by Leonova, 2007). Demographic variables (gender, age, tenure) were measured. Results. A hierarchical regression analysis was performed on the data with potential motivation as criterion. In step 1, demographic variables were entered into the model. In step 2, indicators of work-related stress were added to the model (adj. R-squared = 0.14, $p<0.001$). In step 3, predictors pertaining to the self-assessment of work situation were added (adj. R-squared = 0.36, $F(9, 308) = 21.1$, $p<0.001$), clearly improving the model fit ($p<0.001$). Only appraisal of work tasks (beta = -0.43, t = -7.39, $p <0.001$) and self-assessment of job reward and social climate (beta = -0.22, t = -3.78, $p <0.001$) emerged as significant predictors of potential motivation. Conclusions. The results suggest that after controlling for demographic