

work-family balance self-efficacy among Japanese dual-earner workers with pre-school child(ren).

128

DEVELOPMENT OF AN ONLINE INTERVENTION TOOL TO PREVENT EXPOSURE TO WORKPLACE BULLYING

^{1,2,3}Whitney Van den Brande*, ^{2,4}Elfi Baillien, ^{1,3}Tinne Vander Elst, ^{3,5}Hans De Witte, ^{1,6}Lode Goddeeris. ¹Knowledge, Information and Research Centre (KIR, IDEWE Group), Leuven, Belgium; ²Research Department Work and Organisation Studies (KU Leuven), Brussels, Belgium; ³Research Group Work, Organisational and Personnel Psychology (KU Leuven), Leuven, Belgium; ⁴Department of Psychosocial Science, University of Bergen, Norway; ⁵Optentia Research Focus Area (North-West University), Vanderbijlpark Campus, South Africa; ⁶Centre for Environment and Health (KU Leuven), Leuven, Belgium

10.1136/oemed-2018-ICOHabstracts.1605

Introduction Although the negative impact of workplace bullying has been empirically demonstrated, there is little research on preventive interventions regarding workplace bullying. In reply, the aim of this study is to develop an evidence-based online intervention tool to prevent employees from being exposed to workplace bullying. Given the significant role of coping strategies and self-efficacy in becoming a target of bullying, we aim to develop an online intervention that (1) discourages emotion-focused coping strategies, (2) stimulates self-efficacy, and (3) reduces exposure to workplace bullying.

Methods The online intervention was developed in three steps. First, we developed a short questionnaire by means of Confirmatory Factor Analysis based on a representative sample of the Belgian working population (n=1.068). Second, we developed a personal stress profile module by means of Relative Operating Characteristic Analysis. Third, we developed exercises inspired by the principles of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy.

Result The tool developed (=StressBalancer) contains three steps:

- StressBarometer is a questionnaire that measures the most relevant work-related stressors (i.e., workload, job insecurity, role conflict and role ambiguity), emotion-focused coping strategies and self-efficacy.
- My Stress Profile (= Feedback) provides feedback on the employees' use of emotion-focused coping strategies, their level of self-efficacy and their level of stressors. The profile reports whether employees score safe (= green zone), problematic (= orange zone) or very problematic (= red zone) on these variables.
- Training contains exercises that aim to discourage emotion-focused coping strategies and aim to stimulate self-efficacy.

Discussion Studies have been set up to evaluate the online intervention tool by means of an experimental cross-over design.

1292

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEPRESSION SYMPTOM PROFILES AND WORK PRODUCTIVITY LOSS

¹Carolyn S Dewa*, ²Jeffrey S Hoch, ³Karen Nieuwenhuijsen, ³Judith K Sluiter. ¹University of California, Davis, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, Sacramento, US; ²University of California, Davis, Department of Public Health Sciences, Sacramento, US; ³Colonel Institute of Occupational Health, Academic Medical Centre, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

10.1136/oemed-2018-ICOHabstracts.1606

Introduction Depression is one of the most prevalent mental disorders in the working population. About 10% of workers currently have at least one mental disorder; approximately 2%–7% of the workforce experiences depression. There is growing awareness of the social and economic costs of depression and its heavy workplace burden. Recognising the heterogeneity of workers' experiences of depression, there have been suggestions to focus interventions on individual depression symptoms and symptom clusters (i.e., profiles) rather than depression severity alone. Our analyses explore the question, 'What is the relationship between depression symptom profiles and work productivity loss?'

Methods These analyses use a population-based sample of 2219 employed adults living in Ontario, Canada. Based on PHQ-8 items, depression symptom profiles were identified using cluster analysis methods. Four work productivity loss dimensions (WPLD) were examined: (1) *limitations handling time*, (2) *physical limitations*, (3) *mental-interpersonal limitations* and (4) *output demands limitations* from the Work Limitations Questionnaire. Associations between the WPLD and the symptom profiles were examined using multiple linear regression.

Results Depression symptom profile groups differed in the magnitude of productivity losses. The group experiencing the highest severity across all symptoms had 5%–20% more work productivity losses in all four WPLD compared to the other groups. The group with the most difficulty concentrating had 4%–13% greater productivity losses related to *mental-interpersonal limitations* than other groups. This group along with those who experienced disruption in sleep, energy, and appetite had 8%–12% greater productivity losses related to *limitations handling time* than other groups.

Discussion Our results suggest workers have different experiences of depression. To assist workers with depression to continue being productive, attention should be paid to the combinations of types of difficulties and specific job characteristics. By understanding the specific challenges, work accommodations can be designed to target specific challenges workers face.

1299

THE EFFECTS OF MEASURABLE OUTCOMES ON THE ACTIVITY OF HEALTH AT WORK PREVENTION SERVICES

J Munoz*. Université de Brest Bretagne Occidentale LABERS EA 3149 France. Jorje.munoz@univ-brest.fr

10.1136/oemed-2018-ICOHabstracts.1607

Introduction In France, governments have been developing health at work plans since the early 2000s. The agricultural sector is no exception. In order to set up such a plan, the French agricultural health insurance fund (Caisse Nationale de la Mutuelle Sociale Agricole) has developed a range of managerial processes. These include outcomes to be achieved, which are in turn based on measurable indicators. The aim of the study is to assess the impact of these managerial processes on prevention.

Methods This research is based on non-participant observations that have been conducted within 5 health at work prevention services over a period of 10 months. Observations have been complemented by 2 series of interviews that have been conducted within the above mentioned services (n=34) and at national level (n=3). Two analyses of these interviews