Introduction Work-life balance (WLB) refers to the harmonisation of one’s professional and personal roles. A growing body of research suggests that this conflict may be associated with various mental and physical health problems. An increasing number of organisations are implementing measures to promote WLB, but the effects of these on workers’ health are not well known. Implemented in 2008, the voluntary Healthy Enterprise Standard (HES) targets four intervention areas, including one to promote WLB. The objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of HES implementation on workers’ WLB and their self-rated health.

Methods This was an intervention study with a before-after design derived from secondary data. Organisations adopted the standard of their own initiative and were responsible for implementing interventions. All active employees were solicited to participate before (T1, n=2849) and 24–38 months (T2, n=2560) following the standard’s implementation. At both time points, participants completed a questionnaire. WLB was measured using one item evaluating participants’ ability to maintain balance in their professional and personal responsibilities. Self-rated health was assessed using a validated self-report item. Exposure to the WLB intervention area was determined by qualitative analyses.

Results The overall results show a deterioration of WLB for both women and men from T1 to T2. Of the two organisations that implemented specific interventions to promote WLB, only one implemented recognised interventions (flexible schedule and telecommute). In this organisation, a slight improvement in WLB was observed for men and especially for women. However, an increase in the prevalence of negative self-rated health was also observed in both sexes.

Discussion These results suggest that workplace interventions implementing recognised and specific measures to promote workers’ WLB may be effective. The results of this study illustrate the importance of implementing concrete and recognised interventions in this field.
reducing stigmatisation, improving collaboration between professionals and implementing programmes for rehabilitation. Each speaker will give a short introductory presentation on their perspective on mental health in the workplace. This will be followed by a panel interview conducted by the session chair and include opportunity for questions to be asked from the audience.

**IO SH research** This session builds on recent research funded by IOSH into the ‘Barriers and facilitators of return to work after sick leave in workers with common mental health disorders’ (Joosen, et al). This study was completed in the Netherlands. Interviews were utilised to explore what occupational health professionals, mental health professionals, general practitioners, managers and workers saw as the barriers to and facilitators of work resumption by workers suffering from common mental disorders. The work includes reflection on the workers’ own perspectives on what had led to sickness absence.

The research identified four main areas for improvement:

- The need for different agencies and professionals to collaborate more closely with each other when dealing with each case.
- Personalise workers’ return to work support by focussing on their values, views and needs.
- Support workers in gaining self-awareness and regaining control.
- Improve manager’s skills and knowledge in guiding workers after suffering a common mental disorder.

This research embellished IOSH’s work in this area and is complimentary to its OH Toolkit, webinars and other information sources it has published. These tools are freely available and actively promoted to our members and wider audiences.
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**Introduction** Employers around the globe are being encouraged, recommended or legally mandated to consider the health of their employees beyond the scope of physical health. This broader scope of psychological health and safety in the workplace encompasses issues like depression, inadequate sleep, excessive job demands, low job satisfaction, extending their consideration into areas of direct and indirect business impact.

**Methods** Responses of 4 20 000 employees in 123 countries to an online health risk appraisal that included measures of psychological and organisational factors were used to compare and correlate the impact of these factors, stratified by level of severity, on health and work. Psychosocial factors included work-related sources of personal stress, depression, sleep and organisational stress, the imbalance of job satisfaction and job stress. Impact on work was measured based on self-reported limitations on performance of work functions and absence from work.

**Results** As the severity of psychosocial risk factors increases, so does the unfavourable impact on job performance limitations and absenteeism, directly and indirectly, through the interaction with worsening physical health risk. For example, for individuals screened for depression (PHQ-9), comparing those with no depression symptoms to those with severe depression, we see globally 3.6 times the prevalence of individuals with 4 or more lifestyle-related risk factors, 13.0 times prevalence of 4 or more chronic conditions, 7.2 times prevalence of severe sleep problems and 11.5 times prevalence individuals reporting more stress than satisfaction from their work. Globally, prevalence of psychosocial risk varies by region, country and site. (e.g. prevalence of mild to severe depression ranges from 16% for North America to 37% for Asia and 39% for Africa and Middle East).

**Discussion** When evaluating health risk, it is important to include psychosocial factors. More studies are required to investigate the impact of psychosocial factors on work and interaction between psychosocial factors and health.