Moving on from COPSOQII –
a report on the Danish update

Thomas Clausen, NRCWE, tcl@nrcwe.dk

September 19, 2013
Agenda

• Personal considerations
• Purpose of the project
• Reflections on ‘the good item’
• Dilemmas in updating a questionnaire
• How did we do it?!
• What did we do?
  • What’s new?
  • What has been updated?
• Testing the questionnaire
• Time-line
• Where do we go from here…
On the personal side...

- Andersen LL, T Clausen, R Persson & A Holtermann (In press) Perceived physical exertion during healthcare work and prognosis for recovery from long-term pain in different body regions: Prospective cohort study. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.
Purpose of the project

• To update the questionnaire on psychosocial work environment so that it is able to measure important issues in the psychosocial work environment in today’s workplaces
• And to do so in a language that matches the way the psychosocial work environment in articulated in today’s workplaces
• And to provide specific add-on questionnaires for specific job groups
Project organisation

International reference group
- Hermann Burr (BaUA, Germany)
- Stein Knardahl (STAMI, Norway)
- Hugo Westerlund (Stressforskningsinstitutet, Sweden)
- Ute Bültmann (University of Groningen, Holland)

Internal reference group
- Vilhelm Borg (Senior researcher)
- Reiner Rugulies (Professor)
- Ida E.H. Madsen (Researcher)
- Jesper M. Pedersen (Analyst)
- Otto M. Poulsen (Senior researcher)
- Glen Winzor (Head of Research group)

Steering committee
- Inger Schaumburg (Director General of NRCWE)
- Ulla W. Skjøth (Deputy Director General of NRCWE)
- Nils Fallentin (Research Director of NRCWE)
- Elsa Bach (Head of Research group)
- Per Jakobsen (Head of Management secretariat)

Project group
- Thomas Clausen (Senior researcher)
- Anna Jessen (Research assistant)
What is a good item?

• Items must have face validity
• Items must be easy to understand
• Items should not contain a simultaneous assessment of exposure and strain
• Avoid asking about more than one thing in an item
• Items should be precise and neutral in their wording so that they come as close as possible to the empirical phenomenon that we wish to assess

-> Reduce the degree of cognitive and emotional processing in the response situation
Dilemmas in updating a questionnaire

• Need for development vs. need for continuity
Methods: How did we do it

• Thorough review of the literature

• Focus group interview in 15 workplaces in different occupations

• Thorough review of scales and items in COPSOQII

• Psychometric evaluation of the COPSOQII-data that were collected in 2004
What is new?

• Illegitimate tasks
• Possibilities for performing core tasks
• Changes in the workplace
• Innovation in performing work tasks
• Work without boundaries
• Social capital (bonding, linking)
• Influence on working hours
And what about the ‘old’ scales?

Demands at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demands at work</th>
<th>To be kept in unchanged form</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (1 item kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (2 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (3 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (all items changed)</th>
<th>To be excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional demands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demands for hiding emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And what about the ‘old’ scales?  
Work organization + job content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work organization and job content</th>
<th>To be kept in unchanged form</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (1 item kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (2 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (3 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (all items changed)</th>
<th>To be excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And what about the ‘old’ scales?
Interpersonal relations and leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal relations and leadership</th>
<th>To be kept in unchanged form</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (1 item kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (2 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (3 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (all items changed)</th>
<th>To be excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role confluks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And what about the ‘old’ scales?

Work-individual interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To be kept in unchanged form</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (1 item kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (2 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (3 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (all items changed)</th>
<th>To be excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-individual interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-work conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And what about the ‘old’ scales?
Values at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values in the workplace</th>
<th>To be kept in unchanged form</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (1 item kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (2 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (3 items kept)</th>
<th>Kept in changed form (all items changed)</th>
<th>To be excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Vertical’ trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Horizontal’ trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility/discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stability or change?

• High level of stability at the thematic level (scale-level)

• Not-so-high level of stability at the level of the individual items
Test of the questionnaire

- Right now: cognitive interviewing to test comprehensibility of items

- Early 2014: test of the questionnaire in a stratified sample of Danish employees – with an in-built test-retest design

- Mid-2014: Follow-up among participants in initial test to test predictive validity
Time-line

- September 2013: participation in COPSOQ-workshop
- September-October 2013: Cognitive interviewing
- January-March 2014: Quantitative test of the questionnaire
- August-September 2014: Follow-up on quantitative test

- Mid 2015: Documentation of the revised questionnaire is published in a monograph in Danish and in one or two articles that will be submitted for publication in journals with peer review
Where do we go from here?

• Possibilities for further cooperation?