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I. Background
Background

• Sick leave due to psychosocial factors ++
  – i.e.: DAK 2005: + 70 % from 1997 and 2004 (total sick leave -,-=)

• Costs raising

• D: Obligation to risk assessment („Gefährdungsanalyse“, §5ff, ArbSchG)

• How? Which instruments? (lack of qualified instruments)
Background / starting point

• Need of (valid and reliable) measurement tools
• Measurement of psychosocial factors difficult (as compared to safety-checklists)
• Lot of different models, theories (DCSM, ERI,…). And: theories are determining the instruments! (and the results)
• Different assessment techniques (observation, expert ratings, experimental techniques, self administered questionnaires)
ISO for measuring psychosocial factors

• ISO 10075-3: 3 levels
  – Orienting measurement (level 1)
  – Screening measurement (level 2)
  – Exact measurement (level 3)

• ISO: depending on level: different psychometric requirements
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II. COPSOQ: Adaptation and translation into German
COPSOQ validation study 2003-2005

„Methods for the assessment of mental work load – testing of a measuring procedure (COPSOQ)“

• Funding: Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (BAuA / FIOSH)

• Project team:
  – FFAS Freiburg (M. Nübling, M. Michaelis)
  – Univ. Freiburg, Medical Sociology (U. Stößel)
  – Univ. Wuppertal, Occupational Medicine (H.-M. Hasselhorn, F. Hofmann)

• External partners
  – Univ. Freiburg, Psychology (M. Wirtz)
  – ami (National Institute of Occ. Health), Copenhagen (T. Kristensen)
COPSOQ = COpenhagen PsychoSOcial Questionnaire

Autoren: TS Kistensen, V Borg, ami, Kopenhagen 2000
N=1858.
„Based on theory but not on one specific theory“. (Broad)

3 Versions:
• Long: „Research Quest.“: 30 Scales, 141 Items (-> with some modifications = starting point of German study)
• Middle: „Quest. for work environment professionals“: 26 Scales, 95 Items
• Short: „Quest. for workplaces“: 8 Scales, 44 Items
COPSOQ-study: steps (1)

• 1. Translation and adaptation of COPSOQ (2003)
  – translation – retranslation: English - German - English
  – translation – retranslation: Danish - German – Danish
  – semantic adaptation
  – additional items and scales
  – Expert- decision on final wording (TSK, HMH, MN)

• 2. Pilot study (2003, N= 352), final modifications

• 3. Main study (2003/04, N = 2.561), heterogeneous (not representative as in DK) spectrum of jobs, cooperation with enterprises / organisations (“survey for free”)
German COPSOQ- main study, long version

Demands (5)
- Quantitative demands
- Cognitive demands
- Emotional demands
- Demands for hiding emotions
- Sensorial demands

Influence and Development (5)
- Influence at work
- Degree of freedom at work
- Possibilities of development
- Meaning of work
- Workplace commitment

Interpersonal relations and leadership (8)
- Predictability
- Role clarity
- Role conflicts
- Quality of leadership
- Social support
- Feedback
- Social relations
- Sense of community

Further parameters (1+5)
- Work-privacy conflict
- Procedural justice
- Relational justice
- Job insecurity
- Mobbing
- Intention to leave

Strain (effects, outcomes)
- Job satisfaction
- Work ability
- General health
- Burnout
- Behavioral stress
- Cognitive stress
- Satisfaction with life
COPSOQ-study: steps (2)

• 4. Reanalysis of the measurement properties (2004)
  – Objectivity (measurement, evaluation)
  – Sensitivity
  – Validity (content, construct, criterion)
  – Reliability
  – Diagnostic power
  – Generalisability
  – Suitability in terms of the ISO 10075-3

• 5. Proposal of a shortened measuring instrument

• 6. Final report (May 2005)
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III. Validation study: psychometric qualities of questionnaire and scales – some examples
ex: Reliability scales (internal consistency)

Cronbach‘s alpha: *(we did ICC too)*
partly > 0.8 (ISO), partly > 0.7
- (1) short: alpha lower
- (2) D like DK
Content validity: questionnaire very comprehensive (broad).

Construct validity (SEM): dimensions (mostly) good to separate / distinguish

Criterion validity: relations to outcomes as postulated (some scales omittable)
We (COPSOQ) find the differences, that are expected /known. Some parameters are profession specific, some not. (Scales measure at least something similar to what they should)

Emotional demands: (also) profession specific, Only partly enterprise specific! Can be good or bad in every profession, but some profs have a systematic advantage /disadvantage.
ex: comparison of professions
(sensitivity, Diag. power)

Sense of community: not profession specific, but enterprise specific!
Can be good or bad in every profession, depending on the enterprise
Summary measurement qualities

- Objectivity: ok
- Practicability: (enterprises and probands) ok; shorter is better!
- Acceptance: ok; shorter is better! Anonymity
- Sensitivity: ok
- Validity (content, construct, criterion): mostly ok
- Reliability: depending on coeff. (Cronbach or ICC) and level (0.7, 0.8) and Scale length
- Generalisability: age, sex, ok; occupation: differences but not systematic
- Diagnostical power: ok, plausible results

More in project report (German), English article and: www.copsoq.de
Conflict of interests:
psychometric properties and practicability

Shortened version:
Keep: broad content +
Keep: Intern. comparison +
Impr.: Practicability +
Impr.: Acceptance +

Long version:
Better: Reliability (Scales) +
Better: Validity (+)
Better for ISO
German COPSOQ - shortened standard

**Demands**
- Quantitative demands
- Emotional demands
- Demands for hiding emotions
  - Work - privacy conflict

**Influence and development**
- Influence at work
- Degree of freedom at work
- Possibilities of development
- Meaning of work
- Workplace commitment

**Further parameters**
- Job insecurity

**Supplementary scales**
- conflicts with clients
- shift work
- teacher items
  - …

**Interpersonal relations and leadership**
- Predictability
- Role clarity
- Role conflicts
- Quality of leadership
- Social support
- Feedback
- Social relations
- Sense of community
- Mobbing

**Strain (effects, outcomes)**
- Job satisfaction
- Intention to leave
- General health
- Burnout
- Cognitive stress
- Satisfaction with life
Use of COPSOQ

Screening tool (ISO 10075-3, level 2, not „holy“)

- **Measurement** as starting point for discussion process in organisations („Diagnosis“)
- **Interpretation and defining priorities for improvement actions** (evtl. with external support) on base of solid data (incl. profession-specific reference data)
- **Actions and documentation** („Intervention“)
- **Evaluation** (2. Measurement)
Process – risk assessment

1. Survey T1 = Diagnosis

2. Results to Enterprises, Organisations
   - Interpretation
     - Defining improvement fields and strategies/actions

3. Analyses: actions and survey results (T1, T2)
   - Evaluation: Promising actions?

4. Performance of improvement actions

5. Survey T2 = Evaluation

6. report
Process – risk assessment

1. Survey T1 = Diagnose
2. Results in Enterprises, Organisations
3. Interpretation
   Defining improvement fields and strategies
4. Evaluation: Promising actions?
5. Performance of improvement actions
6. Analyses: actions and survey results (T1, T2)
   Evaluation: Promising actions?
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IV. Formation of database in cooperation science - enterprises/organisations
Cooperation model: science - enterprises/organisations

2. Performance survey

1. materials (online Q, p&p Q-sets)

Enterprise

P 1 P 2 P 3

3. Q or online-data

Data base:
Profession specific reference values

4. Data analysis

FFAS

5. Comparison with reference data
Inclusion in database

6. report + CD
(4 weeks)

7. Improvement actions
benefits

– Single employee
  • Direct feedback: my job situation vs average (open to everybody)
  • Improvement working situation after survey (hope)
– enterprise
  • Solid basic data to psychosocial factors
  • External benchmark (with similar occupations / enterprises)
  • Internal benchmarks (0f sub-units)
– science
  • growing database on profession specific psychosocial factors at work
    (advantage against self-service CD etc)
Example online FB (open for eb)

Quantitative Demands = B1_1 – B1_4 = (100 + 75 + 75 + 25) / 4 = 69
online FB: Individual Feedback (pers. result)

Quantitative demands
MN = 69, Reference = 57

Emotional demands
MN = 42, Reference = 63

For all 25 scales.
Print, save or delete.
Report enterprises (4 Weeks after survey)

– 1. Text:
  • background, aims, performance survey
  • Interpretation of most important results of enterprise

– 2. Doku Questionnaire COPSOQ

– 3. Doku text in open questions
Report enterprises (4 Weeks after survey)

- 4. Graphs (each scale: set à 25 Graphs)
  - External benchmark: comparison with other professions and profession specific reference data

- 5. Graphs (each scale, set à 25 Graphs)
  - Internal benchmark: comparison of sub-units (defined by enterprise before)
Example internal comparison

Scale: quality of leadership
Bars: 7 subunits
Red line: average enterprise

For each of the 25 scales
What can we do with a single mean value? Internal comparison ok, but else? We have no objective cutoff or „Fixed point in the universe“.
We use comparisons as „our best chance available“
Example external comparison, reference values

Scale: Quantitative demands

But: normative power of facts!
Do we want to accept reality as normal?
Example external comparison, reference values

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI): "personal burnout"

Mean (95% Confidence interval)

- value profession
- mean COPSOQ

Reference values as interpretation helpers
Especially necessary when aspects are structurally "profession-dependent"
V. Actual situation and future
Present and future

– FFAS: Work like a „survey service agency“, less like a researcher
– Anyway: data base growing, 5.500 actual, ca. 8000 end of year -> analyses possibilities are growing
– Big project with teachers/schools in BW coming
  (probably biggest teacher study ever?! N=110.000 teachers, 4300 schools)
Present and future

- When projects with scientific funding:
  - International comparison (EU?!)
  - 2nd round with enterprises from main study 2004
  - Inclusion of more “blue collar“ data and up to now „blind fields“ in database, „sponsoring“ of specific enterprises (for free surveys)
  - Comparison COPSOQ - ERI – FIT (convergent validity)
  - More analyses with existing data
Thanks for your attention!

nuebling@copsoq.de

(nearly) everything to the German COPSOQ:
www.copsoq.de