# Fact Sheets: Psychosocial Risk Assessment Tools

University of South Australia

***Asia Pacific Centre for Work, Health and Safety***

WHO Collaborating Centre for Occupational Health

*2018*

**Authors.**

**Mikaela Owen**, Asia Pacific Centre for Work Health and Safety, University of South Australia

**Maureen Dollard**, Asia Pacific Centre for Work, Health and Safety, University of South Australia

Copyright belongs to the Asia Pacific Centre for Work, Health and Safety, University of South Australia

# Fact Sheets: Psychosocial Risk Assessment Tools

The aim of this project was to identify and develop fact sheets on the various risk assessment tools that are available globally to assess psychosocial risk. The intended users of this document are policy makers, organisations, trade unions, human resource personnel, national authorities, work health and safety agencies, inspectors, personnel, managers, work environment professionals, researchers, practitioners, individual workers, doctors, counsellors, and occupational health providers.

Psychosocial risks and hazards represent those aspects of the workplace, such as the job design and the organisation and management of work that have the potential to cause harm of a physical and/or psychological nature to the individual (Cox & Griffith, 2005; International Labour Organization, 1986; Leka & Cox, 2008). The interaction between workers and these psychosocial hazards may prove risky to employee health (BSI, 2011; Leka & Jain, 2016). For example, workers facing heavy workloads, a lack of control over how and when their work tasks are completed, and a lack of support from their supervisors and co-workers, are all examples of psychosocial risks in the workplace. Psychosocial risks have an impact on the health and safety of workers and the productivity of the organisation. The tools identified in the following factsheets can be used to assess psychosocial risks within the workplace.

Systematic examination of psychosocial risks in the workplace through risk assessment can identify problems within a working environment and the severity of identified problems. A comprehensive risk assessment not only identifies the problems that have potential to cause harm for the individual and the organisation but also identifies positive aspects of the work environment that can promote healthy sustainable workplaces (Leka & Cox, 2008). While identified problems in the workplace should be minimized, the positive aspects should be enhanced (Leka & Cox, 2008).

Assessing psychosocial risks in the workplace using one of the provided tools in the subsequent factsheets is important. However, assessing the psychosocial risks is only one aspect of good management practice. Good management practice incorporates psychosocial risk management, which involves organisational learning, risk assessment and audit, translation/ action plans, risk reduction (interventions), and evaluation (Leka & Cox, 2008). Potter, Fattori, and Dollard (2016) provide a recent review of various psychosocial risk management tools, highlighting the psychosocial risk management toolkit most suitable for a specified purpose.

For the current review an extensive literature search was conducted to locate psychosocial risk assessment tools internationally, using a mixed search strategy of online databases, snowballing, an internet based search engine (Google Scholar), websites of stakeholder organisations in occupational health, as well as through macro-level initiatives/standards. The aim of the review is to provide descriptive rather than evaluative information about psychosocial risk assessment tools rather than a systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of the tools. Readers are encouraged to consult the literature or contact the authors of the tools for further information.

For comparative purposes and knowledge transfer across the regions, we reviewed the psychosocial risk assessment tools in relation to their year of publication, objective, type of

hazard, how it works, possible users, costs, how to access the tool, conditions of use, translations, and country of origin.

The tools that are identified and included as fact sheets are the tools that include more than one psychosocial risk. For example, the HSE Indicators Tool measures seven psychosocial risks (e.g., demands, control, peer support, managerial support, relationships, role, and change). It is important to note that these tools are tools identified as of November 2016 – any tools developed from this point onwards have not been included.

**Conditions of Use**

In the use of the tools, all respondents must be anonymous, participation is voluntary, and the employees have the right to see a summary of the results as well as discuss the results.

**Goals for the Future**

Our goal is to continue adding to the factsheets as well as developing factsheets for specific social-relational workplace risks workplace practices such as harassment, bullying, aggressive behaviours, and incivility in the workplace.

A common perception is that psychosocial risk assessment tools have been created in the developed world and therefore cannot be applied in developing countries and particularly in businesses operating in the informal sector. However, many of the risk factor tools in tools such as the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) and Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire have been translated and used in these contexts as they are simple to use and applicable to organisations in all sectors, such as rural development workers in India (Duraisingam & Dollard, 2005), health care workers in Iran (Afsharian, et al., 2016), workers in Malaysia (Idris, Dollard, & Winefield, 2011) and in formal and informal jobs in Brazil (de Araújo & Karasek, 2008). The application of these tools also does not require large investments of resources or expertise.

While some tools are comprehensive and cover a range of risk factors no one tool covers all known risks. For example although comprehensive, the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire does not assess Psychosocial Safety Climate, and the Australian Workplace Barometer does not assess work meaning. A review by Dollard et al. (2007) identified the range of risk factors that should be assessed in monitoring psychosocial factors at a population level, but these risk factors are relevant to assess within organisations too. They include the broad categories of (1) job characteristics and the nature of work (job content/demands, workload/pace, work schedule, job control), the social and organisational context of work (organisational culture and function, interpersonal relationships, role in organisation, career development, bullying violence, organisational justice), see also Cox et al., 2000). Users are encouraged to look across subcomponents of the tools to ensure adequate coverage of risks identified through organisational experience (reports from WHS personnel, unions, HR, interviews) as important to canvas.  Also consideration should be given to the meaning of the items in tools applied cross-culturally.

These fact sheets should be read in combination with the book chapter, Organisational Tools for Psychosocial Risk Management: A Critical International Review (Potter, Fattori, & Dollard, 2016) [1].

This project was conducted as a part of the Global Master Plan of WHO Collaborating Centres for Workers' Health (2015-2017) Priority 3: Healthy Workplace Tools and Training, to Develop an inventory of tools for improving the psychosocial work environment from across the regions. The following institutions were involved in the project.

- Asia Pacific Centre for Work Health and Safety, University of South Australia (Lead)
- Job Stress and Occupational Psychology, Safety and Health at Work University of Milan
- Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (BAuA), Germany
- Centre for Organisational Health & Development, University of Nottingham, UK
- Universidad Nacional Autónoma de *México*.
- St George's University, Grenada
- Indian Council of Med. Research:
- UNAM, Mexico: Horacio Tovalin
- Institute for Occupational Medicine and Maritime Medicine, Germany
- Fudan University
- Hong Kong Work Health and Safety Institute

**References**

Afsharian, A., Zadow, A. & Dollard, M. F. (2016). Psychosocial Safety Climate from two different cultural perspectives in the Asia Pacific: Iranian and Australian healthcare contexts. In A. Shimazu, R. Nordin, M. F. Dollard, & J. Oakman, (Eds.), *2nd Asia Pacific book on psychosocial factors at work in the Asia Pacific: From theory to practice* (pp. 187-201). Dordrecht; Springer International Publishing.

British Standards Institution (BSI). (2011). Guidance on the management of psychosocial risk in the workplace: PAS1010. Retrieved from https://www.qrc.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/9-University-of-Nottingham-Guidance-on-the-management-of-psychosocial-risks-in-the-workplace.pdf. Retrieved 4 April 2017.

Cox, T., & Griffiths, A. (2010). Work-related stress: A theoretical perspective. In S. Leka & J. Houdmont (Eds.), *Occupational health psychology* (pp. 31-55). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

de Araújo T. M. & Karasek, R. (2008). Validity and reliability of the job content questionnaire in formal and informal jobs in Brazil. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 52.

[1] Potter, R.E., Fattori, A., & Dollard, M.F. (2016). Organisational Tools for Psychosocial Risk Management: A Critical International Review. In Dollard, M.F., Shimazu, A., Nordin, R. B., Brough, P., & Tuckey, M. R. (2016). The context of psychosocial factors at work in the Asia Pacific. (Ed.), *Psychosocial Factors at Work in the Asia Pacific*. United Kingdom: Springer.

Duraisingam, V., & Dollard, M. F. (2005). The management of psychosocial risk factors in Indian rural development workers. *International Journal of Rural Management, 1*, 97-123.

Idris, M. A., Dollard, M. F. & Winefield, A. H. (2011). Integrating psychosocial safety climate in the JD-R model: A study amongst Malaysian workers. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 37*, 1-11.

ILO (1986). Psychosocial factors at work: recognition and control (Vol. 56). Geneva: International Labour Office.

Leka, S., & Cox, T. (2008). The European Framework for psychosocial risk management PRIMA-EF. Retrieved from http://www.prima-ef.org/uploads/1/1//2/11022736/prima-ef_ebook.pdf. Retrieved 4 April 2017.

Leka, S., & Jain, A. (2016). International initiatives to tack psychosocial risks and promote mental health in the workplace: Is there a good balance in policy and practice? In A. Shimazu, R. Bin Nordin, M. Dollard & J. Oakman (Eds.), *Psychosocial factors at work in the Asia Pacific: From theory to practice* (pp. 23-43). Switzerland: Springer.

Potter, R. E., Fattori, A., & Dollard, M. F. (2016). Organisational tools for psychosocial risk management: A critical international review. In A. Shimazu, R. Bin Nordin, M. Dollard & J. Oakman (Eds.), *Psychosocial factors at work in the Asia Pacific: From theory to practice* (pp. 23-43). Switzerland: Springer.

| Australian Workplace Barometer (AWB) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2009 |
| **Objective** | The AWB is a surveillance tool used to monitor the psychosocial risks in the workplace. It has been used to develop national benchmarks and can be used to provide evidence for policy, prevention, and intervention effectiveness. This tool is underpinned by Psychosocial Safety Climate theory, Job Demands-Resources model, the Job-Demand Control model, and the Effort-Reward Imbalance model. Within the AWB is a blend of pre-existing subscales from various risk assessment tools; PSC-12 – see appendix (Psychosocial Safety Climate), Job Content Questionnaire (psychological demands, physical demands, emotional demands, organisational change, skill discretion, decision authority, supervisor social support, and co-worker social support), Abusive Experiences – Richman, Flaherty, & Rospenda (1996) (harassment), QPSNordic (Bullying), Work-Family Conflict scale (work-family conflict), Occupational Fatigue Exhaustion Recovery Scale (Recovery), and the Effort-Reward Imbalance scale (organisational rewards). |
| **Type of hazard** | Psychological demands, physical demands, emotional demands, organisational change, harassment, bullying, work-family conflict, psychosocial safety climate, skill discretion, decision authority, macro-decision latitude, supervisor social support, co-worker social support, recovery, organisational justice, and organisational rewards. Tool also measure health symptoms, and workplace outcomes. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire containing 16 subscales of the work environment. Respondents answer on 4-point Likert scale or a 7-point Likert scale with answers ranging between either 1 to 4 or 1 to 7 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, National and State Work Health and Safety Agencies |
| **Costs** | Associated with analysis and interpretation |
| **How to access the tool** | Contact maureen.dollard@unisa.edu.au |
| **Conditions of use** | Use freely for research |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | Australia |
| **Versions** | Original and Modified |
| **Author** | Dollard, Hall, LaMontagne, Taylor, Winefield, and Smith. |

| Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1997 |
| **Objective** | To assess psychosocial factors in the workplace. The COPSOQ is a comprehensive, widely applicable, and user-friendly tool that is designed to enable national and international comparisons, evaluate interventions, facilitate surveillance and benchmarking, and improve communications between different relevant bodies (e.g., workplaces, work environment professionals and researchers). |
| **Type of hazard** | Quantitative Demands (tempo/work pace), Emotional Demands, Decision Authority, Skill Discretion, Meaning of work, Commitment to the workplace, Predictability, Rewards, Role Clarity, Quality of leadership, Supervisor Social Support, Work-Family Conflict, Trust, Justice and respect, and Offensive Behaviour.<br>Scale also measures self-rated health, burnout, and stress. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire containing 23 to 41 subscales of the work environment. Respondents answer on a 5-point Likert scales with answers ranging from 0 to 4 to display their agreement/disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Researchers, Work Environment Professionals, and Managers. |
| **Costs** | This long and short version of this tool are free, the medium version requires a small fee. |
| **How to access the tool** | Download the appropriate tool from the National Research Centre for the Working Environment, http://www.arbejdsmiljoforskning.dk/en/publikationer/spoergeskemaer/psykisk-arbejdsmiljoe |
| **Conditions of use** | All respondents must be anonymous, participation is voluntary, and the employees have the right to see and discuss the results. |
| **Translations** | Dutch, Chinese, Danish, English, Flemish, German, Croatian, Malaysia, Norwegian, Persian, Portuguese, Spanish, Swedish, and Turkish. |
| **Country of Origin** | Denmark |
| **Versions** | Three version of the COPSOQ available; long version (141 items; for research use), medium version (95 items; for use by work environment professionals), and short version (44 items; to be used by the workplaces). There is also the COPSOQ II (2010). |
| **Author** | Kristensen and Borg. |

| Demand-Induced Strain Questionnaire (DISQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2004 |
| **Objective** | The questionnaire assesses job demands and job resources as core concepts relevant to the demand-induced strain compensation model. The DISQ has been employed within many empirical studies, and its theoretical foundation is based on the premise of homeostatic regulation processes, in which the notion of homeostatic regulation is transferred to the organisation. In the organisational setting work requires self-regulation processes in order to handle states of psychological imbalance evoked through different job demands. |
| **Type of hazard** | Cognitive demands, emotional demands, physical demands, cognitive resources, emotional resources, and physical resources. |
| **How does the tool work?** | The DISQ comprises 31-items that measure three kinds of demands and three kinds of resources. Employees respond to these items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'never or very rarely' to 5 'very often or always'. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the psychosocial factors in the workplace. |
| **Possible users** | Researchers |
| **Costs** | No cost identified. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be downloaded from the following website 'http://www.jandejonge.nl/disq.html' or contact 'J.d.Jonge@tue.nl' |
| **Conditions of use** | Cannot be used for commercial purposes. The collected data must be sent to questionnaire developer 'J.d.Jonge@tue.nl' for validation purposes. |
| **Translations** | Dutch, German, French, English, Japanese, Polish and Italian |
| **Country of Origin** | The Netherlands |
| **Versions** | DISQ 1.1 (31-item), and DISQ 2.1 (31-item). |
| **Author** | De Jonge, Dormann, Van Vegchel, Von Nordheim, Dollard, and Cotton. |

| Effort Reward Imbalance Questionnaire (ERI) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1996 |
| **Objective** | This tool is part of the Effort-Reward Imbalance (ERI) model (Siegrist, 1994). The ERI model is built upon the assumption that the workers' health and wellbeing is influenced by the lack of reciprocity in terms of efforts invested/required by the worker and the amount of rewards provided in the workplace. This detrimental combination of high efforts and low rewards is particularly prominent in individuals who are high on 'over-commitment'. As such this tool aims to explore the elements of the model to understand workers' susceptibility to poor health and organisational outcomes. |
| **Type of hazard** | Psychological Demands (i.e., Effort), Rewards (financial, status, and socio-emotional) and individuals' levels of Over-commitment. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 4-point Likert scales with answers ranging from 1 to 4 to display their agreement/disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Primarily researchers. Although non-researchers may seek permission. |
| **Costs** | There are no charges for using the tool amongst researchers. For commercial use, you must contact Johannes.siegrist@med.uni-duesseldorf.de |
| **How to access the tool** | Download the appropriate tool from Universitätsklinikum Düsseldorf, http://www.uniklinik-duesseldorf.de/en/unternehmen/institute/institute-of-medical-sociology/research/the-eri-model-stress-and-health/eri-questionnaires/questionnaires-download/ |
| **Conditions of use** | If the tool is being used for commercial purposes permission from Johannes.siegrist@med.uni-duesseldorf.de must be sought. The key publications on psychometric properties of the ERI scales need to be quote and referenced (refer to http://www.uniklinik-duesseldorf.de/en/unternehmen/institute/institute-of-medical-sociology/research/the-eri-model-stress-and-health/eri-questionnaires/) and the national contact person of the language used should be acknowledged (refer to http://www.uniklinik-duesseldorf.de/en/unternehmen/institute/institute-of-medical-sociology/research/the-eri-model-stress-and-health/eri-questionnaires/questionnaires-download/) |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Translations** | Arabic, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, German, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Korean, Lithuanian, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, and Swedish. |
| **Country of Origin** | Germany |
| **Versions** | Short version (16-items) and Original version (23-items). |
| **Author** | Siegrist. |

| General Nordic Questionnaire (QPS NORDIC) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2000 |
| **Objective** | Designed to assess psychological/social factors as potential determinants of motivation, health and well-being. The General Nordic Questionnaire (QPSNordic) is employed to assess psychological, social and, organizational working conditions for three main reasons. These are to establish a basis in which to implement organisational developments and interventions, to document changes in working conditions and to investigate relationships between work and health outcomes. The measurement of psychological and social factors at work may be used for the assessment and improvement of health and safety, organization climate, learning, quality, as well as of management and leadership. |
| **Type of hazard** | Control at work, work-family balance, job demands, leadership, mastery of work, organizational commitment, organizational culture, predictability at work, role expectations, social support, work centrality, work motive, and working groups and teams. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scales with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate the frequency of events/tasks/situations. |
| **Possible users** | The QPSNordic can be used both by practitioners and by scientists in the field of psychological and social factors at work. The QPSNordic is meant to be used by professional's consultants who are interested in developing the work organization in a participative way or by scientists investigating the relationship of psychological and social factors at work to health and work motivation. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be accessed from https://www.qps-nordic.org/en/ |
| **Conditions of use** | Respondents are guaranteed confidentiality, anonymity, and security in terms of their participation and responses. |
| **Translations** | English, Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian, Suomi, Swedish, Greek, Chinese. |
| **Country of Origin** | Denmark |
| **Versions** | Short version (34 items) and the Long version (123 items). There is also the QPS Nordic for monitoring the age diverse workforce (QPS |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Nordic-ADW) which is specifically for ageing employees aged 55 and above. |
| **Author** | Dallner, Elo, Gamberale, Hottinen, Knardahl, Lindström, and colleagues. |

| HSE Management Standards Indicators Tool (HSE) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2004 |
| **Objective** | This is tool was designed to be part of the Management Standards process to address the six core areas of work stress identified by the HSE (demands, control, managerial support, peer support, relationships, role, and change). The tool provides an indication to organisations of how the workers rate the organisation's performance in terms of managements the risks linked with work related stress. This tool can be used as a standalone tool or it can be included into pre-existing surveys. |
| **Type of hazard** | Demand, control, managerial support, peer support, relationships, role, and change. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 35 items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate either the frequency of events/tasks/situations/scenarios or their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Management looking to tackling work related stress |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be downloaded from the Health and Safety Executive website along with the user manual and complementary analysis tool http://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/downloads.htm |
| **Conditions of use** | The tool should be used in conjunction with the HSE Management Standards Indicator Tool Manual |
| **Translations** | Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, English, Farsi, Gujarati, Hindi, Hungarian, Kurdish, Pashto, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tamil, Turkish, Urdu, and Welsh. |
| **Country of Origin** | United Kingdom |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Health and Safety Executive. |

| ILO Stress Checkpoints | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2012 |
| **Objective** | The ILO Stress Checkpoints is an easy to use risk assessment tool that identifies factors in the workplace that have the potential to cause harm. The results from the tool must be used to create positive change in the work environment. |
| **Type of hazard** | Leadership and justice at work, job demands, job control, social support, physical environment, work-life balance and working time, recognition at work, protection from offensive behaviour, job security, and information and communication. |
| **How does the tool work?** | All 50 checkpoints available can be selected for use from the tool, or one can select the checkpoints most salient to the specific work environment. It is recommend that on average between 20 and 30 checkpoints be selected.<br>Workers respond with 'NO', 'YES', or 'PRIORITY' to proposing action to the various checkpoints. If responded with 'YES' or 'PRIORITY', there is an option to write suggestion to address the checkpoint item. These checkpoints are usually completed during a worksite walk-through. The results of the tool should then be discussed in small groups and examined by all participants and group representatives. |
| **Possible users** | National authorities, company and organizational managers, trade unions, human resource personnel, and occupational safety and health practitioners. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be accessed from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_protect/@protrav/@safework/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_177108.pdf<br><br>This tool is also available as an app from the Apple store and Google play as 'ILO Stress Prevention at Work Checkpoints' or 'ILO Stress Checkpoints'. |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | Multiple countries |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | ILO |

| Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1985 |
| **Objective** | The JCQ is a tool to assess the psychosocial aspects of a job. The original JCQ is underpinned by the Job Demand-Control-Support (DCS; Johnson & Hall, 1988) model which postulates that the source of work stress and work motivation is a function of three basic job characteristics; job demands, job control, and social support. The JCQ 2 aims to address the next generation of research challenges for psychosocial work environments. |
| **Type of hazard** | Skill Discretion, Decision Authority, Decision Latitude, Psychological Demands, Physical Demands, Job Insecurity, Supervisor Social Support, and Co-worker Social Support. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 4 Likert scale ranging from 1 to 4 to display their agreement/disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Researchers and practitioners. |
| **Costs** | There are costs for commercial or large-scale research purposes (over 500 participants). |
| **How to access the tool** | Fill out the 'JCQ Data Base Form' and 'JCQ Permission Form' found at http://www.jcqcenter.org. Then send the completed form through email, mail or fax. |
| **Conditions of use** | Refer to the manual that you can request from the website http://www.jcqcenter.org |
| **Translations** | Belgium, Bulgarian, Chinese, Czech, Dutch, German, Greek, French (Canada), Icelandic, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Malaysian, Norwegian, Persian (Iran), Polish, Portuguese (Brazil), Portuguese (Portugal), Romania, Russian, Spanish, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Spain – Valença (Castilian), Spain – Barcelona (Catalunya), Spain – Lleida, Venezuela, United States, Swedish, Taiwanese, Thai |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | JCQ standard (49-items), JCQ 2.0 User version (39-items), and JCQ 2.0 Researcher version (79-items). |
| **Author** | Karasek, Brisson, Kawakami, Houtman, Bongers, and Amick. |

| Job Characteristics Index (JCI) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1976 |
| **Objective** | The JCI measures the job characteristics faced by employees' in their work environment. It is was designed to address three important issues to management research (1) how job characteristics influence satisfaction and productivity in the workplace, (2) how tasks in the workplace correspond to workers' motivation, and (3) the influence of job characteristics on the link between leader behaviours and workplace satisfaction and performance. This tool was based on the Job Diagnostic Survey. |
| **Type of hazard** | Variety, Autonomy, Feedback, Dealing with others, Task Identify, and Friendship. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 30 items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate the frequency or the extent of their exposure to events/tasks/situations/scenarios. |
| **Possible users** | Researchers and managers. |
| **Costs** | No cost identified. |
| **How to access the tool** | Current Labour Force Status or CPS section in the 1980 questionnaire. A copy of the scale can also be found in the article 'Sims, P. H. Jr., Szilagyi, A. D., & Keller, R. T. (1976). The measurement of job characteristics. *Academy of Management, 19*, 195-212.' |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller. |

| Job Diagnostics Survey (JDS) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1974 |
| **Objective** | This tool addresses both the characteristics of workers' jobs as well as their reactions to their jobs and is aligned by the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldman, 1976). Within the Job Characteristics Model, five core job dimensions inform employees' psychological state, in turn predicting their affective responses and work outcomes. Within the model there is a recognition that individual differences are also important in the work context. The individual component, growth need strength, moderates the relationships from job dimensions to psychological states and affective responses/work outcomes, with stronger links for employees with higher growth need strength. Specifically, this tool is designed to (a) diagnose existing jobs to determine if (and how) they might be re-designed to improve employee productivity and satisfaction; and (b) for evaluating the effect of job changes on employees whether the changes derive from deliberate "Job enrichment" projects or from naturally-occurring modifications of technology or work systems. |
| **Type of hazard** | Job Dimensions (skill variety, task identity, task significance autonomy, feedback from the job itself, feedback from agents, and dealing with others), Psychological States (meaningfulness from work, responsibility for the work, and knowledge of the results), Affective Responses (general satisfaction, internal work motivation, satisfaction with job security, satisfaction with pay, social satisfaction, supervisory satisfaction, and satisfaction with grow), and Individual Growth Need Strength. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 83 items that are scored using a 7 point Likert scale, with answers ranging from 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the characteristics in the employees' work environment, poorer psychological states, affective responses, and higher growth need. The survey is to be completed by individuals whose jobs (and whose reactions to their jobs are of focal interest). |
| **Possible users** | Can be used by researchers and managers. |
| **Costs** | No cost identified. |
| **How to access the tool** | Can be downloaded in PDF form www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=AD0779828 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Conditions of use** | This instrument is not recommend for use at the individual level, but useful for groups of five or more performing the same type of job. It is important that the anonymity of respondents is protected. |
| **Translations** | English and Malaysian |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Full-version (83-items), short form (53-items), and revised and shortened form (15-items - only measures the Job Dimensions). |
| **Author** | Hackman and Oldman. |

| Job Stress Survey (JSS) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1999 |
| **Objective** | This survey identifies sources of stress in the workplace. Specifically, it assesses both severity and frequency of sources of stress encountered by employees in the workplace within the past 6 months. The JSS is intended for use in business or educational settings. |
| **Type of hazard** | Job Pressure (job pressure frequency, job pressure severity, and job pressure index) and Lack of Organisational Support (lack of organisational support frequency, lack of organisational support severity, and lack of organisational support index). |
| **How does the tool work?** | Existing employees respond to 30 self-report items scored using a 9 point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 9 to indicate the frequency and severity for the sources of stress. |
| **Possible users** | To be used by individuals with a degree from an accredited 4-year college or university in psychology, counselling, speech-language pathology, or a closely related field plus satisfactory completion of coursework in test interpretation, psychometrics and measurement theory, educational statistics, or a closely related area; or license or certification from an agency that requires appropriate training and experience in the ethical and competent use of psychological tests. |
| **Costs** | Cost varies depending on package purchased. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be purchased from https://www.parinc.com/Products/Pkey/210 |
| **Conditions of use** | Refer to the manual. |
| **Translations** | English, French, Swedish. |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Spielberger and Vagg. |

| Multidimensional Organizational Health Questionnaire (MOHQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2003 |
| **Objective** | This tool is used to assess the health and wellbeing of organizations. The MOHQ is designed to be part of a process that intends to promote and develop the collective health and wellbeing, by monitoring the various dimensions of organizational health. This tool can help to highlight areas of concern as well as areas that the organisation/units are doing well. |
| **Type of hazards** | Environmental comfort, clear goals, competence valorisation, listening, conflict, relationships, problem solving, demand, safety, effectiveness, fairness, job descriptions, social utility, and openness to innovation. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of self-report items addressing their organisations health and wellbeing, measured on a 4-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 4. |
| **Possible users** | Doctors with specialization in occupational medicine,<br>Psychologists, Counsellors, Psychopedagogists, and HR Professionals. |
| **Costs** | Free for those who register to the OISOrg website (Italian Observatory on Organizational Health). |
| **How to access the tool** | Can be accessed from<br>http://www.oisorg.it/strumenti/mohq/struttura.html |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | Italian |
| **Country of Origin** | Italy |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | Avallone and Paplomatas. |

| Multimethod Job Design Questionnaire (MJDQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1985 |
| **Objective** | The MDJQ is framed as a comprehensive and general measure of work design that integrates multiple disciplines. This tool draws upon the research from organizational psychology, industrial engineering, human factors, and sociotechnical literature. |
| **Type of hazard** | Motivational (job enrichment, job enlargement, intrinsic work motivation, and sociotechnical systems), Mechanistic (task specialization, skill simplification, and repetition), Biological (physical task requirements, and environmental factors), and Perceptual-Motor (job design that accommodates the mental and physical limitations of workers). |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report question in which current employees respond to a number of items scored using a 7-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 7 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Managers and researchers |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Copy of the tool can be accessed from Edwards, J. R., Scully, J. A., & Brtek, M. D. (1999). The measurement of work: Hierachical representation of the multimethod job design questionnaire. Personnel Psychology, 52, 305-334. |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Original (70-items) and Revised (48-items) |
| **Author** | Campion and Thayer. |

| NIOSH Generic Job Stress Questionnaire | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1988 |
| **Objective** | The questionnaire measures components of the NIOSH job stress model (Hurrell & Murphy, 1992). Specifically, it measures job conditions that may cause a worker stress. The questionnaire is designed to advance the research into worker stress, safety, and health. |
| **Type of hazard** | Job content, job control, job demands (expectations), social support/relations, teamwork, work schedules, job (in)security, and role strain. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire was designed so individual scales can be used from the tool or the entire instrument. Current employees respond to a number of items based on the scales used scored using a either a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 or a 4-point Likert scale with answer ranging from 1 to 4. Answers indicate respondents' agreement or disagreement with the statements, the frequency of the events/tasks/situations/scenarios, or quantify the levels of the various work aspects. |
| **Possible users** | Managers and Researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool and corresponding scoring key can be accessed from https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/workorg/detail088.html |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English, Japanese, Finish, Korean, and Spanish. |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. |

| Occupational Stress Index (OSI) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1995 |
| **Objective** | The questionnaire is part of an additive burden model focuses on the stressors in the workplace that are important to workers' cardiovascular health. Unlike other models of work stress, the Job Demand-Control Model and the Effort-Reward Model, the approach underpinning the OSI is the cognitive ergonomics and brain research, to understand how work can burden an individual's health. |
| **Type of hazard** | Aversive Physical Exposures, Conflict and Uncertainty, Disaster Potential, Extrinsic Time Pressure, High Demand, Strictness, and Underload. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored on 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Managers and Researchers. |
| **Costs** | Free-of-charge for all research endeavours aimed at improving the job conditions and health of working people |
| **How to access the tool** | Permission to use any of the OSI instruments should be obtained from Dr. Karen Belkic: Center for social Epidemiology, Room 202, 1528 6th Street, Santa Monica, California email: kbelkic@hsc.usc.edu. |
| **Conditions of use** | All emerging publications using the OSI should acknowledge permission from the author and should cite the appropriate bibliographic references. For further information contact Dr Karen Belkic. |
| **Translations** | English, Bosnian, Serbian, Swedish |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Generic (65-items) and specific (drivers, physicians, teachers, manufacturing workers, clerical staff, air traffic controllers, airline pilots) |
| **Author** | Belkic. |

| Occupational Stress Indicator (OSI) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1988 |
| **Objective** | The aim of the tools is to understand stress at work. The questionnaire is underpinned by the argument that not all individuals are affected by stressors in the same way (the transactional model). As such, the tool takes a combined person-situation approach to the conceptualization and measurement of occupational stress.<br>The OSI attempts to measure:<br>(1) The major sources of occupational pressure<br>(2) The major consequences of occupational stress<br>(3) Coping mechanisms and individual difference variables which may moderate the impact of stress.<br>Overall, the OSI measures sources of stress, as well as measuring individual components (e.g., locus of control and coping strategies) as well as outcome variables (e.g., job satisfaction and health). |
| **Type of hazard** | Sources of Pressure – intrinsic to the job, organizational role, relationship with others, career and achievement, organization structure/climate, and home/work interface. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 61-items that measure source of pressure that are scored using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 6 to indicate respondents' agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Intended primarily for managers and middle managers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | A copy of the abridged tool can be accessed from Evers, A., Frese, M., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). Revision and further developments of the Occupational Stress Indicators: LISREL results from four Dutch studies. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 221-240. The full version is available in Cooper, C. L., Sloan, S. J., & Williams, S. (1988). *Occupational Stress Indicator*. Windsor, England: NFER-Nelson. |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English, French, Chinese, Italian, Brazilian Portuguese, and Dutch |
| **Country of Origin** | United Kingdom |
| **Versions** | 167 items (original), 188 items (revised), and 94 items (abridged) |
| **Author** | Cooper, Sloan, and Williams. |

| Occupational Stress Inventory-Revised (OSI-R) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1998 |
| **Objective** | This tool was developed as part of the OSI-R theoretical model of stress, in which the stressors in the workplace environment and coping resources influence work role perceptions (Hicks, Bahr, & Fujiwara, 2009). That is workplace stressors and stressful work roles results in poor health (i.e. personal or psychological strain). The poor health outcomes are also influenced by the workers' access and utilisation of their coping resources. Overall, the OSI-R is designed to assess occupational stress, through the measurement of 3 adjustment factors – occupational roles, coping resources, and the consequent psychological strain. |
| **Type of hazard** | Occupational Roles (role overload, role insufficiency, role ambiguity, role boundary, responsibility, and physical environment), Psychological Strain (vocational stress, psychological strain, interpersonal strain, and physical strain), and Coping Resources (recreation, self-care, social support, and rational/cognitive coping). |
| **How does the tool work?** | Current employees aged between the ages of 18 and 70 respond to a number of self-report items. |
| **Possible users** | HR professionals, research or practitioners who are qualified professionals trained in the use and interpretation of psychological tests. |
| **Costs** | Cost varies depending on package purchased. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be purchased from https://www.parinc.com/products/pkey/285 |
| **Conditions of use** | Users must have (a) a thorough knowledge of the manual, as well as an understanding of norms and their limitations; (b) a thorough knowledge of test theory and principles of interpretation; (c) a complete understanding of stress, strain and coping model on which the tool is based; and (d) an understanding of appropriate test use (i.e. the identification of occupationally induced stress for the benefit of an individual voluntarily taking the test). The respondents of the tool must be 18 years or older, be physically and emotionally capable of meeting the norms demands of testing with self-report instruments. Individuals that have reading levels below 5th grade, or whose ability to provide valid responses may have been compromised by factors such as cognitive ability, emotional state or health, should be interpreted with caution. The OSI-R should not be used for |

| | |
|---|---|
| | purposes of selection, retention, promotion, job performance evaluation, or compensation. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Osipow. |

| People at Work Survey | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2007 |
| **Objective** | This psychosocial risk tool is part of a risk assessment process (refer to https://www.worksafe.qld.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/128283/paw-implementation-guide.pdf). The objective of the tool and process is to help organisations identify and manage psychosocial risks in the workplace, that threaten their workers', volunteers', and other relevant individuals' psychological health. |
| **Type of hazard** | Job Demands (role overload, job ambiguity, role conflict, cognitive demand, emotional demand, group task conflict, and group relationship conflict) and Job Resources (job control, supervisor support, co-worker support, praise recognition, procedural justice, and change consultation). Bullying is also covered in this tool as well. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 7-point Likert scales with answers ranging from 1 to 7 to indicate either the frequency of events/tasks/situations/scenarios or their agreement or disagreement with the items. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | A copy of the tool and the implementation guide can be accessed from https://www.worksafe.qld.gov.au/injury-prevention-safety/mental-health-at-work/tools-and-resources/people-at-work/tools-and-resources<br>Resources are provided on the website so your organisations' scores on the various hazards can be compared against the People at Work benchmarks, as well as identifying response patterns for the various hazards. |
| **Conditions of use** | It is recommended that the tool be used annually as part of the risk assessment process. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | Australia |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | People at Work Project (a collaboration among Queensland University of Technology, The Australian National University, Workplace Health and Safety Queensland, WorkCover NSW, WorkSafe Victoria, Comcare, Safe Work Australia, and beyondblue) |

| Pressure Management Indicator (PMI) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1998 |
| **Objective** | The PMI was developed from the Occupational Stress Indicator, and assesses the various sources of pressure for workers along with their coping mechanisms, personality, and the consequent outcomes from the combination of these factors. As such, this tool provides a comprehensive picture of a workers' current stress profile based on their individual factors and workplace factors.<br>This tool is designed to help organisations and individuals by<br>• understanding the perceived sources of work pressure and the way in which employees choose to respond to these pressures,<br>• maximizing productivity and minimise the chance of being adversely affected by work demands,<br>• promoting learning and development resources to be deployed in the right areas<br>• providing information to manage sources of pressure and improve coping capacity. |
| **Type of hazard** | Workload, relationships at work, career development (recognition), the organisational climate, managerial role, personal responsibility, home/work demands, and daily hassles. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 146-items that are scored using a 6-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 6 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements, or their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, stress counsellors, stress trainers, occupational health providers, and researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be requested by emailing the contact listed on this website http://www.workingwell.co.uk/pressure-management-indicator or downloading a copy from http://repositorio.ismt.pt/bitstream/123456789/637/5/Anexo4_PMI_-_English%5B1%5D.pdf |
| **Conditions of use** | To use the tool the provider needs to be contacted. |
| **Translations** | English and over 20 other languages |
| **Country of Origin** | United Kingdom |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Working Well |

| Psychosocial Working Conditions (PWC) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2000 |
| **Objective** | This tool is designed to monitor the working conditions that contribute to work stress, consistent with the structure of the Demand-Control Support model (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). This tool should be used as part of constant monitoring to allow organisations to identify problems, and then develop appropriate interventions. |
| **Type of hazard** | Demands, control, social support, and desired changes. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to provide an accurate picture of the current/recent working environment. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, health professionals, unions, and researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Contact the author via email: mawid@ciop.pl |
| **Conditions of use** | Will need to be clarified directly with the author. |
| **Translations** | Polish and English |
| **Country of Origin** | Poland |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Widerszal-Bazyl and Cieślak. |

| Questionnaire on the Experience and Evaluation of Work (VBBA) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1994 |
| **Objective** | This tool explores work-related stressors and their consequences at the individual level. It is considered to be similar to the COPSOQ, another tool developed in the Netherlands. |
| **Type of hazard** | Job characteristics, variety, autonomy, relationships/communication, job-related problems, conditions, satisfaction, and strain. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items scored using a 4-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 4 to indicate frequency of events/tasks/situations/scenarios. |
| **Possible users** | Can be used by managers and researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated if less than 250 employees are being assessed. |
| **How to access the tool** | Access to the tool can be requested from https://www.skb.nl/nl/studenten-en-onderzoekers-vbba |
| **Conditions of use** | The most important conditions are: (1) the tool will only be used for non-commercial, educational, and research purposes, (2) at the end of the research you will send your publications to SKB Vragenlijst Services BV as soon as possible, (3) your research group is no more than 250 employees. If you want to assess more 250 employees, you need to ask SKB prior to your research. It may be that you are charged a small copyright fee for the extra employees, and (4) you process the collected data yourself based on our scoring instructions.<br><br>The complete list of conditions can be found at https://www.skb.nl/nl/studenten-en-onderzoekers-vbba |
| **Translations** | Dutch, French (Worked Life Questionnaire) and English |
| **Country of Origin** | The Netherlands |
| **Versions** | Full (232-items) and abridged (108-items). |
| **Authors** | SKB |

| START | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2006 |
| **Objective** | This risk assessment tool is part of a risk management tool that can be used to reduce or eliminate mental stress at work. The START is designed to be used repeatedly at regular intervals in an effort to improve working conditions and the protection of workers' health. Overall, the START risk assessment tool is an easy to use tool to assessment stress in the workplace. |
| **Type of hazard** | Qualifications Training, Manager Support, Physical Environment, Time Pressure, Working Hours, Division of Labour, Work Recognition and Work Prospects, Safety Training, Cooperation, Job Security, Reaction to Occupational Accidents, Work Satisfaction, |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 41 items scored using a 4-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 4 to indicate agreement with the events/tasks/situations/scenarios. An additional 13 items are provided for workers to add their own additional remarks on the events/tasks/situations/scenarios. |
| **Possible users** | Company and organizational managers, human resource personnel, and occupational safety and health practitioners. Not intended to be used as a scientific investigative tool. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be accessed from https://www.boeckler.de/pdf/p_arbp_174.pdf |
| **Conditions of use** | It is recommend that before the risk assessment several steps must first be completed.<br>• Clarify the mental stress/risk assessment topic and acquire qualifications.<br>• Begin with the instruction, participation, and involvement of the staff.<br>• Clarify the role and procedure for the various parties in the company, in particular, the risk assessment team.<br>• Establishing an internal risk assessment team.<br>• Training the work protection practitioners.<br>• Clarifying or establishing organisational conditions.<br>• Clarifying the need for advice from outside the company.<br>One of the important conditions is the setting up of a company assessment team, as well as providing information in advance, and involve all staff. |
| **Translations** | English and German. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Country of Origin** | Germany. |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Satzer and Geray. |

| Stress Diagnostic Survey (SDS) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1980 |
| **Objective** | The work version of this tool is used to identify specific areas of high job stress in the work environment for both individuals and groups. The Person-Fit environment theory and Role Stress underpins this survey. |
| **Type of hazard** | Role conflict, role ambiguity, work overload, responsibility, and career development |
| **Outcomes** | Assessment of job related stressors (work version of SDS). |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items scored using a 7-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 7 to indicate frequency of conditions detailed in the various statements. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, health professionals, and researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Could not be found. |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use have been found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | United States of America |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Authors** | Stress Research Systems. |

| Questionnaire for Organisational Stress (VOS) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1984 |
| **Objective** | This tool is designed to measure the characteristics in the work environment that contribute to feelings of organisational stress. In particular, the tool measures the stressors that workers can face in their working environment as well as the consequences from the exposure to these stressors. |
| **Type of hazard** | Role ambiguity, responsibility for persons, workload, underutilisation of skills and abilities, tensions in relations with superiors/subordinates, tensions in relations with other departments, lack of participation, role conflict, lack of support, and job future ambiguity. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate the frequency of the events/tasks/situations/scenarios described in the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, health professionals, and researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Not able to be accessed. |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use have been found. |
| **Translations** | Dutch, and French |
| **Country of Origin** | France |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Bergers, Marcelissen, and de Wolff. |

| Stress Risk Assessment Questionnaire (SRA) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | Unknown |
| **Objective** | This tool is designed to identify and manage stressors that are contributing to work-related stress. Can be part of an individual assessment or group assessment. The SRA is developed from the HSE management standards that highlight six key areas of work design (demands, control, support, relationships, role, and change) that are important for workers' health and wellbeing. Many adaptions of the scale exist, however, all adaptions cover the six key areas of work design. |
| **Type of hazard** | Demands, Control, Support, Relationships, Role Clarity, and Organisational Change. |
| **How does the tool work?** | This tool is broken into two parts. The first part is to be completed by the employee and the second part is to be completed by the manager. The first part, which is to be completed by the employees, helps to identify to factors that are contributing to work-related stress. The employees respond to a number of open-ended questions about the demands, control, support, relationships, role clarity, and organisational change in their workplace.<br>The second part, which is to be completed by the manager, is an action plan. Managers have to identify what measures currently are in place to address the stressors, what can be done to address the stressors in the future, who will ensure these actions are put into place, and the date in which the actions can be put into place. |
| **Possible users** | Managers |
| **Costs** | No costs indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Multiple versions of this tool exist.<br>• https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:qMWQt6iWeOwJ:https://www.iosh.co.uk/~/media/Documents/Networks/Group/Health%2520and%2520Social%2520Care/IOSH%2520Stress%2520risk%2520assessment%2520template%252027%2520June%25202013.docx%3Fla%3Den+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=au<br>• http://support.fitforwork.org/app/answers/detail/a_id/387?utm_source=website&utm_medium=blog&utm_campaign=stressriskassesment<br>• https://www.sid.cam.ac.uk/aboutus/publications/hands/stress-RA.pdf |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | Unknown |
| **Versions** | Multiple versions of the scale can be found. |
| **Author** | Unknown. |

| Stress Satisfaction Offset Score (SSOS) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1999 |
| **Objective** | A simple tool that can be utilised on its own or used as part of a larger survey that generates a stress score for each employer or an overall score for the organisation's culture (Business Health Culture Index). It assesses both stressors and satisfiers in the workplace. |
| **Type of hazard** | Effort, Demand, Reward, and Control. |
| **How does the tool work?** | Employees respond to 4 self-report items that measure 2 stressors and 2 satisfiers in the workplace. |
| **Possible users** | Managers |
| **Costs** | No cost identified. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be accessed from<br>• http://www.workplacementalhealth.org/getattachment/Case-Studies/Pittsburgh-Plate-Glass-Industries-(PPG)-II/fd_ssos.pdf?lang=en-US&ext=.pdf<br>• http://www.healthatworkpeterborough.ca/site/wp-content/uploads/Workplace_Culture_Final1.pdf |
| **Conditions of use** | It is not to be used as an evaluation tool; it only provides a quick snapshot of how stressful the working environment is. Users of this tool are permitted to utilise the material for their own internal training and educational purposes only. For any other purpose, including use in conjunction with fee for service or other commercial activities, no part of this material may be used, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recorded, or otherwise, without the express prior written permission of the Workplace Safety & Prevention Services. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | Canada |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | Shain. |

| Workplace Health Assessment Questionnaire (SATIN) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2009 |
| **Objective** | This tool was developed as part of a well-being at work approach. This should allow to initiate, through a strengthened partnership between the human resources department, the occupational doctor, the employees and the representative bodies of the personnel, improvement actions aiming at the same time the well-being and the performance over the long term. The SATIN questionnaire is one of the tools used to promote the implementation of this approach. It deals with fairly general health issues, demands at work and the resources to cope with them, and features of the organization of work that may promote or hinder well-being at work. This last part answers to the need to have information on the problems encountered by the employees and whose main source is the organization of work.<br>SATIN is a tool for investigating working conditions and health (somatic health, stress, psycho-social risks, evaluation of the working environment). It has been designed to be part of a policy to promote well-being at work and to prevent psychosocial risks. It makes it possible to diagnose and help to set up an intervention. This tool has been designed for individual and/or collective use. |
| **Type of hazard** | Physical environment, human environment, work organization, skill management, and time management. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to provide a picture of their working environment. |
| **Possible users** | Research, organisations, and occupational health professionals. |
| **Costs** | No costs associated with use as long as the tool is appropriately referenced. |
| **How to access the tool** | The tool can be accessed from https://sites.google.com/site/questsatin/ |
| **Conditions of use** | In publications, the tool needs to be referenced. |
| **Translations** | Dutch, and French |
| **Country of Origin** | France |
| **Versions** | 76-items (Version 1) and 90-items (Version 2), and 86-items (Version 3). |
| **Author** | Grosjean, Kop, Formet-Robert, and Althaus. |

| Tripod Sigma Questionnaire | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2003 |
| **Objective** | The tool is designed to identify risks to experiencing work stress in order to give organizations direction on how to effectively solve the stress problems of their employees. This tool targets managerial issues. Underlying the tool is that human error is affecting by the working environment and the organisation. That is when there are deficiencies in the workplace environment or organisation in the form of management processes, human errors will more likely occur. This tool identifies where the deficiencies are and where there are no deficiencies, in order to decrease risks to work-related stress and poor work performance. |
| **Type of hazard** | Procedures, Hardware, Organisation, Communication, Training and Skills, Incompatible Goals, Social Support, and Individual Defences. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 166 items to evaluate the risk factors in their workplace environment. |
| **Possible users** | Managers |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Contact one of the authors (e.g., Dr. Noortje Wiezer at noortje.wiezer@tno.nl). |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | Dutch |
| **Country of Origin** | The Netherlands |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | Nelemans, Wiezer, Vaas, Fort, and Groeneweg. |

| Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2006 |
| **Objective** | The main objective of this tool is to assess the work characteristics of a job. This tool of work design was built upon the integration of more than 40 years of research into work design into the one parsimonious measure. Similar to the Job Diagnostic Survey, the Job Characteristics Index, and the Multimethod Job Design Questionnaire, the WDQ is underpinned by the Job Characteristics Theory. As such, the WDQ provides an assessment of various work characteristics that allows for a theory driven and informed approach to work redesign. |
| **Type of hazard** | Task characteristics (autonomy, task variety, task significance, and feedback from job), knowledge characteristics (job complexity, information processing, problem solving, skill variety, and specialization), social characteristics (social support, interdependence, interaction outside organization, and feedback from others), and work context (ergonomic, physical demands, work conditions, and equipment use). |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 77 items scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Managers and researchers. |
| **Costs** | No costs indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | A copy of the tool can be accessed from https://msu.edu/~morgeson/English_WDQ.pdf |
| **Conditions of use** | It is recommended that you contact the author if you use the tool in your research as well as sharing your findings. In addition if you translate the WDQ into another language contact the author.<br>Author – Frederick Morgeson (fred@morgeson.com) |
| **Translations** | English, Dutch, German, Polish, and Spanish |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | Morgeson and Humphrey. |

| Work Experience Measurement Scale (WEMS) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2010 |
| **Objective** | In contrast to previous tools that are designed for assesses factors that lead to organisational stress, this primary goal of this tool is towards health promotion – salutogenic perspective. The goal is to discuss and identify the strengths and the resources in workplace environments. |
| **Type of hazard** | Supportive work conditions, internal work experience, autonomy, time experience, management, and process of change. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 32 items that are scored using a 6-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 6 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Can be used by researchers and managers. |
| **Costs** | No cost was indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | Contact one of the author of the tool (Petra Nilsson – petra.nilsson@hkr.se). |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | Swedish, English and Lithuanian |
| **Country of Origin** | Sweden |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Nilsson, Bringsen, Andersson, and Ejlertsson. |

| Work Environment Scale (WES) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1974 |
| **Objective** | This tool measures the social environment of a workplace. This tool has been recommended for use in hospitals and other healthcare environments. Understanding the healthcare work environment is essential to help reduce stressor, build cohesion, and help improve managers' and employees' morale and productivity. The tool compares both employees' and managers' experiences of the work environment, as well as compare actual and preferred work environments. This tool is effective in monitoring changes in the workplace environment, and evaluating the effectiveness of implemented interventions. When the WES is implemented appropriately, the tool can promote a health work environment promoting productivity, employee satisfaction, and positive health outcomes. |
| **Type of hazard** | Involvement, co-worker cohesion, supervisor support, autonomy, task orientation, work pressure, clarity, managerial control, innovation, and physical comfort. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire consisting of 90 true or false statements to be completed by employees who work as part of a team.<br>There are three formats; real forms, ideal form, and expectations form. The 'real form' is used most and measures managers' and employees' perception of their current work environment. The 'ideal form' measures managers' and employees' conceptions of an ideal work environment. Finally, the 'expectations form' measures prospective managers' and employees' expectations about work settings.<br><br>The 'real form' is used to (a) evaluate climates in workplaces encountering or needing change; (b) to understand individuals' perceptions of their workplaces; (c) to formulate clinical case descriptions and understand the workplace's importance; (d) to monitor changes in the workplace; (e) to improve workplace strategic plans of assessment and change; (f) to fully describe and compare work settings and departments or programs; and (g) to focus on the various associations between perceived work climates and outcomes for groups and individuals. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, organisational health professionals, and researchers. |
| **Costs** | Prices vary based on product purchased. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **How to access the tool** | The WES and accompanying manual can be purchased from mindgarden.com |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | Arabic, Mandarin, Dutch, English, Estonian, French, German, Hindi, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, and Spanish. |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Moos and Insel. |

| Work Environment Survey (WES) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | Unknown |
| **Objective** | The WES is a corporate employee survey that measures employee attitudes about work and the workplace. The WES is designed to support the effective management of employees in departments and central agencies. This tool should be used as part of an action plan requiring continuous assessment and action. |
| **Type of hazard** | Job satisfaction, supervision, organizational commitment, communication, co-workers, health and safety, work-life balance, senior leadership, workload, compensation, strategic plans, and learning and development. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 70 items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Managers, Safety Representatives, and Researchers. |
| **Costs** | No cost indicated. |
| **How to access the tool** | A copy of the items used can be found in the Work Environment Survey Report http://www.exec.gov.nl.ca/exec/hrs/publications/WES2011.pdf |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | Canada |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Public Service Secretariat, Newfoundland, and Labrador Statistics Agency |

| Worked Life (VT) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 1994 |
| **Objective** | The WES is an assessment of psychosocial factors in the workplace and corresponding occupational stress outcomes. This tool is similar to the COPSOQ, another psychosocial risk tool developed in the Netherlands. |
| **Type of hazard** | Work content, material working conditions, working conditions, and work relationships. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to a number of items that are scored using a 4 point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 4 to indicate the frequency of the events/tasks/situations/scenarios described in the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Can be used by researchers and managers. |
| **Costs** | No cost was found. |
| **How to access the tool** | A copy of the manual can be accessed from http://www.emploi.belgique.be/moduleDefault.aspx?id=28990 |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use were specified. |
| **Translations** | French, and Dutch |
| **Country of Origin** | Netherlands |
| **Versions** | 201 items (full version) and 108 items (abridged version). |
| **Author** | Van Veldhoven and Meijman. |

| Work Organization Assessment Questionnaire (WOAQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2006 |
| **Objective** | The objective of the tool is to identify hazards in the work environment, as well as assess the risks in terms of work and organizational factors, employee health, satisfaction, and health related behaviour. |
| **Type of hazard** | Quality of relationships with management, reward and recognition, workload, quality of relationships with colleagues, and quality of physical environment. |
| **How does the tool work?** | The WOAQ is a self-report measure that consists of 28-items on various work and organisational risk factors. The items are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with existing employees rating how problematic (or good) the different aspects of their work have been over the past six months. |
| **Possible users** | Health and safety inspections, occupational health managers, and line managers. |
| **Costs** | No cost identified. |
| **How to access the tool** | A copy of the tool is provided in Griffiths, A., Cox, T., Karanika, M., Khan, S., & Tomás, J-M. (2006). Work design and management in the manufacturing sector: Development and validation of the Work Organization Assessment Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 63*, 669-675.<br>While originally developed for the manufacturing sector, with a modified method of scoring, it can be acceptable for use in the public sector (refer to Wynne-Jones, G., Varnava, A., Buck, R., Karanika-Murray, M., Griffiths, C., Cox, T., Kahn, S., & Main, C. J. (2009). Examination of the Work Organization Assessment Questionnaire in public sector workers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 51*, 586-589.) |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | United Kingdom |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | Griffiths, Cox, Karanika, Khan, and Tomás. |

| Workplace Stressors Assessment Questionnaire (WSAQ) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2010 |
| **Objective** | This tool has been developed for routine use specifically in high-tech worksites. This tool can help systematically monitor sources of workplace stress and consequent outcomes, to help promote and guide existing resources and developed and apply new strategies to tackle work-related stress. |
| **Type of hazard** | Demands, control, support, work role, rewards, and work relationships. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 22-items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 to indicate their agreement or disagreement with the various statements. |
| **Possible users** | Researchers, medical and allied health professionals, work health and safety experts. |
| **Costs** | No cost identified. |
| **How to access the tool** | Description of the tool is available at: Mahmood, M. H., Coons, S. J., Guy, M. C., & Pelletier, K. R. (2010). Development and Testing of the Workplace Stressors Assessment Questionnaire. *JOEM, 52 (12),* 1192-2000. |
| **Conditions of use** | No conditions of use found. |
| **Translations** | English |
| **Country of Origin** | United States |
| **Versions** | Only one version. |
| **Author** | Mahmood, Coons, Guy, and Pelletier. |

**Appendix 1**

| Psychosocial Safety Climate (PSC-12) | |
|---|---|
| **Year** | 2010 |
| **Objective** | This tool is used to measure a leading indicator of psychosocial risk factors; psychosocial safety climate. As such this tool provides a better understanding of how organisational factors contribute to the development of risks and hazards in the workplace, and helps guide intervention and prevention strategies. |
| **Type of hazard** | Corporate climate in particular, organisational commitment, organisational participation, management priority, and management commitment in relation to worker psychological health. |
| **How does the tool work?** | A self-report questionnaire in which current employees respond to 12 items that are scored using a 5-point Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 to 5 to indicated their agreement or disagreement with the statements. |
| **Possible users** | Organisations, national and state work health and safety agencies |
| **Costs** | For private use, costs in analysis and interpretation by negotiation |
| **How to access the tool** | Maureen.dollard@unisa.edu.au |
| **Conditions of use** | Use freely for research, data share with creators |
| **Translations** | Dutch, Chinese, English, German, Malaysia, French, Persian, Spanish, Swedish. |
| **Country of Origin** | Australia |
| **Versions** | Only one version |
| **Author** | Hall, Dollard, and Coward. |