







# SLIC 2012 - Campaign on psychosocial risks – Country report l Germany

#### See instructions!

### General description

Contrai decemp	
National legislation	See Annex no.1
Campaign goals or indicators	See Annex no. 2
Sectors inspected	See Annex no. 3
SLIC inspection tools and methods	See Annex no. 4
National tools (existing tools, development of new national tools or adjustment of campaign tools)	See Annex no. 5
Number of labour inspectors	The total number of labour inspectors? See Annex no. 6 The number of labour inspectors with competence on psychosocial risks? The number of labour inspectors actively taking part in the campaign?
Training	Has specific training for preparation of the campaign taken place?  Has training material been developed? See Annex no. 7  The number of training days per inspector  The number of inspectors trained











National evaluation or follow-up	See Annex no. 8
Development of national information materials	See Annex no. 9
Development of a national campaign website	No

## Assessment of the campaign

Usefulness of background material	Limited benefit, had to be adapted to national conditions.
Usefulness of the inspection tools (toolkit)	Useful as basis to develop own tools.
Usefulness of the project flyer	Useful as basis to develop own flyer.
Usefulness of the project website	Useful for gathering informations and learning more about health and safety in other european countries.
Description of good examples, in attachment if needed	9 out of 12 federal states named examples of good practi see annex 2 to this report.
The inspectors' overall experiences of the campaign	Assessment of instruction for action and inspection tools:  - Very useful and helpful: 27%  - Partially useful and helpful: 63%  - Not really useful and helpful: 10%
The employers' experiences of the campaign	We didn't ask for the employers' experiences, but labour inspectors judged about employers acceptance:  High acceptance: 65%  Middle acceptance: 28%

- Low acceptance:7%











## Evaluation

Please, scale the following aspects of the event on a 1-5 basis, where 5 signifies "very much", 4-"somewhat", 3 - "undecided", 2 - "not really" and 1 - "not at all".

	5	4	3	2	1
Did the campaign influence the national priorities?		X			
Did the campaign induce measures in the enterprises?		X			
Did the campaign contribute to the OSH management and prevention culture in enterprises?			X		
Did the campaign contribute to inform employers and workers?		X			
Did the campaign induce an increase in adequate risk assessments?		X			
Did the campaign improve the national OSH infrastructure?				X	
Did the campaign stimulate enforcement in SME:s and high risk sectors?		×			
Did the exchange of information with other member states stimulate national development?					×









# SLIC 2012 - Campaign on psychosocial risks - Country report II (insert country)

Questions connected to inspections.

The questionnaire is intended to summarize the results of the inspections on country level and to be used to report on individual inspections.

### See instructions!

Sector	Total number of inspections (inspection visits)	Number of follow-up inspections (part of total number)	Number of inspected companies or institutions	Number of inspections (Size of worksite 1-9)	Number of inspections (Size of worksite 10-50)	Number of inspections (Size of worksite >50)
Health						
	_	German Occu	r -		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Services		enterprises of the sized during the sized during the sized during the size of				
	475	Not	470	59	317	95
Transport		noted				
	4.40	Not	4.40	0.7	00	20
Other sectors	142	noted	142	27	82	33
Total						
	617	Not	612	86	399	128

(In 4 cases no information was given about the size of the worksite)



noted









1.Had the employer made a psychosocial risk assessment?	48,6% totally and partially	□ yes	51,4%	no		
2.Psychosocial risks considered	24,7%	☐ frequent	changes	workload	56,4%	
in the risk assessment?	, and the same same same same same same same sam		expectations	night/shift work	42,6%	
	30,7%	threats,	violence	relations	20,3%	
	22,6%	stress/ot	her risks, spe e.g.: impolite	ecify customer, bad weath working alone,high le		
3.Participation in making	60,5%	employe	ees	□ experts 65,2%	, D	
the risk assessment?	5,7%	mploye	ployees' representatives			
	12,2%	others	the risk asse	the employer is responsible.  The employer is responsible is no restriction of employers.	egulation	
4. Actions needed concerning	81,4%	yes and	partially	□ no 14,9% no	action	
ps venosociai risks.	were drawn		was taken			
al	oout necess	ary actions		and 3,7% missing data		
5. Actions taken by the employer	preventive		mitigating mitigating			
after the risk assessment?	remedial					
54 % had taken action in improving labour organisation and structure of work 20% did something to prevent critical events, 31 % initiated measures of behavioural prevention						
6.Did the risk assessment compl	☐ yes31,8%		partially 48,9%			
the legal requirements?	□ no 19,3%					
7. Actions of the labour inspection	advice		inspection notice			
Advisory discus	injunctions injunctions		prohition			
Formal letter 44%		☐ fines ☐ prosecution				
Fixing of a time	other actions i.e					
Other administrative acti						