

The **Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR)** worked with content experts to develop a review protocol, search the literature, and review 27 studies designed to estimate the causal impact of OSHA activities on injuries and other outcomes. We assessed two different aspects of each study:

Causal Evidence: Do the estimated effects reflect the true impact of OSHA activities on outcomes or could they be the result of some other factor? *High causal evidence* means we are confident that the effects estimated in the study are caused by OSHA inspections. *Moderate causal evidence* means we have some confidence that the estimated effects are caused by OSHA inspections, but other factors might also be at work. *Low causal evidence* means we do not have confidence that the estimated effects are caused by OSHA inspections.

Current Relevance: How relevant are the study's findings to the current policy environment and how useful is the descriptive evidence in the study? Based on the data used and OSHA activities examined, studies were classified as having *strong, some, or little current relevance*. Studies with strong current relevance are highly relevant to current decision-making, even though they may not provide causal evidence.

No study provided high causal evidence, but five provided moderate causal evidence. Although most studies do not estimate the causal impact of OSHA activities, they nonetheless contain valuable descriptive information. CLEAR determined that four studies had strong current relevance and seven had some current relevance.

The **Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA)** strives to improve the safety of working conditions in the United States by providing technical assistance to employers and setting and enforcing standards. OSHA conducts inspections, gives citations, levies penalties, provides consultations, and offers a wide variety of cooperative programs designed to improve working conditions and reduce on-the-job hazards.

According to the research, there is some evidence that OSHA inspections reduce injury rates, on average.

Levine et al. (2012) provides moderate causal evidence of OSHA's impact on injuries and was strongly relevant. The study demonstrated that random OSHA inspections led to a 9 percent decrease in injuries and a 26 percent decrease in injury-related costs among inspected firms. It also showed that OSHA inspections did not adversely affect firm financial performance. Further, the study used administrative injury data from Workers' Compensation records, which may capture actual injury rates better than the firm-reported injury data used in other analyses.

Four other studies, using two different research methods, provided moderate causal evidence that OSHA inspections reduced injury rates, but these studies were all published before 1995. Because OSHA operations have changed in important ways since then, these findings may have low current relevance.

Some recent research has strong current relevance and provides valuable descriptive information, but low causal evidence on the impact of inspections.

ERG (2004) found that firms that received notice that they might be inspected but were not subsequently inspected experienced a five percent decline in injuries in the three years following the notice. Firms that received notice *and* a subsequent inspection experienced a 14 percent decline in injuries in the same period.

Gray and Mendeloff (2005) found that OSHA inspections that resulted in penalties were associated with a 19 percent decline in lost-workday injuries in 1979–1985, an 11 percent decline in 1987–1991, but no large or significant decline in injuries in 1992–1998. Inspections with penalties and inspections to smaller or non-unionized plants were associated with larger changes in injuries than other inspections.

Haviland et al. (2012) found that inspections with penalties were associated with a 19 to 24 percent decline in injuries during the two years after the inspection. This association was not found for inspections without penalties or inspections at very small or very large plants. This study is particularly valuable as it uses administrative data on injury rates (rather than less-accurate firm reports).

OSHA conducts inspections for various reasons, prioritizing *targeted inspections* to firms where there is either evidence of danger, a catastrophe or fatal accident has occurred, or there has been a complaint or referral (OSHA 2002). The above studies compared firms that had received an inspection, including those that received targeted inspections, to firms that were not inspected at all. But firms in the latter group do not provide a good comparison for the former, because they did not experience an adverse event that would trigger a targeted inspection. In other words, they were probably safer than the firms that did receive inspections. Thus, although these studies provide valuable and relevant information, we cannot be confident that the estimated changes in injuries are caused by OSHA activities per se.

To provide stronger causal evidence, researchers could examine only those firms that received *programmed inspections*. Programmed inspections are aimed at high-hazard industries, plants, or occupations. Based on observable characteristics, some firms receive programmed inspections with certainty but others are selected at random for these visits (OSHA 2002). Thus, firms that received programmed inspections could credibly be compared to firms with similar characteristics that did not receive an inspection.

There is little information on the characteristics of OSHA inspections and other OSHA activities.

In particular, our systematic review found little information on:

- The relationship between size of OSHA penalty and change in injury rates
- Impacts of changes in OSHA policies, practices, and procedures
- Impacts of OSHA consultations
- Whether impacts vary by characteristics of the inspector or of the inspection itself
- How the use of administrative or self-reported data affects the interpretation of the estimated impact of OSHA inspections

See Mendeloff (2012) for further discussion of areas for future research.

References

- ERG. (2004). Evaluation of OSHA's impact on workplace injuries and illnesses in manufacturing using establishment-specific targeting of interventions: Programmed inspections vs. high hazard notification letters. Lexington, MA: Author.
- Gray, W., & Mendeloff, J. (2005). The declining effects of OSHA inspections on manufacturing injuries, 1979-1998. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 58(4), 571-587.
- Haviland, A., Burns, R., Gray, W., Ruder, T., & Mendeloff, J. (2012). A new estimate of the impact of OSHA inspections on manufacturing injury rates, 1998-2005. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 55(11), 964-975.
- Levine, D., Toffel, M., & Johnson, M. (2012). Randomized government safety inspections reduce worker injuries with no detectable job loss. *Science*, 336(6083), 907-911.
- Mendeloff, J. (2012). Enforcement knowns and unknowns—Do you agree? What are the implications? Memo, RAND Corporation.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2002). OSHA inspections. *OSHA Report 2098*.

See the Appendices for further details on CLEAR's systematic review of the effectiveness of OSHA activities.

This research synthesis was conducted by Mathematica Policy Research for the Department of Labor under contract number DOLU139634844. For more information on CLEAR policies and procedures, see the About Us section of www.clear.dol.gov.