

Effective Management of Regulatory Requirements for Business Safety: A Literature Review

Ilija Životić¹[0000-0002-3288-3915], Siniša Domazet²[0000-0002-5964-2249] and Sunčica
Stanković²[0000-0001-8824-1973]

¹ Faculty of Engineering Management, Union Nikola Tesla University
Bulevar Vojvode Mišića 43, Belgrade, Serbia

² Faculty of Management, Belgrade Metropolitan University
Tadeuša Košćuška 63, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia

ilija.zivotic@fim.rs,
sinisa.domazet@metropolitan.ac.rs,
suncica.stankovic@metropolitan.ac.rs

Abstract. The legislative framework in the field of health and safety at work is a key segment in the effective management of legislative requirements for business safety. Although this regulation aims to protect employees and preserve safety in organizations, critics point out that it can limit innovation and slow industrial development, which has led to proposals to reduce the regulatory burden when possible. The aim of this paper is to explore the challenges that organizations face in trying to meet legal requirements and to effectively manage the process of implementing regulations in the context of business security. A systematic literature review was conducted that analyzes the relationship between the management of legislative requirements and the day-to-day management of security in companies. The search for relevant publications was carried out through international bibliographic databases and scientific search engines, with an additional analysis of quotes from other authors. The results of the literature review show how compliance or non-compliance with legislation directly affects the effectiveness of the management of security systems in companies. The analysis highlights successful regulatory strategies, as well as key challenges, weaknesses and limitations that organizations face when implementing regulations. The study emphasizes that the effective management of legislative requirements in the area of business security, especially in small and medium-sized enterprises, is a complex and demanding process. The management of security systems should not only be based on strict enforcement of regulations and detection of non-compliance, but also on proactive approaches that include analysis of how legal compliance affects day-to-day operations and performance.

Keywords: Occupational Health and Safety Management, Legislation, Inspection Practices, Europe.

1 Introduction

Legislation in the area of occupational health and safety (OHS) represents the basic mechanism for ensuring safe working conditions in organizations [1]. Although the

Review Paper - Invited Paper

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46793/BISEC25.031Z>

Part of ISBN: 978-86-89755-40-4



© 2026 Copyright for this paper by its authors.
Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).

relationship between the work environment and employee health outcomes is well established [2, 3], the path from legal requirements to concrete workplace practices involves complex organizational processes that are still not sufficiently elucidated [4]. As stated by authors [5] in their comprehensive review of European research, the steps between OSH legislation and outcomes in the work environment are complex, and the impact of various conditions, both internal and external to the workplace, requires further clarification.

Fulfilling legal requirements is the primary responsibility of every organization and a basic preventive step in safety management [1]. However, critics have pointed out that regulation in the area of OHS can limit innovation and industrial development, while encouraging bureaucratic cultures [6]. This tension between regulatory compliance and organizational flexibility creates challenges for businesses striving to effectively manage security. Understanding these tensions is crucial, as managing legal compliance in companies, especially SMEs, has become a complex task that requires careful examination of both successful strategies and persistent difficulties [7].

The European context provides a particularly relevant setting for examining these dynamics. The European Union Framework Directive 89/391/EEC [8] establishes common requirements for member states, but there are significant differences in the way these requirements are transposed and applied, due to different regulatory traditions, industrial relations systems and economic conditions [9, 10]. The analysis of European workplaces is particularly relevant due to the combination of relative legislative coherence and variation across national contexts [5].

The aim of this review is to synthesize existing research on how organizations manage regulatory requirements in the area of occupational health and safety compliance, with a focus on the conditions that facilitate or hinder effective implementation. The research question is: What organizational conditions influence the effective management of regulations in the field of occupational health and safety?

2 Methodology

This review follows the systematic literature review methodology as defined by [11] and [12], including techniques for identifying, evaluating, and synthesizing existing research. The review integrates findings from two complementary approaches: a rapid review of European research by authors [5] and a systematic review of the international literature on legal compliance in the field of OHS conducted by authors [7].

Authors [5] applied a rapid review methodology, systematically searching six general databases (Scopus, Web of Science, PsycInfo, ASC, BSP, PubMed), one thematic database (Safety Lit) and one specialist journal (Journal of Safety Research). Their search generated 16,284 references, of which 339 full texts were reviewed, and 56 studies were finally included in the analysis. Studies were included if they related to the European work context, examined legislation or workplace inspection practices, and investigated how organizations accept and implement regulations.

Authors [7] conducted a systematic review covering publications from the period 1987–2018, searching four international bibliographic databases: Science Direct,

Scopus, ISI Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Their search used 24 key word combinations and generated 1,164 publications, which after removing duplicates and checking for relevance were narrowed down to 25 final included papers.

Combined search strategies identified studies published in the period 1987–2024, with a primary focus on peer-reviewed empirical research. Inclusion criteria required that studies: 1) examine legislation, regulations or inspection practices in the field of OHS in the working environment; 2) explore how organizations accept and implement regulations; 3) provide empirical data on the conditions that affect compliance.

After study selection, the methodological quality of all included studies was assessed using the Mixed Methods Assessment Tool (MMAT) [13]. Following this quality assessment, the synthesized review included findings from more than 70 studies, ensuring a rigorous and reliable review of the literature.

3 Results

3.1 The Legislative Framework as a System of External Pressure

Legislation functions as an external pressure mechanism to encourage employers to prioritize occupational safety and health and to develop internal management systems. Legislation acts as an external pressure on employers to develop routines to establish a good working environment, where its effectiveness depends on the clarity and relevance of regulations, as well as on inspection practices that have a constructive character [5].

Authors [14] conceptualized legal frameworks as invisible barrier systems that, when properly implemented, enable organizations to prevent, control, and mitigate adverse events. This perspective is consistent with [15] FRAM method (Functional Resonance Analysis), which views legislation as part of an organization's protective barrier system. However, [16] later questions the extent to which existing safety and health legislation provides a truly effective barrier system.

The effectiveness of legislative pressure largely depends on the clarity and enforceability of regulations. Research shows that employers experience compliance difficulties when regulations are perceived as complex, unclear or disconnected from operational realities [17, 18]. This is particularly visible in areas such as chemicals regulation, where complex requirements, such as REACH, require local interpretation that varies significantly across contexts [19]. Understanding legislation can be a challenge for organizations, sometimes leading to minimalist compliance strategies [7].

The European Directive 89/391/EEC [8] has generally affected the routines of employers, but its implementation varies considerably between Member States. Authors [10] compared the Swedish and Spanish approaches and found a weak integration of OHS management in companies where compliance was reduced to the exchange of documents, rather than actual practice. EU directives are applied differently, with Sweden having a more extensive regulatory framework than Spain, and national contexts being differently adapted to the harmonization of those directives [5]. Effective

implementation requires the active participation of safety professionals, workers and business owners – not just formal compliance [20].

3.2 Inspection practices: Balance between control and advisory work

Labor inspections are a key mechanism for translating legal requirements into practice at the workplace. Research consistently shows that inspection practices significantly influence employers' management of occupational health and safety [10, 21, 22]. However, the style and approach in inspections greatly affects how they are received and what their outcomes are. As authors [5] note, most studies on inspection practices emphasize the importance of a balance between control and advisory work in order for employers to change their OHS practices.

A comparative study of German and British inspection practices [23] showed that the frequency of inspections alone did not predict a reduction in the number of accidents; instead, broader approaches that combine appropriate means with targeted inspections have proven to be more beneficial. Author [24] compared inspections in the construction industry in Denmark and Sweden, finding that Swedish practice is more focused on advisory work and is perceived by employers as more constructive. According to [5] this comparative study showed that the Swedish inspection practice is more oriented towards advisory work compared to the Danish one, which was judged to be more constructive.

The balance between control and advisory work emerges as a central theme. Finnish studies reveal tensions between employers who demand more advisory work [25] and inspectors who strive for stronger control measures [26]. Research from Great Britain [27] highlights how resource cuts reduce the capacity of inspectors to conduct adequate inspections and develop competencies. Multiple studies call for increased inspection resources to improve regulatory compliance [28, 29].

Authors [30] systematically reviewed the effectiveness of enforcement, finding that inspections with sanctions produced better health outcomes compared to purely advisory approaches. However, authors [5] note that qualitative evidence from the Nordic countries suggests that consultative approaches may be better accepted in workplaces [31], indicating that effectiveness may depend on national regulatory traditions and workplace expectations. They point out that support for these approaches in the review rests heavily on qualitative evidence and can be context specific, highlighting the need for stronger national support for participatory and consultative methods.

The public model of accident investigation, carried out by labor authorities, includes an assessment by experts whose testimony can be used in court [7]. Despite concerns that fear of lawsuits may hinder open communication during investigations [32], evidence suggests that regulatory policies have a positive “tractor effect” on improving health and safety processes and outcomes in companies [30, 33].

3.3 Organizational Conditions for Regulatory Compliance

Structural Conditions

Organizational size consistently predicts regulatory compliance capacity. Larger organizations show more developed risk assessments [29], greater risk awareness [34] and stronger overall compliance [28, 35]. The size of the organization strongly predicts the level of development of risk assessment, with larger companies usually having more favorable conditions for occupational safety and health, including dedicated resources, specialized personnel and systematized structures for OHS management [5].

Economic resources are an essential prerequisite for working on the OHS. Studies repeatedly emphasize that insufficient resources limit the ability of organizations to devote time and attention to safety issues [28, 36, 37]. Production demands and high work tempo directly hinder OHS activities and reduce regulatory compliance [38, 39, 40]. Intensive production requirements and fast work rhythms negatively affect occupational health and safety, leading to less compliance with regulations [5].

Integrating OHS practices into organizational routines is another critical structural condition. Organizations with developed routines show better outcomes in terms of work environment [41, 42]. Such integration creates internal pressure that, combined with external regulatory pressure, increases risk awareness and compliance [5]. Authors [41] identified multiple factors that support integration: cross-functional collaboration, clear roles, project management, leadership, safety climate, training, and operational risk management.

Working arrangements also affect compliance. Studies examining work through temporary employment agencies and subcontracting chains find that complex employment relationships create challenges for consistent implementation of OHS [36, 43]. Internal systems that transmit pressure through supply chains can improve standards across organizational boundaries [44].

Management and Leadership

Management commitment appears as a central factor in the effective management of occupational health and safety. Executive support is correlated with improved safety culture, safety behaviors and regulatory compliance [45, 46, 47]. Management and leadership are key structural factors, with the training, skills and commitment of managers being crucial for effectively prioritizing occupational safety and health [5].

Dahl et al. [42] found that operators who received training from OHS had a better understanding of the positive relationship between a good work environment and organizational effectiveness. These findings challenge perceptions that safety and productivity are necessarily in conflict, suggesting instead that well-managed safety supports operational goals. Managers who received the training also found a good work environment to be positive for production and efficiency [5].

Leadership styles affect safety outcomes. Authors [47] found that active transactional leadership positively affects regulatory compliance in military operations. Reference [40] identified multiple factors that influence executives' commitment to safety, including organizational support, personal values, and perceived responsibilities.

Knowledge and Competence

OHS competencies and risk awareness at all levels of the organization are essential for compliance. Lack of knowledge is often cited as a reason for non-compliance [19, 39, 48]. Training interventions can positively influence regulatory compliance [31, 49]. Competencies in the field of health, safety and environment, as well as risk awareness within an organization are important and among employees, and that training interventions can have positive effects on regulatory compliance [5].

However, knowledge alone proves to be insufficient. Employees must navigate between formal requirements and operational reality. Laurence [50] studied the Australian mining industry's transition from compliance-based to risk-based approaches, finding that extensive rules and regulations failed to connect with miners. Effective compliance requires that security knowledge be embedded in practice, not just documented.

Social Conditions and Safety Culture

Safety culture and climate significantly influence regulatory compliance [41, 51]. Different professional groups can develop distinct subcultures with different perspectives on security. Lofquist et al. [52] identified three such cultures among Norwegian managers, engineers and workers, each interpreting safety rules differently. Subcultures can develop in different professions and that these cultural differences shape the way safety rules are interpreted and applied [5].

Roles and responsibilities in the management of the OHS shape the way regulations are implemented. Employee safety representatives often show greater trust in regulations than managers [25] and prioritize safety more [35]. However, those in formal positions in the OHS field must navigate a multitude of expectations and may end up with more responsibilities than anticipated [53]. Authors [5] note that roles in OHS management are often not very well defined, and those with formal roles may end up with more responsibility than expected. A clear definition of roles and a sufficient mandate are prerequisites for effective management of the OHS [41, 54].

Gender dimensions remain under-researched in the literature on compliance with regulations in the area of OHS. Gender issues are rarely included in the reviewed studies; only two have an explicit gender focus [5]. Available studies indicate that stereotypical gender cultures at work can prevent the prioritization of OHS by reinforcing traditional masculine identities that diminish the importance of risk [55]. Consideration of gender aspects in OHS primarily appears only in relation to risks of sexual harassment [56], indicating significant gaps in understanding how gender dynamics affect security practices.

3.4 The Challenge of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) face particular challenges in meeting regulatory requirements. The European Agency for Safety and Health at Work [57] estimates that EU-15 member states have almost 19 million SMEs employing approximately 75 million people, with these enterprises accounting for 82% of occupational

injuries and up to 90% of fatal accidents. The majority of problems are found in small and medium-sized enterprises [7].

Hasle and Limborg [58] documented that small firms are organized differently than large firms, making it difficult to apply results-based regulations when those results are not easily measurable. Managers in SMEs deal with multiple issues at the same time, where health and safety are not always a priority [59]. Many small business owners see safety as the responsibility of employees and regulatory requirements as a financial burden [6, 58]. Small businesses are often organizations that focus their resources on mere survival and that business managers have to deal with different issues at the same time, and health and safety is not always a priority [7].

Limited material and human resources make it difficult for SMEs to meet all legal requirements [60, 61, 62]. Research by [23] questions whether compliance management brings as many benefits as costs to such organizations. Authors [59] and [63] argue that future laws in the field of OHS must take greater account of the specificities of SMEs and develop a better understanding of how owners and managers define their organizational identity and how this affects security practices. Reference [7] conclude that their limited economic, human and material resources can make it difficult to meet the legal requirements to which they must respond.

3.5 Self-Regulation and Management Systems

Self-regulation through voluntary standards and certification systems offers potential avenues for reducing the regulatory burden while maintaining safety standards. Robbens [64] originally proposed self-regulation through voluntary norms and codes of good practice, an approach revisited by [65] suggesting its particular relevance to SMEs.

Certification according to standards such as OHSAS 18001 or ISO 45001 is an important tool for implementing and updating the occupational health and safety management system [66]. Voluntary standards help companies monitor the implementation of regulations, assess compliance and plan activities [67]. However, [6] and [68] noted that some organizations, especially SMEs, resist the burden of self-regulation, initially seeing it as deregulation rather than increased responsibility.

Research on certified OHS management systems reveals mixed findings. Certification systems can be useful for improving organizational routines, but they do not seem to provide enough guidance for employers to improve psychosocial work environment practices [69]. Hohnen and Hasle [70] examined third-party audits, identifying challenges in effectively auditing psychosocial factors. Madsen et al. [71] found that adopters of certified systems show a stronger commitment to OHS, although questions remain as to whether certification drives improvement or merely reflects pre-existing commitment.

The effectiveness of self-regulation depends on strong supervision. Regulators require effective audit tools to determine when organizations can be trusted to self-regulate properly [65]. Braithwaite et al. [72] argued that innovative regulators that delay punishment while supporting organizational improvement achieve better long-term compliance outcomes. The effect of standards-based self-regulation in compa-

nies on regulatory compliance management poses several challenges, including the need for regulators and certifiers to be strict yet accountable to provide incentives for certification [7].

3.6 Resilience Engineering and Regulatory Compliance

New security paradigms challenge traditional compliance-based approaches. Resilience engineering [73] represents a third-generation model of accident causation that goes beyond linear and epidemiological approaches, recognizing accidents as non-linear phenomena arising from complex systems.

Resilience engineering recognizes that normal functioning requires variability in order to achieve everyday successes, suggesting that this variability should not be limited [74]. Organizations should develop the capacity to respond, monitor, learn and predict [75]. However, the current governance of OHS is still characterized by prescriptive standards and reactive approaches, with legislation focusing on things that go wrong rather than things that work right. The current reality of most organizations and companies, health and safety management is still characterized by the use of prescriptive standards and reaction-based approaches [7].

Regulations must be reviewed to adapt to changing organizational realities while remaining compatible with operational performance [76]. Grotan et al. [77] highlight the importance of resilience in the context of regulatory compliance and the creation of room for manoeuvre, which enables recovery based on the experience and adaptability of workers. Companies and organizations often find it difficult to avoid deviating from legal compliance, which is the easiest option, creating a dilemma between operational requirements and legal compliance [7].

Anderson et al. [78] suggest that resilience and legal compliance need not be incompatible. While Resilience Engineering focuses on operational variability rather than strict compliance, both approaches can be combined so that resilience supports compliance. The best practices for the management of OHS should include not only prescriptive principles, but also proactive ones, which include assessing the effectiveness of compliance in predicting, preventing and controlling risks [7]. They emphasize that companies should include a more accurate assessment of the effectiveness of compliance with legislation in terms of security programs, as well as their effectiveness in terms of predicting, preventing and controlling risks.

3.7 Leading Indicators and Predictive Approaches

Traditional safety measurement relies on lagging indicators such as accident rates, but researchers are increasingly advocating the use of leading indicators that predict future safety performance [79, 80]. These proactive measures allow organizations to identify and resolve problems before incidents occur.

Some authors [81, 82, 83] developed classifications of leading indicators for construction and other sectors. Key predictive indicators include detection of non-compliance with legal regulations in company audits and procedural violations. Salas and Hallowell [84] empirically validated leading indicators in the oil and gas sector,

demonstrating their predictive validity. Alexander et al. [85] identified precursors to construction fatalities, enabling predictive modeling of serious incidents.

The move towards leading indicators is aligned with proactive regulatory approaches. Instead of merely sanctioning past violations, organizations and inspectors can identify emerging risks and take preventive action. This approach requires sophisticated data systems and analytical capabilities that can be challenging for smaller organizations, but offers the potential for more effective security management.

4 Discussion / Synthesis

The reviewed literature consistently shows that effective management of regulatory requirements depends on the interaction between external and internal pressures. Reference [5] provide a comprehensive framework for understanding this interaction, concluding that legislation functions as an external pressure on employers to develop routines for establishing a good work environment, while if an internal system is established to improve OHS practices, it creates a corresponding internal pressure within the organization to prioritize work environment issues.

This finding is consistent with the holistic compliance model developed by [86] and [87], which combines external factors (regulations, inspections, social norms, market structures) with internal factors (organizational characteristics, support structures, skills, worker organization) to explain compliance behavior. Authors [5] note that their findings are reminiscent of a holistic model of compliance that similarly combines external and internal factors to influence compliance behavior.

External pressure acts through at least four levels, according to reference [5]. First, wider societal factors, including EU regulatory frameworks and national regulations, set requirements that must be understandable and adaptable to different contexts. Second, inspection practices require sufficient resources and an appropriate balance between control and advisory work. Third, the organizational management of OHS depends on functional internal systems integrated into day-to-day operations. Fourth, the basic working conditions – production requirements, work pace, safety culture – shape the way the requirements are implemented.

Internal pressure occurs when organizations establish systems that prioritize work environment issues. Such systems include routines for risk assessment, incident reporting, management commitment, clear roles, cooperation and adequate working conditions for employees. Authors [5] emphasize that such a system is made possible by adequate management of OHS, risk assessment systems, integrated routines, sufficient awareness and training, and sufficiently good general working conditions.

When external and internal pressures are effectively combined, OHS becomes a true priority and work processes support regulatory compliance. Reference [7] similarly conclude that correct application of legislation in companies can prevent and control an adverse event and even reduce its impact, but emphasize that this requires going beyond minimalist compliance strategies.

The EU Framework Directive 89/391 [8] is an example of how external factors influence organizational motivations for engagement in the area of OHS, although the

effects vary depending on political and economic developments [88]. Current EU policy combines incentives for voluntary compliance with enforcement where necessary, but optimal support depends on the design of national regulatory and support systems.

5 Implications for Policy and Practice

5.1 Policy Implications

The literature review brings several implications for policy makers. Regulation and inspection activities remain central to achieving and maintaining a good working environment. However, given the differences in the way EU directives are implemented in member states, attention must be focused on national legislative and institutional structures when initiating new policies at supranational levels. Authors [5] point out that the literature indicates clear differences in regulatory compliance between countries, where jurisdictions with a stronger national system are likely to facilitate the adoption of new requirements.

Jurisdictions with stronger national systems make it easier to adopt new requirements. Organizations in such countries show stronger motivations and better internal OHS systems, which enable compliance with complex directives dealing with psychosocial issues. Policy makers at the supranational level should promote sufficient support and resources for national authorities to align national systems with international requirements. Reference [5] recommend that policy makers at supranational levels must promote sufficient support and resources for policy makers at the national level to align national systems with international requirements.

The clarity and relevance of regulations significantly influence compliance. Legislation that fails to connect with operational reality creates resistance and creative interpretation rather than actual safety improvement. Policy makers should involve stakeholders, including employers and workers, in regulation development processes from early stages [89]. Authors [7] suggest that researchers should develop scientific studies on the collaboration between regulators and health and safety management professionals during the development of legal standards, which would encourage the adoption of effective implementation and compliance with new regulations.

5.2 Organizational Implications

For workplaces, the review highlights the importance of developing internal structures that create sufficient internal pressure for compliance. Authors [5] advise that the review points to the need to develop internal structures within the organization to ensure sufficient internal pressure for compliance. Organizations should establish adequate OHS management systems, risk assessment procedures and integrated routines, while ensuring sufficient awareness, training and general working conditions.

Management commitment is proving to be essential. Organizations should invest in executive training that builds an understanding of how a good work environment

supports operational goals. A clear definition of roles and a sufficient mandate for safety employee representatives enable effective management of the OHS. Authors [5] note that studies in the review indicate that this is central to the prioritization of work environment issues, and that this is supported by adequate work requirements, sufficient training for managers and workers, and risk management systems.

Organizations should assess their specific conditions – size, resources, sector, working arrangements – and develop alignment approaches tailored to their context. Although certification to voluntary standards can support improvement, organizations must ensure that systems capture all relevant risks, including psychosocial factors that certification processes may overlook.

External support systems, especially occupational medicine services, remain underutilized resources for preventive work [90, 91]. Organizations should integrate such services into their OHS management, rather than treating them as peripheral.

5.3 Research limitations

This literature review has several significant limitations. First, terminological heterogeneity in the field made a comprehensive search difficult, despite the use of broad terms in multiple databases. Second, the geographical focus primarily on European research, although justified due to EU directives, limits the global generalizability of the findings. Third, most of the included studies are cross-sectional in design, making it impossible to draw firm conclusions about causal relationships. Fourth, the underrepresentation of SMEs in the literature, even though they make up the majority of the economy and have the most compliance difficulties, is a significant shortcoming. Finally, the language restriction to English may have resulted in missing relevant studies published in other languages.

5.4 Future Research Directions

The review identifies several gaps that require further investigation. Reference [5] specifically recommend that future research can focus more on analyzing how organizations with different gender structures provide different structural and social conditions for OHS work; comparing sectors and countries to study how regulations are interpreted and applied differently; how safety climate is related to regulatory practices; and how external support systems can be integrated into OSH employer practices. The gender dimensions of compliance with regulations in the area of OHS remain insufficiently researched; future studies should examine how organizations with different gender structures provide different structural and social conditions for safety work. Comparative research across sectors and countries would shed light on how regulations are interpreted and applied in different contexts.

The relationship between security climate and regulatory practices requires deeper examination. Although studies confirm that culture influences compliance, the mechanisms through which this occurs remain poorly understood. Research should examine how organizations can intentionally foster cultures that support both compliance and resilient action.

The integration of external support systems deserves attention. Studies should examine how occupational health services, industry associations and other intermediaries can effectively support organizational compliance, especially for SMEs with limited internal resources.

The compatibility of resilience engineering and regulatory compliance raises both theoretical and practical issues. While it seems obvious that legislation focuses on things that go wrong, contrary to what Resilience Engineering suggests, this does not imply that regulations should be abandoned, but rather revised to adapt to the changing realities of companies [7]. Research should examine how organizations can develop resilient capacities while maintaining regulatory compliance, and how regulations can be developed to support rather than hinder resilience.

Finally, intervention research should evaluate strategies to improve compliance, particularly in challenging contexts such as SMEs and complex supply chains. Longitudinal studies that follow organizations over time would illuminate how compliance develops and what factors support sustained improvement.

6 Conclusion

This literature review investigated how organizations effectively manage occupational safety and health requirements. The analysis shows that regulatory compliance is the result of a complex interaction between external pressures – legislation, inspection practices and the social context – and internal organizational factors, such as resources, management commitment, knowledge and competences, social ties and culture. Legislation represents a key external pressure, but its effectiveness depends on the clarity of regulations, their relevance and the constructive approach of inspections. Organizations should have sufficiently strong internal systems that create appropriate internal pressure to prioritize work environment issues. Such systems depend on adequate resources, integrated procedures, management commitment, clearly defined roles and a positive safety culture. If an internal system is established to improve safety and health practices, it creates additional internal pressure within the organization to prioritize work environment issues. The functioning of such a system is made possible by adequate management of the OHS, risk assessment systems, integrated procedures, a sufficient level of awareness and training, as well as satisfactory general working conditions.

SMEs face particular challenges in meeting regulatory requirements due to limited resources and competing priorities. Future policies and research should focus on the specific needs of these businesses, while maintaining safety standards. The management of safety and health systems should not only be based on strict application of regulations and detection of non-compliance, but also on proactive principles that examine how compliance with laws affects the day-to-day functioning of the organization.

New approaches, such as resilience engineering and the use of indicators to predict risk, offer the potential for more proactive and effective safety management, although their relationship to regulatory compliance is still under investigation. Effectively

managing regulatory requirements requires moving beyond a minimalist approach to compliance and moving toward integrated strategies that treat security as a key part of an organization's success. When external and internal pressures are successfully combined, regulations help, rather than hinder, organizations' efforts to provide safe and healthy working conditions.

References

1. Jacinto, C., Guedes Soares, C., Fialho, T., Silva, S. A.: RIATT: The recording, investigation and analysis of accidents at work-User's manual. Revision 1.1 (2010), http://www.mar.ist.utl.pt/captar/images/RIAAT%20Users%20Manual_revision%201.1_May%202010.pdf, last accessed 2025/10/20.
2. Rugulies, R., Aust, B., Greiner, B. A., Arensman, E., Kawakami, N., LaMontagne, A. D., Madsen, I. E.: Work-related causes of mental health conditions and interventions for their improvement in workplaces. *The Lancet* **402**(10410), 1368-1381 (2023).
3. Theorell, T., Hammarström, A., Aronsson, G., Träskman Bendz, L., Grape, T., Hogstedt, C., ..., Hall, C.: A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and depressive symptoms. *BMC Public Health* **15**(1), 738 (2015).
4. MacEachen, E., Kosny, A., Ståhl, C., O'Hagan, F., Redgrift, L., Sanford, S., ..., Mahood, Q.: Systematic review of qualitative literature on occupational health and safety legislation and regulatory enforcement planning and implementation. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 3-16 (2016).
5. Ståhl, C., Lundqvist, D., Reineholm, C.: Improving work environments through regulation: A literature review on the influence of regulation, inspection practices and organizational conditions in European workplaces. *Safety Science* **191**, 106917 (2025).
6. Hale, A., Borys, D., Adams, M.: Safety regulation: The lessons of workplace safety rule management for managing the regulatory burden. *Safety Science*, **71**, 112-122 (2015).
7. Salguero-Caparrós, F., Pardo-Ferreira, M. D. C., Martínez-Rojas, M., Rubio-Romero, J. C.: Management of legal compliance in occupational health and safety. A literature review. *Safety Science* **121**, 111-118 (2020).
8. European Council: European Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June: Introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work. *Official Journal of the European Communities* **32** (L1 83), 29 June 1989, Luxembourg (1989).
9. Walters, D., Wadsworth, E. J. K., Quinlan, M.: Analysis of the determinants of workplace occupational safety and health practice in a selection of EU Member States. Luxembourg: European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2013).
10. Morillas, R. M., Rubio-Romero, J. C., Fuertes, A. (2013). A comparative analysis of occupational health and safety risk prevention practices in Sweden and Spain. *Journal of Safety Research* **47**, 57-65 (2013).
11. Fink, A.: *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*. Sage Publications, California, EE.UU (2019).
12. Zhou, Z., Goh, Y. M., Li, Q.: Overview and analysis of safety management studies in the construction industry. *Safety Science* **72**, 337-350 (2015).
13. Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., ..., Pluye, P.: The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for Information* **34**(4), 285-291 (2018).
14. Hale, A. R., Swuste, P. H. J. J.: Safety rules: procedural freedom or action constraint? *Safety Science* **29**(3), 163-177 (1998).

15. Hollnagel, E.: Barriers and accident prevention: or how to improve safety by understanding the nature of accidents rather than finding their causes. Hampshire: Ashgate (2004).
16. Hollnagel, E.: Risk+ barriers= safety?. *Safety Science* **46**(2), 221-229 (2008).
17. Evans, J., Silbey, S. S.: (Co-opting regulation: Professional control through discretionary mobilization of legal prescriptions and expert knowledge. *Organization Science* **33**(5), 2041-2064 (2022).
18. Przystupa, K., Gil, L., Niewczas, A., Pieniak, D.: Working time of a Polish professional driver. *Archives of Transport* **52**(4), 57-66 (2019).
19. Schenk, L., Antonsson, A. B.: Implementation of the chemicals regulation REACH– Exploring the impact on occupational health and safety management among Swedish downstream users. *Safety Science* **80**, 233-242 (2015).
20. Niskanen, T., Naumanen, P., Hirvonen, M. L.: An evaluation of EU legislation concerning risk assessment and preventive measures in occupational safety and health. *Applied Ergonomics* **43**(5), 829-842 (2012).
21. Farina, E., Bena, A., Fedeli, U., Mastrangelo, G., Veronese, M., Agnesi, R.: Public injury prevention system in the Italian manufacturing sector: What types of inspection are more effective? *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* **59**(4), 315-321 (2016).
22. Johannessen, H. A., Knardahl, S., Emberland, J. S., Skare, Ø., Finnanger Garshol, B.: Do regulatory tools instigate measures to prevent work-related psychosocial and ergonomic risk factors? A process evaluation of a Labour inspection authority trial in the Norwegian home-care services. *BMC Research Notes* **15**(1), 349 (2022).
23. Blanc, F.: *From Chasing Violations to Managing Risks: Origins, Challenges and Evolutions in Regulatory Inspections*. Edward Elgar Publishing (2018).
24. Nielsen, K. J.: A comparison of inspection practices within the construction industry between the Danish and Swedish Work Environment Authorities. *Construction Management and Economics* **35**(3), 154-169 (2017).
25. Niskanen, T., Louhelainen, K., Hirvonen, M. L.: An evaluation of the effects of the occupational safety and health inspectors' supervision in workplaces. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* **68**, 139-155 (2014).
26. Niskanen, T.: Investigation into qualitative discourses of the occupational safety and health inspectors in order to promote enforcement. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics* **21**(4), 426-439 (2015).
27. Mustchin, S., & Martínez Lucio, M.: The fragmenting occupation of labour inspection and the degradation of regulatory and enforcement work inside the British state. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* **44**(2), 526-546 (2023).
28. Abderhalden-Zellweger, A., Probst, I., Politis Mercier, M. P., Zenoni, M., Wild, P., Danuser, B., Krief, P.: Implementation of the Swiss Ordinance on Maternity Protection at Work in companies in French-speaking Switzerland. *Work* **69**(1), 157-172 (2021).
29. Lenhardt, U., Beck, D.: Prevalence and quality of workplace risk assessments–Findings from a representative company survey in Germany. *Safety Science* **86**, 48-56 (2016).
30. Tompa, E., Kalcevich, C., Foley, M., McLeod, C., Hogg-Johnson, S., Cullen, K., ..., Irvin, E.: A systematic literature review of the effectiveness of occupational health and safety regulatory enforcement. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* **59**(11), 919-933 (2016).
31. Hagqvist, E., Vinberg, S., Toivanen, S., Landstad, B. J.: A balancing act: Swedish occupational safety and health inspectors' reflections on their bureaucratic role when supervising micro-enterprises. *Small Business Economics* **57**(2), 821-834 (2021).
32. Saleh, J. H., Marais, K. B., Bakolas, E., Cowlagi, R. V.: Highlights from the literature on accident causation and system safety: Review of major ideas, recent contributions, and challenges. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* **95**(11), 1105-1116 (2010).

33. Robson, L. S., Clarke, J. A., Cullen, K., Bielecky, A., Severin, C., Bigelow, P. L., ..., Mahood, Q.: The effectiveness of occupational health and safety management system interventions: A systematic review. *Safety Science* **45**(3), 329-353 (2007).
34. Weissbrodt, R., Arial, M., Graf, M., Iff, S., Giauque, D.: Preventing psychosocial risks at work: An evaluation study of labour inspectorate interventions. *Safety Science*, **110**, 355-362 (2018).
35. Koppel, T., Vilcane, I.: Safety compliance of occupational exposure to electromagnetic fields. *Research in Economics and Business: Central and Eastern Europe*, **10**(1) (2018).
36. Edwin, K. W., Nilsen, M., Albrechtsen, E.: Why is the construction industry killing more workers than the offshore petroleum industry in occupational accidents? *Sustainability* **13**(14), 7592 (2021).
37. Dellve, L., Skagert, K.: Organisational conditions for safety management practice in homecare and nursing homes, pre-pandemic and in pandemic. *Safety Science* **174**, 106488 (2024).
38. Bunner, J., Prem, R., Korunka, C.: How work intensification relates to organization-level safety performance: The mediating roles of safety climate, safety motivation, and safety knowledge. *Frontiers in Psychology* **9**, 2575 (2018).
39. Donati, D., Biagioli, V., Cianfrocca, C., Marano, T., Tartaglini, D., De Marinis, M. G.: Experiences of compliance with standard precautions during emergencies: A qualitative study of nurses working in intensive care units. *Applied Nursing Research* **49**, 35-40 (2019).
40. Tappura, S., Nenonen, N., Kivistö-Rahnasto, J.: Managers' viewpoint on factors influencing their commitment to safety: An empirical investigation in five Finnish industrial organisations. *Safety Science* **96**, 52-61 (2017).
41. Winge, S., Albrechtsen, E., Arnesen, J.: A comparative analysis of safety management and safety performance in twelve construction projects. *Journal of Safety Research* **71**, 139-152 (2019).
42. Dahl, Ø., Rundmo, T., Olsen, E.: The impact of business leaders' formal health and safety training on the establishment of robust occupational safety and health management systems: Three studies based on data from labour inspections. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **19**(3), 1269 (2022).
43. Cajander, N., Reiman, A., Tappura, S.: Occupational safety and health and temporary agency work in multiemployer restaurants. *Work* **75**(3), 939-952 (2023).
44. James, P., Banay, R. F., Hart, J. E., Laden, F.: A review of the health benefits of greenness. *Current Epidemiology Reports* **2**(2), 131-142 (2015).
45. Dahler-Larsen, P., Sundby, A., Boodhoo, A.: Can occupational health and safety management systems address psychosocial risk factors? An empirical study. *Safety Science* **130**, 104878 (2020).
46. Dahl, Ø.: Safety compliance in a highly regulated environment: A case study of workers' knowledge of rules and procedures within the petroleum industry. *Safety Science* **60**, 185-195 (2013).
47. Martínez-Córcoles, M., Stephanou, K.: Linking active transactional leadership and safety performance in military operations. *Safety Science* **96**, 93-101 (2017).
48. Hagqvist, E., Vinberg, S., Toivanen, S., Hagström, M., Granqvist, S., Landstad, B. J.: Falling outside the system: Occupational safety and health inspectors' experiences of micro-enterprises in Sweden. *Safety Science* **125**, 10463 (2020).
49. Cocca, P., Marciano, F., Alberti, M.: Video surveillance systems to enhance occupational safety: A case study. *Safety Science* **84**, 140-148 (2016).

50. Laurence, D.: Safety rules and regulations on mine sites—the problem and a solution. *Journal of Safety Research* **36**(1), 39-50 (2005).
51. Kvalheim, S. A., Dahl, Ø.: Safety compliance and safety climate: A repeated cross-sectional study in the oil and gas industry. *Journal of Safety Research* **59**, 33-41 (2016).
52. Lofquist, E. A., Dyson, P. K., Trønnes, S. N.: Mind the gap: A qualitative approach to assessing why different sub-cultures within high-risk industries interpret safety rule gaps in different ways. *Safety Science* **92**, 241-256 (2017).
53. Rasmussen, B. H., Hasle, P., Andersen, P. (2014). Safety representatives' roles and dilemmas in the Danish oil and gas industry. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety* **12**(1), 17-34 (2014).
54. Schuller, K.: Interventions as the centrepiece of psychosocial risk assessment—why so difficult? *International Journal of Workplace Health Management* **13**(1), 61-80 (2020).
55. Forssberg, K. S., Vänje, A., Parding, K.: Bringing in gender perspectives on systematic occupational safety and health management. *Safety Science* **152**, 105776 (2020).
56. de Celis, I. L. R., de Bobadilla-Güémez, S. F., del Mar Alonso-Almeida, M., Velasco-Balmaseda, E.: Women's occupational health and safety management: An issue for corporate social responsibility. *Safety Science* **91**, 61-70 (2017).
57. EU-OSHA: European Safety and Health Agency (2011), <http://www.osha.europa.eu/en/statistics/index.stm>, last accessed 2025/12/15.
58. Hasle, P., Limborg, H. J.: A review of the literature on preventive occupational health and safety activities in small enterprises. *Industrial Health* **44**(1), 6-12 (2006).
59. Legg, S. J., Olsen, K. B., Laird, I. S., Hasle, P.: Managing safety in small and medium enterprises. *Safety Science* **71**, 189-196 (2015).
60. Stevens, G.: Workplace injuries in small and large manufacturing workplaces. *Labour Market Trends* **107**, 19-26 (1999).
61. Fabiano, B., Currò, F., Pastorino, R.: A study of the relationship between occupational injuries and firm size and type in the Italian industry. *Safety Science* **42**(7), 587-600 (2004).
62. Hasle, P., Kines, P., Andersen, L. P.: Small enterprise owners' accident causation attribution and prevention. *Safety Science* **47**(1), 9-19 (2009).
63. Cagno, E., Micheli, G. J., Masi, D., Jacinto, C.: Economic evaluation of OSH and its way to SMEs: A constructive review. *Safety Science* **53**, 134-152 (2013).
64. Robens, A.: Safety and health at work: report of the Committee, 1970-72. HM Stationery Office (1972).
65. Hale, A. R.: Method in your madness: System in your safety. Technische Universiteit Delft (2006).
66. Darabont, D. C., Antonov, A. E., Bejinariu, C.: Key elements on implementing an occupational health and safety management system using ISO 45001 standard. In MATEC web of conferences, vol. 121, p. 11007. EDP Sciences (2017).
67. Audiffren, T., Rallo, J. M., Guarnieri, F.: OHS certification and legal compliance management in France: a quantitative survey. In ESREL Conference (2013, September).
68. Hohnen, P., Hasle, P.: Making work environment auditable - A 'critical case' study of certified occupational health and safety management systems in Denmark. *Safety Science* **49**(7), 1022-1029 (2011).
69. Jespersen, A. H., Hohnen, P., Hasle, P.: Internal audits of psychosocial risks at workplaces with certified OHS management systems. *Safety Science* **84**, 201-209 (2016).
70. Hohnen, P., Hasle, P.: Third party audits of the psychosocial work environment in occupational health and safety management systems. *Safety Science* **109**, 76-85 (2018).

71. Madsen, C. U., Thorsen, S. V., Hasle, P., Laursen, L. L., Dyreborg, J.: Differences in occupational health and safety efforts between adopters and non-adopters of certified occupational health and safety management systems. *Safety Science* **152**, 105794 (2022).
72. Braithwaite, J., Makkai, T., Braithwaite, V.: Regulating aged care: Ritualism and the new py Hollnagel, E., Woods, D. D., & Leveson, N. (Eds.). (2006). *Resilience engineering: Concepts and precepts*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.. ramid. In *Regulating Aged Care*. Edward Elgar Publishing (2007).
73. Hollnagel, E., Woods, D. D., Leveson, N. (Eds.): *Resilience engineering: Concepts and precepts*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd (2006).
74. Hollnagel, E.: RAG-The Resilience Analysis Grid. *Resilience Engineering in Practice: A Guidebook*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, Farnham, Surrey, 275–296 (2011).
75. Hollnagel, E.: *Safety-II in Practice: Developing the Resilience Potentials*. Routledge (2017).
76. Schröder-Hinrichs, J. U., Praetorius, G., Graziano, A., Kataria, A., Baldauf, M.: Introducing the concept of resilience into maritime safety. In 6th Symposium on Resilience Engineering, Lisbon, Portugal, June 22-25, 2015 (pp. 176-182). Resilience Engineering Association (2016).
77. Grøtan, T. O., Wærø, I., Van der Vorm, J. K. J., Van der Beek, F. A., Zuiderwijk, D. C.: Using gaming and resilience engineering principles to energize a situated resilience training of front-end operators and managers. *Risk, reliability and safety: Innovating theory and practice*, 2246-2253 (2016).
78. Anderson, J. E., Ross, A. J., Back, J., Duncan, M., Snell, P., Walsh, K., Jaye, P.: Implementing resilience engineering for healthcare quality improvement using the CARE model: a feasibility study protocol. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies* 2(1), 61 (2016).
79. Kjellén, U.: The safety measurement problem revisited. *Safety Science* **47**(4), 486-489 (2009).
80. Dyreborg, J.: The causal relation between lead and lag indicators. *Safety Science* **47**(4), 474-475 (2009).
81. Hinze, J., Thurman, S., Wehle, A.: Leading indicators of construction safety performance. *Safety Science* **51**(1), 23-28 (2013).
82. Shea, T., De Cieri, H., Donohue, R., Cooper, B., Sheehan, C.: Leading indicators of occupational health and safety: An employee and workplace level validation study. *Safety Science* **85**, 293-304 (2016).
83. Lingard, H., Hollowell, M., Salas, R., Pirzadeh, P.: Leading or lagging? Temporal analysis of safety indicators on a large infrastructure construction project. *Safety Science* **91**, 206-220 (2017).
84. Salas, R., Hollowell, M.: Predictive validity of safety leading indicators: Empirical assessment in the oil and gas sector. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* **142**(10), 04016052 (2016).
85. Alexander, D., Hollowell, M., Gambatese, J.: Precursors of construction fatalities. II: Predictive modeling and empirical validation. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* **143**(7), 04017024 (2017).
86. Nielsen, V. L., Parker, C.: Mixed motives: Economic, social, and normative motivations in business compliance. *Law & Policy* **34**(4), 428-462 (2012).
87. Parker, C., Nielsen, V. L.: Compliance: 14 questions. *Regulatory theory: Foundations and applications*, 217-232 (2017).
88. Walters, D., Johnstone, R., Bluff, E., Limborg, H. J., Gensby, U.: Securing compliance: Some lessons for EU strategy on occupational health and safety (No. 2021.05). Working Paper (2021).

89. Rinfret, S., Cook, J. J., Pautz, M. C. Understanding State Rulemaking Processes: Developing Fracking Rules in Colorado, New York, and Ohio. *Review of Policy Research* **31**(2), 88-104 (2014).
90. Niskanen, T., Louhelainen, K., Hirvonen, M. L.: A systems thinking approach of occupational safety and health applied in the micro-, meso- and macro-levels: A Finnish survey. *Safety Science* **82**, 212-227 (2016).
91. Schmidt, L., Sjöström, J., Antonsson, A. B.: Understanding the challenges facing occupational health services in the Swedish public sector. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies* **7**(3), 85-104 (2017).