

COST Action CA16123
Safety Culture and Risk Management in Agriculture (SACURIMA)
WG 2 Meeting

Time: Friday, February 1, 2019

Place: COST Association, Avenue Louise, Brussels

Review of Literature and Workshop findings

What Data to Collect?

Stephan Van den Broucke advised that several approaches could be taken to Conducting Safety Culture survey as follows:

- 1. Behavioural Epidemiology – Conduct national surveys of farmer's safe/ unsafe behaviours – needs to be nationally representative.
- 2. Reasons why farmers do work unsafely – need not be nationally representative.

The meeting considered Approach No. 2 as the preferred option based on the resources available to the Action.

Stephan advised that we should start from concepts that we want to measure.

Theory of Planned Behaviour determinants can be measured using validated questionnaires.

Additionally the following determinants can be included:

- Safety Culture
- Cues for Action
- Rewards for action
- Barriers
- Other psychological variables, e.g. habits, compensatory beliefs, self-image etc.
- Cell phone use?

- Previous accident involvement
- Health information (Illness). e.g. Physical health issues, overweight, hearing etc

Decisions on draft survey tool

Scales to be used could combine Safety Culture/ Climate measures

Risto asked what we need to examine behaviours associated with 4 tasks in Stephan's paper (Machinery; Fall Prevention; Handling animals; Pesticide use) or more.

The following were listed as possible additional task: Drowning, Asphyxiation, electrocution.

- Establish reasons for behaviours
- Demographic questions needed (35)
- Predictive questions for tasks (20)
- Add interesting questions from farmer's perspective (phone, Bluetooth, car audio).
- Solutions available (engineering/ behavioural) – examine reasons why. Why not used.
- Ask a number of open questions. E.g. reasons for safety problems; seat belt use etc.

Pat Griffin informed the meeting that similar research had been conducted in Ireland and he made the study and questionnaire available to the meeting. Stephan believes that this report provides a lot of useful questions.

There was consensus that we need to obtain the farmer perspective (both self-employed/ employees).

If Employer and Employee perspective is to be gained, then Farm I.D is required, which adds to complexity.

Peter Lundqvist raised the question of including migrant workers was raised?

Decision on pilot testing sampling and data collection methods

Stephan advised that development of a questionnaire would have the following steps

1. Choose a number of behaviours to study and devise questions related to determinants of behaviour, (minimise these items).
2. Ask 2/3 English speaking farmers to use for face validity – readability/understanding
3. Translation – Use 'back translation' e.g. English to French and back to English. Check for same meaning

4. Should have Questionnaire available by Summer (Novi Sad – too soon)

Ethics.

This is mandatory for studies and Publication

Our Survey does not use intrusive questions and maybe exempt

We could follow protocols used in Eurostat surveys.

May have to apply for Ethics approval individually in each country.

Costs of Ethics were discussed: Finland €1500/ Belgium €40 Insurance

Action plan for implementation

- Use an on-line survey with publicity and co-operation of national organisations
- Additionally use agricultural colleges/ schools, farmer groups
- Gain ethical approval at national level
- Store data at a National level and subsequently pool data at EU level
- By using the approach agreed, which is inexpensive and as it is ‘convenience sampling there is less emphasis on representivity issues.

Analysis of Data

- A STSM could be used in next budget period.
- Considerable Funding is available for STSM.

Minutes written by Dr John McNamara, Ireland