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1. KEY FINDINGS
KEY FINDINGS - 1

The Agriculture sector is lagging behind the other three high-risk sectors in terms of health and safety.

The Agriculture sector

- The Agriculture sector is characterised by small workplaces (74% have five workers or fewer), that are geographically dispersed and rurally located. Like the Construction and Manufacturing sectors, a significant proportion of Agriculture workplaces have migrant workers – 24% have one to five migrant workers and 6% have six or more (primarily from India, the Philippines and other Asian countries).

Health and safety is a lesser focus for Agriculture workers than for other high-risk sector workers

- Agriculture workers place less emphasis on health and safety in their work than workers in the other three high-risk sectors. One in four (26%) identified it as one of their top three priorities – fifth in their list of priorities (and lower than the 36% result across all high-risk sector workers). Keeping workers healthy and safe while at work was the top priority for Agriculture employers, as for employers across the other three high-risk sectors, with 59% of Agriculture employers identifying it as one of their top three business considerations.

- While four in five workers consider that workers themselves have a big responsibility for health and safety, 19% do not, suggesting that there is still work to do to encourage greater worker engagement and participation.

- Workers and employers have lower than average confidence in their knowledge of legal responsibilities and rights (workers) and legal obligations and how to comply (employers).

Worker engagement and participation

- In contrast to the other high-risk sectors, Agriculture worker and employer ratings are closely aligned on engagement measures. Whereas employers in other high-risk sectors are generally a lot more positive than workers, workers in the Agriculture sector are slightly more positive than employers.

- Over eight out of ten workers and employers are positive about worker involvement in decisions, and open and helpful discussion about things that put health and safety at risk. Over seven in ten say that hazards, near misses and accidents are reported to bosses or supervisors always or most of the time.

- Those who are more strongly engaged are those who supervise others, those who have been in the industry for 20 years or more, and those who have received training recently. There is opportunity to improve engagement among those who are new to the sector.
KEY FINDINGS - 2

Workers and employers are well aligned on engagement measures and views are positive. However, there are some disconnects on participation, leadership and two-way communication measures.

Worker engagement and participation, continued

- Having formal participatory structures in place to help ensure that workers’ voices are heard and that safety issues are not overlooked is a key component of a safer workplace. The Agriculture sector does not rate as highly as other sectors on participation measures, and there is some misalignment between workers’ and employers’ views.

- Worker participation practices are not strongly embedded and are not formalised in the Agriculture sector, although some increases are apparent over the four years of surveying. While eight in ten employers (79%) consider that their workplace has one or more worker participation practices in place, only six in ten workers (64%) say this. In total, 31% of workers think there are no participatory practices in their workplace (a much higher level than 6% to 12% levels in Forestry and Construction, for example). Only two practices received more than a one in three mention: having health and safety included as a regular team/meeting item (38% and 47% mention among workers and employers) and holding regular health and safety meetings (35% and 39% mention). Only one in three employers said that formal safety audits are carried out regularly.

- Notable differences are apparent between Agriculture worker and employer perceptions on a number of measures around leadership, engagement and participation, as in the other high-risk sectors. For example, Agriculture workers do not receive strong encouragement from employers to act safely. Fewer than half (49%) agree that their boss praises or rewards workers who act safely, compared with 69% of Agriculture employers saying this happens. (Note also, that while a gap was apparent in the other sectors, the 49% agreement score is much lower than the agreement levels for workers in the other three high-risk sectors). Involving workers in deciding what behaviours deserve recognition and how they should be recognised could potentially help to close this gap, and help workers to feel that their views are taken into account with regard to health and safety.

How well do the work environment and workplace culture support health and safety?

- Fewer workers than employers agree that management and workers work together/in partnership to make sure everyone is safe at work (79% cf. 91%) – this figure is consistent with Construction workers but lower than the Forestry sector (87%). Only two in three Agriculture workers (67%) say that everyone from the boss down is always trying to improve safety.

- There has been little change in either measure over time.

- In terms of elements of a supportive culture, employers are more positive than workers are about this: for example, 63% of workers and 84% of employers agree that workers are encouraged to come up with ideas to make our work safe, and 69% of workers and 90% of employers agree that the boss/business would totally support workers who suggested work should stop because of a possible hazard or risk.
KEY FINDINGS - 3

There are opportunities to improve two-way communication in the Agriculture sector.

Two way communication

- 73% of workers and 96% of employers agree that the boss /business encourages workers to speak up if they feel something is unsafe. 78% of workers and 61% of employers are confident that workers always tell co-workers if they aren’t working safely (for example not wearing the right protective equipment). But only six in ten workers (59%) said that their boss says something when he/she sees a worker taking a short-cut or risk.

- Ensuring that information is shared consistently and is easy to understand is critical for improving health and safety as well as increasing worker engagement and participation overall. Three in four Agriculture workers and employers (73% and 78% respectively) agree that relevant health and safety information and updates are always shared, but workers are less inclined than employers to agree that workers are always given health and safety information that is easy to understand.

- Employers also need to ensure that workers’ views are considered. Agriculture employers are much more positive than workers that they always tell workers how their views were considered. For example, only 54% of workers and 77% of employers agree that workers are always told how their views have been considered. These patterns of response were observed across the other three high-risk sectors.

- Employers can help bridge these gaps and improve workers’ engagement and participation by changes to communication practices such as testing communications with workers to ensure they are relevant, easy to understand and delivered in a accessible way, regularly giving feedback to workers about any outcomes of their ideas and views and having more accessibility to the boss or a health and safety representative they trust.
Recent health and safety training has a positive impact on worker engagement and participation. The Agriculture sector has the lowest level of recent health and safety training for workers of all high-risk sectors.

Recent health and safety training influences worker engagement and participation

- Findings across the four high-risk sectors indicate a marked improvement in worker engagement and active participation between those who have received recent training (in the last six to 12 months) and those who had training longer ago or not at all. For example, eight in ten workers (82%) across the four high-risk sectors who have had training in the last twelve months said that health and safety risks are discussed openly compared with only two-thirds (68%) who have never had training (2017 results).

- Within the Agriculture sector, 54% of workers who have received training recorded near misses, compared with only 35% of all Agriculture workers. And those who have received training are more likely to believe that their boss is genuinely concerned about the health and safety of workers (93% agree cf. 79% of all Agriculture workers).

- There is also a link between employers’ views on worker engagement and participation and health and safety training. Employers who say at least half of their workforce has had health and safety training in the last 12 months are more likely to rate a number of engagement and participation measures positively.

- The Agriculture sector lags behind the other high-risk sectors in terms of formal health and safety training, although it has increased significantly since 2014. In 2017 only one in four Agriculture workers (28%) reported receiving any training in the last year, compared with over half of the workers in all other high-risk sectors receiving training in the last twelve months. Also, the proportion of Agriculture workers receiving training has not increased.

- WorkSafe’s focus on connecting with farmers and the rural community has encouraged some farmers and workers to undertake training or to plan training for workers. Given the influence of recent health and safety training on factors such as worker engagement and participation and given the number of migrant workers in the sector, continued focus is important to ensure a large greater proportion of Agriculture workers participate in training.
Agriculture workers perceive a lower level of risk of injury than workers in other high-risk sectors; they report lower levels of serious harm events and near misses and are less likely to identify new hazards.

Agriculture workers perceive less risk of getting hurt than in other high-risk sectors, and most feel safe at work

• Compared with workers in Forestry and Construction, Agriculture workers are less likely to feel that there is a moderate risk of injury in their industry. Around four in ten workers (42%) and half of employers (48%) believe the risk of getting seriously hurt in Agriculture is higher compared with other industries. There has been some decrease in perceptions of the risk of moderate injury compared to other industries since 2014.

• While workers acknowledge that Agriculture is a riskier industry than average, the vast majority of workers (94%) say they feel safe at work – with more than half (57%) saying they feel very safe. Furthermore, both workers and employers in the Agriculture sector perceive a fairly low risk of workers being seriously hurt or injured in their workplace (as distinct from the comparative measure). But the proportion of workers considering there is a risk that someone could be seriously hurt is double that of employers (12% cf. 5%).

• The reported level of both serious harm events and near misses is lower among Agriculture workers than other high-risk sectors. Both were more prevalent among workers on livestock farms than in horticultural businesses. Levels of reporting incidents and taking action are quite high among workers and employers, but levels of recording such incidents are relatively low, although increases are apparent since 2014.

• Levels of identification of new hazards are lower among Agriculture workers than workers in other high-risk sectors (59% compared with 71% across all high-risk sectors). This may reflect the lower incidence of training and lack of understanding about what constitutes a hazard. Since 2014 however, there has been an increase in the proportions identifying a new hazard (up from 51% in 2014 to 59% for workers and from 48% to 61% for employers).

While Agriculture workers and employers report high levels of safe behaviours in the workplace mostly happening, safe behaviours are not always used

• A high proportion of workers and employers report a number of positive behaviours occurring most or all of the time. But when only the ‘all the time’ responses are considered, the picture is less rosy. Workers report an average of 3.5 positive behaviours occurring all the time while employers report an average of 3.7. There is reasonably close alignment on specific behaviours (and much stronger alignment than in other high-risk sectors).

• The only behaviours that over half the workers say happen all the time having machinery and equipment that is well maintained (61%), having safety devices fitted to machinery and equipment when they should be (66%) and taking action straight away when a potential hazard is identified (57%). However, fewer than half say that machinery and equipment are always fully checked before use (47%) or that personal protective equipment is used when it should be (44%).
Self-reported risky behaviour is commonplace, but on the decline

- Self reported risky behaviour in Agriculture workplaces is common place according to workers. Four risky behaviours were identified as happening from time to time or a lot by over a quarter of workers: working when overtired (44%), working when sick or injured (41%), taking a risk or short-cut on purpose (27%), and making a mistake by being careless or not having their mind on the job (26%).

- The reported incidence of risky behaviours is generally lower among Agriculture workers than in the other high-risk sectors. There has been little real change in the types of risk behaviours mentioned since 2014.

- Employers are less likely than workers to say a particular behaviour occurs in their workplace. On average Agriculture workers identify 2.5 risky behaviours that happen at work, while employers report an average of only 1.6, suggesting that employers are not always aware of what behaviours are taking place. The biggest gap lies in working when sick or injured. Only 15% of employers said that this happens from time to time or a lot (cf. 41% of workers).

Making changes to health and safety systems and practices

- Just under one in two Agriculture sector employers said they have made significant changes to their workplace health and safety practices in the last twelve months.

- The incidence of making changes peaked in 2016 at 59%, but settled somewhat in 2017. This trend pattern is consistent with the other high-risk sectors, although the incidence of reported changes is lower than average each year among Agriculture employers than others, with 52% of all high-risk employers having made such a change in 2017.

- Changes are prompted primarily by on-going improvements to workplace health and safety (79%), but over half (54%) said they were prompted by learning more about best practice through information and education, and 42% by improvements in industry practice.
Given a comparatively low level of trust among workers and employers, and/or belief that WorkSafe works effectively with businesses like theirs (employers), continued emphasis on breaking down barriers and finding effective ways of working with the sector is important.

Impressions of WorkSafe NZ

- Work undertaken in Australia for Safe Work Australia by Valerie Braithwaite highlighted the importance of having a respected and trusted work safety authority, that is known to workers and employers and with a reputation for being fair.

- While nearly all Agriculture workers and employers have heard of WorkSafe NZ, their knowledge is not extensive. One in three workers (34%) say they know a lot or quite a lot about WorkSafe NZ, compared with 42% of employers. (In contrast, 56% of Forestry workers and 79% of Forestry employers say they know a lot or quite a lot.)

- WorkSafe is the main source of advice workers and employers would turn to if needing help.

- A high proportion of those who know of WorkSafe (75% of workers and 87% of employers) have had some contact with WorkSafe in the last 12 months, generally via materials/information produced by WorkSafe, media reports (32%) and for employers, and/or the WorkSafe website.

- However, perceptions of WorkSafe are mixed overall. While there is general acknowledgement that Worksafe NZ is helping the industry understand health and safety issues and is doing a good job helping workers be safe and healthy at work, Agriculture workers and employers have significantly lower levels of trust in WorkSafe NZ than those in the other three high-risk sectors. For example, fewer than half agree that WorkSafe is making a real difference to workplace health and safety in New Zealand, that Worksafe NZ is a trustworthy organisation, or one that they can have confidence in. Only a third of employers agree that WorkSafe works effectively with businesses like theirs.

- These relatively weak results reflect some fairly sceptical attitudes towards health and safety, perceptions of bureaucracy and a desire for regulations that are based on pragmatism and common sense.

- On a positive note, WorkSafe’s focus on connecting with farmers and the rural community appears to be achieving positive results. Nearly half the Agriculture workers and employers say they make sure they use the right equipment for the job and over a third are talking more about safety with people who work on or visit the farm. Employers are also saying they have read and/or downloaded resources from various websites including WorkSafe’s website and the Safer Farms site. Employers and workers feel that such resource information and advice is helping them to identify hazards and risks on the farm, to better manage those risks and hazards, and generally improving their knowledge and confidence.
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

• Compared with other high-risk sectors, the Agriculture sector has performed relatively weakly across a number of key health and safety measures. There has been little significant change in workers’ views over time, and there are some discrepancies between workers’ and employers’ views on aspects of leadership and participation.

• Opportunities for improvement include employers giving more focus to communication – providing opportunities to discuss health and safety matters and enable two-way conversations so workers feel their views are being considered, and that employers understand when and why they are working in a less than safe way. Encouraging workers to report hazards, near misses and accidents all the time is also important.

• Communication can also involve highlighting the increased risk involved when workers work when they are sick and injured or overtired to help reduce the frequency of risky behaviours taking place.

• There is a gap between workers ‘mostly’ and ‘always’ practising safe behaviours. Given the risks of injury from farm machinery and equipment and from not using personal protective equipment, ongoing focus on these is important.

• Recent health and safety training makes a positive difference to worker engagement and participation. As there is a low reported level of training taking place among Agriculture workers, this is an area for discussion and further follow-up with the sector and key influencer groups. Given the proportion of migrant workers in the Agriculture sector workforce, ensuring the relevance of training to upskill these workers in health and safety practices is important.

• Average levels of trust in WorkSafe and weak beliefs about how effectively WorkSafe works with farming businesses have the potential to undermine the focus that WorkSafe is putting into the rural sector. These should be acknowledged and discussed with the Agriculture sector to find ways to reduce the divide between ‘bureaucrats’ and farmers.

• Achieving change in a sector that is geographically dispersed with a workforce that is older (with entrenched habits and potentially therefore, somewhat resistant to change) is challenging. Continued emphasis on ways to connect effectively with a geographically dispersed workforce and the wider rural community and provide practical support and resources will help to achieve positive attitudinal and behavioural shifts within the sector.
2. INTRODUCTION
New Zealand has unacceptably high rates of workplace fatalities and serious harm injuries. The four sectors with the highest acute harm rates are Construction, Forestry, Manufacturing and Agriculture (the subject of this report).

WorkSafe New Zealand (WorkSafe) regulates workplace health and safety in all workplaces. WorkSafe’s mandate from the Government is to lead New Zealand to at least a 25 percent reduction in workplace fatalities and serious harms by 2020. WorkSafe has had particular focus on four high-risk sectors that are major contributors to workplace deaths and injuries: Agriculture, Construction, Forestry and Manufacturing.

In 2014, Nielsen was commissioned to implement a survey programme, with the 2014 survey providing baseline measures. The overall purpose of the research was to:

- Provide baseline measures of workers’ and employers’ attitudes and behaviours around health and safety that can be tracked over time.
- Inform the design and development of interventions to improve workplace health and safety, both at an overall level and within each of the priority sectors.

Agriculture sector workers and employers were included in the four annual surveys conducted in 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017. This report provides an overview of the health and safety attitudes and behaviours of workers and employers in the Agriculture sector focusing on the 2017 results and, where relevant, comparing these results with previous years.
ABOUT THE SURVEY

The 2017 Health and Safety Attitudes and Behaviours Survey was a self-completion survey where participants could respond either online or via a paper survey. In total 514 workers and 379 employers in the Agriculture sector completed the survey between 30 October 2017 and 10 January 2018.

SURVEY PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS</td>
<td>9 July to 16 September 2014</td>
<td>31 October 2017 to 10 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYERS</td>
<td>14 July to 19 September 2014</td>
<td>30 October 2017 to 10 January 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAMPLE SOURCES

- WORKERS: The New Zealand Electoral Roll
- EMPLOYERS: ACC Levy payers database

RESPONSE RATES

2014: Workers 28%, Employers 27% (ACC database only)

2017: Workers 18%, Employers 20%

There are a number of reasons why responses rates could have fallen between 2014 and 2017. The one that is most likely in the context of this survey is due to the time of year when the survey was conducted.

MARGINS OF ERROR

All sample surveys are subject to sampling error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAXIMUM MARGIN OF ERROR ON 50% RESULTS</th>
<th>WORKERS (SAMPLE ACHIEVED)</th>
<th>MARGIN OF ERROR (95% LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE)</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS (SAMPLE ACHIEVED)</th>
<th>MARGIN OF ERROR (95% LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>±4.3%</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>±5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that there is a 95% chance that the population value of a result of 50% in 2017 lies between 45.7% and 54.3% for Agriculture workers and between 42.3% and 57.7% for employers.

INCENTIVES AND KOHA

A prize draw was provided as an incentive to help encourage participation in the survey. Winners could redeem the prize as either a Prezzy card or as a donation to a registered charity of their choice.

Koha was provided in the form of a branded pen to those sent a hard-copy survey.

MORE INFORMATION ABOUT HOW THE SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED

More information about the research approach and sample profile can be found in the 2017 Technical report for this survey.
NOTES TO THE REPORT

KEY DEFINITION

WORKERS: Includes self-employed people who do not employ others and employers who do the day-to-day work they also employ others to do.

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

All sub-group differences and changes over time mentioned in this report are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level. This means that the difference is a true difference statistically and not due to random variation.

Effective bases were used for significance testing to safeguard against making conclusions from a sample that has been drastically adjusted up or down (using weights) to match the population. Effective base = (sum of weight factors) squared/sum of squared weight factors).

COMPARISONS MADE

SUB-GROUPS: Differences in sub-groups (e.g. differences between sectors) mentioned are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level.

WORKERS / EMPLOYERS: Obvious differences between workers and employers are described in the report but, with a few exceptions, these differences have not been subject to statistical testing. Direct comparisons between workers and employers aren’t always possible because the groups come from different sources and question wording differs slightly.

OVER TIME: Arrows have been used to show significant increases or decreases between two consecutive years.

DATA PRESENTED

To help manage the amount of detailed data in this report, results are often presented in summary form (e.g. the % who agreed with a statement) rather than showing every possible data point. Therefore when interpreting the data, it is important to remember that the remaining respondents did not necessarily disagree with a statement but consist of those who disagreed, were non-committal (either agreed nor disagreed) or were uncertain.

EXCLUSIONS

All bases exclude those who did not answer the question. A question may not have been answered because:

• the survey was self-completion and some respondents may not have answered all questions in the hard-copy questionnaire.

• some sensitive questions were optional.

Some bases may also exclude ‘not applicable’ responses’ (e.g. it wasn’t relevant to ask a self-employed person about their boss).

NOTATIONS IN THE REPORT

Where there were no responses to a question or response category, this has been shown as a dash ‘-’. Low proportions (i.e. those up to 0.49%) have been shown as <0.5%.
3. WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY IN CONTEXT
This section presents information to help put attitudes and behaviours to health and safety in context.

First, we consider:

- Where health and safety sits in the priorities of workers and employers, relative to other workplace and business considerations.
- The extent to which workers and employers see themselves as having a very big responsibility for workplace health and safety, relative to other groups of people and organisations with influence in the workplace.

The qualitative research conducted in 2013 highlighted the huge impact that workplace culture has on health and safety practices in the WorkSafe NZ high-risk sectors. Therefore, in this section we also look at factors known to influence a positive health and safety culture.

This draws on the work carried out by Valerie Braithwaite for Safe Work Australia and reported in Motivation, Attitudes, Perceptions and Skills: Pathways to Safe Work (2011).

Three of the factors identified in Braithwaite’s work as influencing a safer workplace are:

1. **Leadership**: that is, where leaders are seen to value safety for its own sake and prioritise safety above all else

2. **Responsive dialogue**: that is, where management, supervisors and workers are able to openly discuss safety issues and there is shared determination to ensure the workplace is safe

3. **Participatory structures**: that is, where formal avenues are in place to ensure safety issues are not overlooked and workers’ voices are heard (e.g. having a health and safety representative).

These are discussed in this section.

We also look at how much influence each of a number of business levers has in determining what New Zealand businesses do in relation to health and safety.

Finally, we consider worker and employer confidence in their knowledge of their legal rights, responsibilities and obligations under the Health and Safety at Work Act, 2015.
RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH AND SAFETY

To provide context around where health and safety sits relative to other work and business considerations, Agriculture workers and employers selected the three aspects (from a list of 14) that were most important to them in their work / business.

A quarter of Agriculture workers (26%) identify staying healthy and safety at work as fifth* in their list of priorities. By contrast, 59% of Agriculture employers identify keeping workers healthy and safe at work as their number one priority.

While the proportion of Agriculture employers identifying staying healthy and safe at work has remained relatively stable since 2014, there has been a significant decrease in the proportion of workers prioritising health and safety, down from 31% in 2016 to 26% in 2017. Taking a longer term view, the 2017 worker result is much the same as in 2014 (23%) and 2015 (25%).

In general, the rankings of the considerations have remained relatively stable among workers and employers between 2014 and 2017, with only minor shifts.

WHO IS MORE LIKELY TO PLACE IMPORTANCE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY?

Older workers (45-54 years) are more likely to regard staying healthy and safe at work as important (34% cf. 26% overall). Males are more likely than females to prioritise this area (28% of males chose it as a top priority cf. 20% of females).

* The four most important considerations at work for Agriculture workers are pride in doing a good job (47%), having a good work/life balance (42%), enjoying their work (40%), and staying fit and healthy so they can keep doing the work they do (27%). The importance of staying fit and health is higher than across all four high-risk sectors (19% overall).
RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH AND SAFETY BY SECTOR

To understand worker and employer prioritisation of health and safety in Agriculture in relation to the other high-risk sectors (Construction, Forestry and Manufacturing) we looked at highest ranked considerations for each sector.

Compared with the other high-risk sectors, workers in the Agriculture sector place less emphasis on health and safety than those in the Forestry, Manufacturing and Construction sectors (Agriculture is in fourth place). In contrast, Agriculture employers edge ahead of Manufacturing employers in the importance they place on health and safety (Agriculture is in third place).

RANKING THE IMPORTANCE OF HEALTH AND SAFETY BY SECTOR 2017

Of the various priorities for Agriculture workers, staying healthy and safety at work is ranked fifth equal. In comparison, this area is the first priority for Forestry workers, second for Manufacturing workers and third for Construction workers.

In 2017 employers in all four sectors ranked health and safety as their most important business consideration.

CHANGES OVER TIME

Between 2014 and 2017 there have been increases in the proportion of employers ranking health and safety as a priority in all the high-risk sectors except for Forestry. However, prioritisation within Forestry was already high in 2014.

- **FORESTRY**: 87% in 2014 and 84% in 2017
- **AGRICULTURE**: Up from 44% in 2014 to 59% in 2017
- **CONSTRUCTION**: Up from 57% in 2014 to 68% in 2017
- **MANUFACTURING**: Up from 48% in 2014 to 57% in 2017

‘HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK’ SELECTED AS A TOP PRIORITY: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORKERS</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE</strong></td>
<td>59% ▲</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>68% ▲</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORESTRY</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANUFACTURING</strong></td>
<td>57% ▲</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers (Agriculture, n=511; Construction, n=447; Forestry, n=366; Manufacturing, n=557)

Q30 (W): What three things are most important to you in your work right now?

Base: Employers (Agriculture, n=379; Construction, n=338; Forestry, n=226; Manufacturing, n=364)

Q24 (E): What three aspects are the most important considerations for your business right now?
Agriculture workers and employers see the greatest responsibility lying with workers themselves, the farm or property owner and the immediate boss or supervisor of the workers.

Both workers and employers see a multiplicity of individuals and organisations having a ‘big responsibility’ regarding health and safety matters.

Workers themselves, their immediate boss and/or the farm or property manager are considered to be the top three groups with a ‘very big’ responsibility for worker health and safety. Both workers and employers identify these as the top three.

Other sector organisations including machinery and vehicle manufacturers are considered to have a big responsibility. In 2014, 34% of workers identified machinery and vehicle manufacturers, with an increase to 41% naming them in 2017.

WHO HAS A ‘VERY BIG’ RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORKER HEALTH AND SAFETY AT WORK: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workers themselves</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The immediate boss or supervisor of the workers</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farm or property owners</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management e.g. Chief Executive, Board</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and vehicle manufacturers that supply the industry</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies in the industry e.g. Fonterra, FMG</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Government</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry bodies e.g. Federated Farmers etc.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ unions</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19% of workers do not see a ‘very big’ responsibility lying with workers themselves, suggesting there is still work to do in Agriculture to encourage worker participation in health and safety.

81% of workers Say that workers themselves have a ‘very big’ responsibility

86% of employers

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=478-505) and Employers from the Agriculture sector (2017, n=372-376)

Q47 (W) & Q44 (E) How much responsibility should each of the following groups take for making sure workers stay healthy and safe at work? (5-point scale where 1 = no responsibility and 5 = very big responsibility)
RESPONSIBILITY OVER TIME

Comparing 2017 with 2014 results, the top two groups – workers themselves and the immediate boss are still identified as having the greatest responsibility for worker health and safety.

CHANGES OVER TIME

Employers are increasingly identifying a wider network of influencers.

More are identifying top management as having a big responsibility (up from 46% in 2014 to 55% in 2017), with greater mention also of the Government and workers’ unions.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKERS</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workers themselves</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The immediate boss or supervisor of the workers</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management e.g. Chief Executive, Board</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The farm or property owners</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies in the industry e.g. Fonterra, FMG</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery and vehicle manufacturers that supply the industry</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Government</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry bodies e.g. Federated Farmers etc.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ unions</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector 2014 (n=571-592); 2017 (n=478-505)
Base: Employers from the Agriculture sector 2014 (n=370-380); 2017 (n=372-376)
Q47 (W) & Q44 (E): How much responsibility should each of the following groups take for making sure workers stay healthy and safe at work (5 point scale where 1= no responsibility and 5 = very big responsibility)?
LEADERSHIP

The qualitative research in 2013 concluded that a worker’s immediate boss sets the tone in terms of how health and safety is regarded. If the boss is seen to prioritise health and safety above other considerations then this flows through to the workers.

This section focuses on three key indicators of leadership within a business:
- Whether or not a boss shows genuine concern for the health and safety of their workers
- Whether a boss seems more interested in getting the job done or profit than safety
- Whether a boss praises or rewards workers who act safely.

Overall, the three leadership indicators have remained relatively stable in the Agriculture sector since 2014, indicating that there haven’t been major changes in leadership behaviours between 2014 and 2017.

Of the three measures, both workers and employers gave their lowest ratings for safe behaviour being praised or rewarded. Just under half the workers (49%) agreed that this happens.

DISCONNECT BETWEEN THE PERCEPTIONS OF WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS

As in 2014, there is a disconnect between the perceptions of workers and employers about whether bosses are genuinely concerned, they encourage workers to speak up and praise or reward those who act safely. Employers consistently think they are performing better on these elements of leadership.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORKERS 2014</th>
<th>WORKERS 2017</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS 2014</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENUINE CONCERN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss is genuinely concerned about the health and safety of workers</td>
<td>80% agree</td>
<td>79% Agree</td>
<td>89% agree</td>
<td>90% agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKERS ENCOURAGED TO SPEAK UP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss encourages us to speak up if we feel something is unsafe</td>
<td>73% agree</td>
<td>73% agree</td>
<td>91% agree</td>
<td>96% agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFE BEHAVIOUR IS REWARDED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss praises or rewards workers who act safely</td>
<td>46% agree</td>
<td>49% agree</td>
<td>68% agree</td>
<td>69% agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector excluding self employed and not applicable 2014 (n=253-255); 2017 (n=184-188) Q49 (W) R7-R9

Base: Employers from the Agriculture sector 2014 (n=372); 2017 (n=372-377) Q43, Q45, Q47 (E)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Level of agreement using 5-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree
WHO IS MORE OR LESS POSITIVE ABOUT LEADERSHIP AT THEIR WORKPLACE?

Key factors which affect worker perceptions of the leadership qualities of their boss include whether or not they have had health and safety training in the last 6 or 12 months and whether or not they have experienced a near miss at work.

The tables below show which groups of Agriculture workers are more or less likely to agree with the three indicator statements about the leadership qualities of their boss:

**MY BOSS IS GENUINELY CONCERNED ABOUT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF WORKERS, 2017**
Total agree 79%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS LIKELY TO AGREE</th>
<th>MORE LIKELY TO AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a near miss at work in the past year (70%)</td>
<td>Had health and safety training in the last six months (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work with migrant workers (67%)</td>
<td>From a sheep farm (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t work with migrant workers (84%)</td>
<td>Have not had a near miss at work in the past year (84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORKERS ARE ENCOURAGED TO SPEAK UP, 2017**
Total agree 73%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS LIKELY TO AGREE</th>
<th>MORE LIKELY TO AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had a near miss at work in the past year (62%)</td>
<td>Had health and safety training in the last six months (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no educational qualification (86%)</td>
<td>Had health and safety training in the last 12 months (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not had a near miss at work in the past year (79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAFE BEHAVIOUR IS PRAISED OR REWARDED, 2017**
Total agree 49%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS LIKELY TO AGREE</th>
<th>MORE LIKELY TO AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervise three or more other workers (65%)</td>
<td>Had health and safety training in the last six months (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had health and safety training in the last 12 months (59%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector excluding self employed and not applicable 2017

Q49 (W) R7-9 & Q43 (E): To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Level of agreement using 5-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree
Compared with the other high-risk sectors, Agriculture is performing at a similar level to Construction, but ahead of Manufacturing, with Forestry a clear sector leader on the three leadership indicators.

**THREE LEADERSHIP INDICATORS ACROSS THE FOUR HIGH-RISK SECTORS:**
**AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Genuine Concern</th>
<th>Workers Encouraged to Speak Up</th>
<th>Safe Behaviour Rewarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>85%^</td>
<td>87%^</td>
<td>66%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>71%^</td>
<td>73%^</td>
<td>43%^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers excluding self-employed and doesn’t apply
Agriculture (n=184–188); Construction (n=273 – 277); Forestry (n=286 – 289); Manufacturing (n=488 – 497)

Q49 (W): Level of agreement using 5-point scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree
DRIVERS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY ACTIVITY

What a business does in terms of health and safety is influenced by a number of different drivers. While many businesses will be influenced by a very strong and genuine concern for the welfare of workers, other drivers will also come into play to a greater or lesser extent. For example, some businesses may be worried about the damage to their reputation of a poor health and safety record, while others might be motivated by a desire to attract and retain good staff.

Employers were asked to identify the extent to which each of the following aspects influenced what their business does in terms of health and safety. A 5-point rating scale was used (no influence, slight influence, moderate influence, strong influence, very strong influence).

Concern for the welfare of workers is the most influential driver of health and safety activity, followed by the cost of a serious incident should one happen.

Of the seven key influences measured, six remain stable compared with 2014. However the influence of damage to our business’s reputation if we have a poor health and safety record has increased. In 2014, just over one half of Agriculture employers (53%) said this had a strong influence compared with two-thirds (66%) in 2017. This factor has moved from fifth position in 2014 to third equal in 2017.

Working for a large corporate company who has a large profile, health and safety is a serious consideration every day.
Horticulture worker - Age 52

PROPORTION INFLUENCED BY EACH DRIVER (% STRONG OR VERY STRONG INFLUENCE): AGRICULTURE EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very strong concern for the welfare of the workers</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost to the business in terms of productivity if we have serious harm incidents</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The damage to our business’s reputation if we have a poor health and safety record</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid being found at fault, fined or prosecuted</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good health and safety record helping us attract and retain good staff</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The companies who sub-contract to us or who use our products or services require good health and safety practices</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good health and safety record helping the business win contracts</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Agriculture sector employers (n=368-373)
Q45 (E): How strongly does each of the following aspects influence what your business does in terms of health and safety? (5-point scale: no influence, slight, moderate, strong, very strong influence)

Note: the comparison year in this chart is 2014, not 2016, as the question was asked only in 2014 and 2017.
HEALTH AND SAFETY DRIVERS BY SECTOR

Concern for the welfare of workers is the top driver for all four high-risk sectors. However, avoiding being at fault, fined or prosecuted is only a top four driver for Agriculture and Manufacturing. While damage to reputation is the third equal driver for Agriculture, this result is significantly lower than the total (70%) for the four high-risk sectors.

### TOP FOUR DRIVERS (% STRONG OR VERY STRONG INFLUENCE) BY HIGH-RISK SECTOR: AGRICULTURE SECTOR EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Agric. (n=368-373)</th>
<th>Const. (n=335-337)</th>
<th>Forestry (n=224-225)</th>
<th>Manuf. (n=360-363)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for welfare of workers</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>98%^</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to business in productivity</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%^</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to reputation (third equal)</td>
<td>66%^</td>
<td>75%^</td>
<td>81%^</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOURTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding being at fault, fined or prosecuted (third equal)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%^</td>
<td>80%^</td>
<td>65%^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results marked with a caret `^` are significantly higher than the total for the four high-risk sectors while those marked with an asterisk `*` are significantly lower.

Base: Employers

**Q45 (E): How strongly does each of the following aspects influence what your business does in terms of health and safety (5-point scale of no influence, slight, moderate, strong, very strong influence)**
Under the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (which took effect on 4 April 2016) workers have legal responsibilities in relation to workplace health and safety and their rights are protected in law. Employers have legal obligations for health and safety and must know both what these obligations are and how to comply with them.

Employer confidence in their awareness of their legal obligations and how to comply is higher than workers’ but not strongly so.

Two in three Agriculture workers have consistently been confident in their awareness of their legal responsibilities (58% in 2017) and rights (54% in 2017) both before and after the implementation of the 2015 legislation. Agriculture worker confidence in responsibilities and legal rights is lower than the overall high-risk sector level (64% for responsibilities and 63% for legal rights in 2017).

Employers’ confidence in their awareness of their legal obligations and how to comply with them was stable from 2014 to 2016 and has increased in 2017, with around two in three (67%) saying they are aware of their health and safety obligations and around two in three (64%) confident that they know how to comply. Agriculture employers are slightly less confident about their legal obligations than all high-sector employers (71% confident).

### AWARENESS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY RESPONSIBILITIES, RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS:
**AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2014 AND 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORKERS % CONFIDENT</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS % CONFIDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEGAL RIGHTS</td>
<td>HOW TO COMPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q51 (w), Q48 (E): Level of confidence felt (5-point scale where 1= not at all confident and 5=very confident)
## AWARENESS OF LEGAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Compared with other high-risk sectors, Agriculture workers and employers have comparatively low confidence in their legal health and safety responsibilities, rights and obligations.

### AWARENESS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY RESPONSIBILITIES, RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS: HIGH-RISK SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORKERS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>FORESTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=502)</td>
<td>(n=444)</td>
<td>(n=358-359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident about legal responsibilities</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident about rights</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EMPLOYERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>FORESTRY</th>
<th>MANUFACTURING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=375)</td>
<td>(n=335)</td>
<td>(n=223-224)</td>
<td>(n=362-3631)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident about obligations</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident know how to comply</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67% 73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All Workers Q55 (W) All Employers Q48 (E)

*Level of confidence felt (5 point scale where 1=not at all important and 5=very confident)*
4. Worker Engagement and Participation
INTRODUCTION

Workers play an essential role in reducing work-related injuries and ill-health. Good levels of worker engagement and participation are critical to improving health and safety in the workplace.

This section of the report covers aspects of worker engagement and participation in health and safety in the workplace.

Worker engagement refers to how a business involves its workers in work health and safety matters and decisions.

Worker participation means ongoing ways for workers to contribute to improving health and safety at work, including raising health and safety concerns, being involved in making decisions that affect worker health and safety and offering suggestions for improving health and safety.

Representation means that workers choose one or more people to speak or act on their behalf.

All involve two-way communication – a conversation about health and safety.

Workers and employers were asked questions about:
- Worker involvement in decision making involving health and safety
- Effectiveness of worker engagement in health and safety matters
- Communication about health and safety issues
- Worker participation practices (e.g. health and safety committees, mentors, representatives)
- Provision of health and safety information to workers
- Workers and employers working together to create a safer workplace
- Speaking up about health and safety matters.
WORKER ENGAGEMENT

Four interconnected measures help us to understand levels of worker engagement.

In the Agriculture sector, over eight out of ten workers and employers are positive about worker involvement in decisions and open and helpful discussion about things that put health and safety at risk.

Unlike the other high-risk sectors, worker and employer ratings are very closely aligned. In other sectors, employers are a lot more positive than workers, whereas in Agriculture, workers are slightly more positive than employers.

WORKER ENGAGEMENT IN HEALTH & SAFETY: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

- 75% of workers say Hazards, near misses and accidents are reported to bosses or supervisors always or most of the time in their workplace.
- 66% of workers agree That where I work, workers really do make a difference to health and safety.
- 83% of workers agree They always have a say in decisions that affect their health and safety.
- 70% of employers said this.
- 81% of employers agree Workers are always involved in decisions affecting their health and safety*.

This question was only asked of workers and was introduced in 2015.
WHO IS MORE / LESS ENGAGED?

There are opportunities for improving engagement particularly among those who are relatively new to the Agriculture sector, those who do not supervise others and are employees rather than self-employed.

While results vary from year to year, generally workers who have been working in the industry for 20 years or more, those who supervise others, self-employed workers, those with recent health and safety training and those from sheep farms tend to be more strongly engaged with health and safety.

In contrast, those who tend to be less engaged are those who have worked in the industry for less time (0-5 years), who do not supervise others, who are employees rather than self-employed, who have not experienced recent health and safety training and/or those who have had personally have a near miss at their work in the last 12 months.

83% of workers agree They always have a say in decisions that affect their health and safety.

INernED IN DECISIONS

Self-employed workers (91%) and those working on sheep farms (90%) are more likely to agree that they always have a say in decisions that affect their health and safety.

Workers aged 25 to 34 (73%), those from larger workplaces with 20 or more workers (59%) and workers who are employees rather than being self employed (74%) were less likely to agree that they have a say in decisions.

66% of workers agree That where I work, workers really do make a difference to health and safety.

REALLY MAKE A DIFFERENCE

Those who have worked in the industry 20 or more years (74%) and had health and safety training in the last 12 months (75%) are more likely to agree that workers really do make a difference to health and safety (cf. 66% overall).

By contrast, workers with less than six years experience in the industry (43%) and those who have never had health and safety training (54%) are less likely to agree with this statement.

75% of workers say Hazards, near misses and accidents are reported to bosses or supervisors always or most of the time in their workplace.

REPORTING

Workers who are supervisors of one or two staff (83%) and those who have worked in the industry 20 or more years (80%) are more likely to agree that reporting health and safety issues to bosses or supervisors happens all or most of the time (cf. 75% overall).

By contrast, workers who do not supervise others (70%) and those who had experienced a near miss in the last year (67%) are less likely to agree with this statement.

81% of workers say Things that put health and safety at risk are discussed in an open and helpful way always or most of the time.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Workers who are supervisors of three or more staff (90%) and those working on sheep farms (88%) are more likely to agree that things that put health and safety at risk are discussed in an open and helpful way.

Workers who are not supervisors of other staff (74%), have never had health and safety training (75%), those who are newer to working in Agriculture (0-5 years, 66%), who had experienced a near miss (75%) and workers who are employees rather than being self-employed (76%) are less likely to agree.
PARTICIPATION

Ideally all workplaces and businesses will have:

- Worker participation practices in place so workers can effectively participate in improving work health and safety on an ongoing basis.
- An environment and culture where workers can raise health and safety concerns at any time – they don’t need to wait until a formal opportunity to participate comes up.
- Two-way communication – where workers have reasonable opportunities to raise health and safety concerns and contribute to decisions that affect work health and safety matters.

HOW THE SURVEY MEASURES PARTICIPATION
Along with good health and safety leadership and engagement among workers and employers, having formal, participatory structures in place to help ensure safety issues are not overlooked and that workers’ voices are heard, is a key component of a safer workplace.

31% of Agriculture workers reported no formal work practices in their workplace.

This is a much higher proportion than in the other three high-risk sectors:
- Forestry: 6% no formal practices
- Manufacturing: 11% no formal practices
- Construction: 12% no formal practices.

REPRESENTATION
26% of workers and 30% of employers say that they have a health and safety representative and / or champion in their workplace or business. *Note: This question has changed since 2014 and cannot be compared over time.

CHANGES OVER TIME
The proportion of Agriculture sector employers who report having one or more formal worker participation practice has increased from 63% in 2014 to 79% in 2017.
WORK ENVIRONMENT

A: WORKING TOGETHER

EVERYONE TRYING

67% of workers
Say everyone from the boss down is always trying to improve safety.

WORKING TOGETHER

79% of workers AND 91% of employers
Agree the boss / management and workers work together / in partnership to make sure everyone is safe at work.

Workers and employers working together to improve health and safety is an important aspect of improving the working environment and is measured through the two key indicators above.

EVERYONE TRYING

Overall, across the four high-risk sectors 64% of workers say everyone from the boss down is always trying to improve safety and in the Agriculture sector, a similar proportion of workers (67%) agree with this statement. This result has remained stable since 2014.

WORKING TOGETHER

Across the four high-risk sectors, 76% of workers and 92% of employers agree the boss/management and workers work together / in partnership to make sure everyone is safe at work. In the Agriculture sector, the result is very similar (79% of workers and 91% of employers agree). Again, there have not been any significant improvements over time (76% of workers and 91% of employers agreed in 2014).

WORK ENVIRONMENT MEASURES BY SECTOR 2017: WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGRICULTURE (n=185-187)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION (n=277)</th>
<th>FORESTRY (n=287)</th>
<th>MANUFACTURING (n=496-499)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone from the boss down is always trying to improve safety (% agree)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss and the workers work together to make sure everyone is safe at work (% agree)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from Agriculture. Base: Employers from Agriculture Q49 (W) R4,R1 Q47 (E) R4,R2
## WORK ENVIRONMENT

### B: A SUPPORTIVE CULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Workers / Employers</th>
<th>% Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to come up with ideas</td>
<td>63% of workers AND 84% of employers</td>
<td>21 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOULD NOT GET INTO TROUBLE</td>
<td>82% of workers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for stopping work</td>
<td>69% of workers AND 90% of employers</td>
<td>21 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENCOURAGED TO COME UP WITH IDEAS**
Overall, 68% of workers in the four high-risk sectors agree that they are encouraged to come up with ideas to make their work safer. The result for the Agriculture sector is slightly lower at 63% and has not changed significantly since 2014 (64%).

**WOULD NOT GET INTO TROUBLE**
Positively, 82% of Agriculture workers say they would not get into trouble if they told their boss they had a near miss, with this result remaining relatively stable since 2014 (84%).

**SUPPORT FOR STOPPING WORK**
Overall, 68% of workers and 92% of employers in the four high-risk sectors agree that the boss/business would totally support workers who suggested work should stop because of a possible hazard / risk. Similar proportions of workers (69%) and employers (90%) in the Agriculture sector agree with this statement with no changes over time.

### Ensuring that a workplace has a culture which supports and encourages reporting of risks and incidents, as well as creative solutions to issues is critical.

This environment is developed through employers encouraging workers to come up with ideas themselves, ensuring workers feel they can come to their boss or supervisor if they had a near miss without fear of getting into trouble and ensuring that management is supportive of workers when they recommend that work is stopped because of a potentially hazardous situation.

### Workers and employers don’t see things the same way.
When it comes to elements of supportive culture, there is a disparity between the perceptions of workers and employers, with employers being much more positive than workers.
TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

A: SPEAKING UP

ENCOURAGED TO SPEAK UP

73% of workers AND 96% of employers
Agree that the boss / business encourages workers to speak up if they feel something is unsafe.

BOSS SPEAKS UP IF THEY SEE A RISK

59% of workers
Disagree that their boss sometimes says nothing when he/she sees a worker taking a short-cut or risk

RAISING ISSUES WITH CO-WORKERS

78% of workers AND 61% of employers
Agree that workers always tell co-workers if they aren’t working safely.

Speaking up when there is a risk or hazard is important for preventing workplace incidents.

This is more likely to happen when everyone is encouraged to speak up, the behaviour is modelled by bosses and supervisors, and workers feel confident in approaching each other if they see a colleague who is not working safely.

19% of workers report that their employer sometimes says nothing when they see a short-cut or a risk being taken.

While 59% of Agriculture workers disagree that their boss sometimes says nothing when he/she sees a worker taking a short-cut or risk, 19% of workers agree.

ENCOURAGED TO SPEAK UP

Overall, 75% of workers and 96% of employers across the four high-risk sectors agree that they are encouraged to speak up if they feel something is unsafe. Results from the Agriculture sector are very similar to the total result – 73% of workers in the Agriculture sector agree with this statement, compared with almost 96% of employers.

As with a number of other indicators of participation, employers are considerably more positive than the workers themselves (23% points higher agreement).

BOSS SPEAKS UP IF THERE IS A RISK

Around six out of ten Agriculture workers (59%) say that their boss says something when he/she sees a worker taking a short-cut or risk (they disagree that their employer says nothing). This result has dropped since 2014 however not significantly (68%) and is lower than the total for the four high-risk sectors (65%).

RAISING ISSUES WITH CO-WORKERS

Overall, 78% of workers and 69% of employers across the four high-risk sectors agree that they are confident workers always tell each other if they aren’t working safely (for example, not wearing the right protective equipment).

In the Agriculture sector, the worker result is the same (78%); however, employers are less positive than the total (61% of Agriculture sector employers agree cf. 69% overall). Interestingly, this is one of the few measures where employers have lower levels of agreement than workers, indicating that they don’t have as much confidence that workers always raise issues with their co-workers, or they are uncertain about this.

I believe the company that I work for takes health and safety very seriously and is very proactive about updating operating procedures and communicating changes.

Orchard worker – age 47
### TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION

#### B: INFORMATION AND FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION SHARED</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>% Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73% of workers AND 78% of employers</td>
<td>Agree that relevant health and safety information and updates are always shared.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EASY TO UNDERSTAND</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>% Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69% of workers AND 83% of employers</td>
<td>Agree that workers are always given health and safety information that is easy to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLD HOW VIEWS WERE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>% Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54% of workers AND 77% of employers</td>
<td>Agree that workers are always told how their views have been considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensuring that information is shared consistently and is easy to understand is critical for improving health and safety as well as increasing worker engagement and participation overall.

Not only does information need to be shared, but employers also need to ensure that workers’ views are considered and workers know how their views have been considered.

Employers are much more positive than workers that they always tell workers how their views were considered.

There is a large gap between the perceptions of workers and employers (23 percentage points difference) when it comes to whether or not workers are always told how their views have been considered.

### COMPARISON OF AGRICULTURE SECTOR RESULTS WITH THE FOUR HIGH-RISK SECTOR TOTAL, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION SHARED</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Difference (% points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total four high-risk sectors</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture sector</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EASY TO UNDERSTAND</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Difference (% points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total four high-risk sectors</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture sector</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLD HOW VIEWS WERE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Difference (% points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total four high-risk sectors</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture sector</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worker views about relevant information being shared with workers, being easy to understand, and being told how their views are considered are in line with the other four high-risk sectors. However, Agriculture employer views about two-way communication are slightly less positive than those of other high-risk sector employers.

**Note:** These questions were asked from 2015 onwards. No changes over time can be measured for the Agriculture sector.
5. HEALTH AND SAFETY TRAINING
Training provides an important avenue for embedding and formalising health and safety. Participation in health and safety training in the last year is associated with a range of positive health and safety attitudes and behaviours for Agriculture workers, with some examples given below.

While the proportion of Agriculture workers participating in formal health and safety training has grown from 22% to 28% between 2014 and 2017, the level of training in the Agriculture sector is comparatively very low.

Agriculture lags well behind the other three high-risk sectors in undertaking formal health and safety training for workers. For instance, just over half of Manufacturing workers (53%) reported this training in the last year compared with 28% of Agriculture workers.

Encouraging more formal training is likely to have some very positive outcomes.

For instance, compared with all Agriculture workers, those who had formal training in the last year are significantly more likely to:

- Record near misses (54% of workers who had received this training cf. 35% total)
- Do something immediately after noticing a hazard (45% cf. 31%) and writing the hazard into a hazard register (32% cf. 23%)
- Get huge satisfaction from knowing we have a safe working environment (80% cf. 71%)
- Disagree that I really only follow the health and safety rules because I have to (72% cf. 58%)
- Say that my boss and the workers work together to make sure everyone is safe at work (88% cf. 79%)
- Say where I work, workers really do make a difference to health and safety (75% cf. 66%)
- Agree that my boss and the workers work together to make sure everyone is safe at work (88% cf. 79%).

People should be taught / learn to take responsibility for themselves.
Sheep & beef farmer – age 52
WHO HAS RECEIVED TRAINING?

Older workers, those who are not supervisors of others and self employed workers are the groups of Agriculture workers least likely to have had training in the last year.

28% of all Agriculture workers received health and safety training in the last 12 months.

WORKERS LESS LIKELY TO HAVE UNDERTAKEN TRAINING IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS WERE...

- Aged 55 or more, 21%
- Not a supervisor of other workers, 21%
- Self-employed, 23%

WORKERS MORE LIKELY TO HAVE UNDERTAKEN TRAINING IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS WERE...

- From a large workplace with 20 or more workers, 52%
- From the Bay of Plenty, 46%
- Those who supervise three or more other workers, 46%
- Aged 25 to 34, 41%
- Those with a trade or Polytechnic qualification, 38%
- Horticulture workers, 36%
- From the north of the North Island (including Auckland), 33%
- Employee (not self-employed), 34%.

We need more training programmes at minimal or no cost to our employees.

Dairy farm employer – age 45

Older age group is hard to educate re health and safety.

Dairy farm worker – age 52

Has Worksafe considered a national H&S Work Card (like the White Card in Australia)? This would be up to the individual to achieve, possibly through online tutorials and questions.

Sheep farm worker – age 58
6. HEALTH AND SAFETY RISK MANAGEMENT
INTRODUCTION

Agriculture has been identified by WorkSafe NZ as one of four high-risk sectors with the highest acute harm rates. This section covers Agriculture sector worker and employer attitudes towards health and safety risks, whether they have the resources and information to deal with these risks and what they are doing to minimise risk.

This section of the report covers several aspects of risk including:

- Workers’ and employers’ views about the perceived level of risk in their industry compared with other industries
- The perceived risk of serious harm occurring in their own workplace / business
- Workers’ feelings of safety in the workplace
- Whether workers have the resources and information (tools, equipment, advice) to deal with risk
- Workers’ level of confidence that they have the knowledge and skills to keep healthy at work, safe at work and know how to report a hazard, near miss or accident
- Risky behaviours occurring in the workplace
- Communication about hazards, near misses and accidents
- Positive actions taken to minimise risk.
PERCEPTIONS OF RISK COMPARED WITH OTHER INDUSTRIES

Respondents were asked to rate the risk of people getting seriously hurt in their industry compared with other industries, using a 5-point scale ranging from ‘much lower’ (rated 1) through to ‘much higher’ (rated 5).

Four out of ten Agriculture workers (42%) and almost five out of ten employers (48%) think that their industry has a higher level of risk of serious injuries than other industries. This result is considerably lower than the level expressed by Forestry and Construction sector workers but is higher than Manufacturing.

For both Agriculture workers and employers, this level of perceived risk being higher than in other industries is lower in 2017 than in 2014, with a drop occurring in 2015.

### HIGHER RISK THAT SOMEONE WILL BE SERIOUSLY HURT AT WORK COMPARED WITH OTHER SECTORS: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W n=508)</td>
<td>(E n=377)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>42%*</td>
<td>59%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W n=442)</td>
<td>(E n=337)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORESTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W n=360)</td>
<td>(E n=224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANUFACTURING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W n=550)</td>
<td>(E n=363)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HIGHER RISK THAT SOMEONE WILL BE SERIOUSLY HURT AT WORK: AGRICULTURE SECTOR OVER TIME

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=595)</td>
<td>(n=533)</td>
<td>(n=684)</td>
<td>(n=508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=376)</td>
<td>(n=412)</td>
<td>(n=360)</td>
<td>(n=377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workers were asked how they rated the risk of themselves or someone they worked with getting seriously hurt at work in the upcoming 12 months, while employers were asked the question in relation to someone in their business getting seriously hurt. They responded on a 5-point scale ranging from ‘very low risk’ to ‘very high risk’.

Both workers and employers in the Agriculture sector perceive a fairly low risk of workers being seriously hurt or injured at their workplace (as distinct from ‘compared with other industries’, on the previous page). But workers have a higher perception than employers, with 12% of workers saying there is a high risk that someone will be seriously hurt at work, compared with 5% of employers.

Compared with other high-risk sectors, the proportion who see a high level of risk is relatively low. These perceptions have not changed appreciably since 2014 for either workers or employers in the Agriculture sector.

Sub-groups of Agriculture workers who see the highest level of risk include those who:
- Had a serious harm event (26%) or near miss in the last year (27% high risk)
- Work in a large workplace with 20 or more workers (27%)
- Have worked 0-5 years in the industry (24% high risk)
- Work with migrant workers (22%).

### RISK THAT SOMEONE WILL BE SERIALLY HURT AT WORK: AGRICULTURE SECTOR 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low (1)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high (5)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Agriculture workers 2017 n=509; employers n=378
Q46 (W) How do you rate the risk that you or someone you work with will be seriously hurt at work in the next 12 months?
Q40 (E) How would you rate the risk that one of your workers in your business will be seriously hurt at work in the next 12 months?

### HIGH RISK THAT SOMEONE WILL BE SERIOUSLY HURT AT WORK BY SECTOR: 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FORESTRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%^</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANUFACTURING</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%^</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures are adjusted to 2017 for non-response adjustment
^ Figures are adjusted to 2017 for shrinkage.
HOW SAFE WORKERS FEEL AT WORK

Workers were asked how safe they felt at work overall and gave their responses on a 4-point scale (very safe, safe, unsafe and very unsafe). (This question was based on a question in the New Zealand General Social Survey (NZGSS) conducted by Statistics New Zealand.)

94% of Agriculture workers feel very safe or safe at work.

Workers in the Agriculture sector generally feel safe at work with 94% feeling safe and only 6% feeling unsafe.

Nearly six in ten (57%) feel very safe, a similar proportion to Forestry workers.

Feeling very safe at work has not changed since 2014 (57% in both 2014 and 2017).

Groups of workers who are most likely to feel very safe in 2017 include:
- Self-employed (64%)

By contrast, those who are most likely to feel unsafe include:
- Those working in large workplaces with 20 or more workers (13%)

FEELING VERY SAFE AT WORK – COMPARISON WITH OTHER SECTORS: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGRICULTURE (n=509)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION (n=446)</th>
<th>FORESTRY (n=364)</th>
<th>MANUFACTURING (n=556)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling very safe at work</td>
<td>57%^</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%^</td>
<td>43%^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Agriculture workers 2017 n=509
Q45 (W) Overall, how safe do you feel at work?
RESOURCES AND INFORMATION TO DEAL WITH RISK

To do their jobs properly, workers need the right tools and equipment for the job and they need appropriate information. Workers and employers were asked to what extent they agree that this is the case, using the scale where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree. (‘Agree’ includes responses 4 and 5 on the scale.)

While views are well aligned on having the tools and equipment to do their jobs safely (88% of workers and 91% of employers saying this in 2017), Agriculture workers are less likely than employers to think they are told everything they need to know to do their jobs safely, a pattern consistent with other high-risk sectors.

A high proportion of workers feel that they have the tools and equipment to do their jobs safely (88% agreement). They are less likely to feel that they are told everything they need to know to do their jobs safely (75% agreed with this in 2017).

Agreement among Agriculture workers about both aspects has not changed since 2014 (89% for tools and equipment and 74% for being told everything they need to know in 2014).

There has however been an increase in the proportion of Agriculture employers who agree that their workers have all the information needed to do their jobs safely, (from 82% in 2014 to 86% in 2017).
RISKY HEALTH & SAFETY BEHAVIOURS

Risky behaviour is fairly common in Agriculture workplaces. The most common risks taken are working when overtired, working when sick or injured and taking risks or short-cuts on purpose. In a number of areas employers are much less aware of these issues, for example, workers working when overtired.

Agriculture workers report an average of 2.5 risky behaviours occurring from time to time or a lot at their work place, while employers report an average of only 1.6 risky behaviours.

Four risky behaviours were reported by over a quarter of workers – working when overtired (44%), working when sick or injured (41%), taking a risk or shortcut on purpose (27%) and making a mistake by being careless (26%).

None of these has changed significantly from 2016 to 2017.

Agriculture employers perceive a much lower level of risky behaviours. The biggest gaps between workers and employers relate to workers working when sick or injured (with a gap of 26% points) and working when overtired (gap of 18% points). It is possible that these behaviours are not visible to employers on-farm, which may explain some of these perception gaps. But the same gap in perceptions was apparent in the other high-risk sectors.

CHANGES OVER TIME

Progress has been made in this area with reductions in workers’ reporting of some risky behaviours from 2014 to 2017, as follows:

- Working when overtired (44% in 2017 cf. 54% in 2014)
- Working when sick or injured (41% cf. 56%)
- Taking risks or short-cuts on purpose (e.g. to save time) (27% cf. 36%)
- Making mistake by being careless or not having their mind on the job (26% cf. 37%)
- Make a mistake because they have been working too long or too hard without a break (20% cf. 26%)
- Doing a risky job that they don’t have the right skills for (8% cf. 16%)
- Working when hungover or stoned (7% cf. 13%).

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector 2017, n=500-507
Employers from Agriculture sector 2017, n=377-379

Q36 (W) How often does someone in your workplace (you or anyone you work with)…?
Q30 (E) How often does a worker in your business…?

(4-point frequency scale where 1 = never, 2 = hardly ever, 3 = from time to time, 4 = a lot)

Average number of these risky behaviours reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by workers  by employers
Agriculture workers mention a number of positive behaviours occurring all of the time. Having well maintained machinery and equipment (61%), fitting safety devices to machinery and equipment (66%) and taking action straight away (57%) were the three most widespread behaviours and the only ones mentioned by more than half the workers.

Workers and employers gave similar responses, unlike other high-risk sectors where employers thought behaviours happened more consistently than did workers.

Compared with 2014, the proportion of workers always reporting hazards, near misses and accidents to bosses / supervisors has remained unchanged (25% in 2014 and 26% in 2017). But once the ‘mostly’ responses are included, an increase is apparent – up from 69% in 2014 to 75% in 2017).

**Average number of positive behaviours reported as ‘always’ taking place**

- **3.5** by workers
- **3.7** by employers

**POSITIVE BEHAVIOURS IN THE WORKPLACE OCCURRING ALL OF THE TIME: AGRICULTURE WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017**

- Machinery and equipment is well maintained: Workers: 61%, Employers: 93%
- Safety devices are fitted to machinery and equipment when they should be (e.g. safety guards on machinery): Workers: 66%, Employers: 98%
- Action is taken straight away when a potential hazard is identified: Workers: 57%, Employers: 90%
- Personal protective equipment is used when it should be (e.g. ear, eye or head protection): Workers: 44%, Employers: 89%
- Machinery and equipment is fully checked before it is used: Workers: 47%, Employers: 96%
- Things that put health and safety at risk (such as hazards, near misses and accidents) are discussed in an open and helpful way: Workers: 44%, Employers: 87%
- Workers report hazards, near misses and accidents to bosses/supervisors: Workers: 33%, Employers: 92%

**Base:** Workers from the Agriculture sector excluding doesn’t apply. 2017, n=392-503
Employers from the Agriculture sector excluding doesn’t apply. 2017, n=352-374

Q53 & Q52 (W), Q50 & Q49 (E) How often does each of the following happen in your workplace?
CHANGES TO WORKPLACE SYSTEMS AND PRACTICES

Nearly one in two Agriculture employers had made a significant change to their workplace systems or practices in the last twelve months, largely as a part of on-going improvements or learning more about best practice.

Just under one in two Agriculture sector employers said they had made significant changes to their workplace health and safety practices in the last twelve months.

The incidence of making changes increased significantly between 2014 and 2015 and peaking in 2016 at 59%, but settled somewhat in 2017.

This trend pattern was consistent with the other high-risk sectors, although the incidence of reported changes was lower than average among Agriculture employers than others, each year. For example, in 2014, 40% of all high-risk sector employers made a significant change, while 52% did so in 2017.

REASONS FOR MAKING CHANGES

The most common reasons given for making significant changes to health and safety systems or practices have been consistent over the four survey years. The four key reasons were:

- on-going improvements to workplace health and safety (79%)
- learning more about best practice through information or education (54%)
- improvements in industry practice (42%)
- a worker suggested a change to improve workplace health and safety (14%)
- a workplace inspection by a health and safety inspector (8%)
- a worker raised a health and safety issue (6%)
- a near miss (5%)
- an accident (34%)
- a prosecution (1%)
- other (3%)

The same pattern of reasons was also consistent across all high-risk sectors.
7. SERIOUS HARM EVENTS, NEAR MISSES AND HAZARDS
INTRODUCTION

This section focuses on the level of serious harm events (injury and sickness), near misses and hazards experienced in the Agriculture sector. Experiences were self reported. We also cover what actions were taken as a result of experiencing or noticing these issues.

Both workers and employers were asked about the level of serious harm injuries or near misses at their workplace or business:

For workers:

• In the last 12 months, which of the following have you had from your work? (list of injuries and medical problems)

• In the last 12 months, how many times have you personally had a near miss at work where you could have been seriously hurt?

• Have you noticed a new hazard at work recently?

For employers:

• In the last 12 months, which of the following [list of injuries and medical problems] has happened to anyone who works in your business while they were at work (including employees and contractors)?

• In the last 12 months, as far as you know, how many times has someone working in your business had a near miss where they could have been seriously hurt at work?

• Have you noticed a new hazard at work recently?

They were also asked what happened after experiencing/hearing about the serious harm injury, near miss or noticing the hazard.

• For workers: And what happened the last time you were seriously hurt or unwell/ had a near miss/ noticed a new hazard at work? (list of actions)
Twelve percent of Agriculture workers and 11% of employers report serious harm events in their workplace or business. The three main types of events mentioned by both groups included injuries from crushing, eye injuries and deep cuts or wounds that required stitches.

A similar proportion of workers and employers report serious harm events in 2017 (12% and 11% respectively). Both results declined compared with 2016, with the employer result representing a significant decline.

The top five serious harm events experienced by workers include injuries from crushing, eye injuries, a deep cut or wound that required stitches. Temporary, but serious loss of hearing and other serious temporary damage.

Employers report similar events although they do not mention other serious temporary damage.
A quarter of Agriculture workers (25%) had experienced a near miss in 2017, (in which a worker could have been seriously hurt). This is similar to the result recorded in 2014. By contrast, 28% of employers mentioned near misses occurring at their business, again a similar level to 2014. Note: Workers are referring to their own personal experience while employers are commenting on the business as a whole.

The Agriculture sector has the lowest level of serious harm events and near misses of the four high-risk sectors in 2017. The level of near misses is significantly lower than the total for the high-risk sectors.

Dairy farm workers recorded the highest level of serious harm injuries and near misses. However, this was not significantly different from the total for Agriculture workers.
Workers indicate that levels of reporting incidents and taking action are quite high. By contrast, levels of recording these incidents are relatively low.

In general, Agriculture workers are reporting incidents – in 2017 only 12% did not report serious harm incidents or near misses. And, in general some action is taken after reporting (6% said no action was taken after a serious incident or near miss was reported).

The level of recording incidents is quite low however, with only 27% of serious incidents and 35% of near misses recorded in 2017, although recording near misses has lifted significantly since 2016.

There is a low level of workers being blamed for these events – applying to only 2% of near misses in 2017 and no serious harm incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE LAST OCCASION A SERIOUS HARM INCIDENT OR NEAR MISS OCCURRED: AGRICULTURE WORKERS, 2014 TO 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE WORKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIOUS HARM INCIDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTHING, I DIDN’T TELL ANYONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED BUT NO ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS BLAMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION TAKEN (NET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORDED (e.g. hazard register/board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED (e.g. to manager/boss with action, or to other workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION TAKEN (e.g. discussed to stop happening again, changed the way we did something)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC CLAIM MADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAR MISSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTHING, I DIDN’T TELL ANYONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED BUT NO ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS BLAMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION TAKEN (NET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORDED (e.g. hazard register/board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED (e.g. to manager/boss with action, or to other workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION TAKEN (e.g. discussed to stop happening again, changed the way we did something)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector who have experienced serious harm incident or health problems/near miss at work in the last 12 months

Q40 (W) And what happened the last time you were seriously hurt or unwell at work?
Q43 (W) What happened the last time you had a near miss at work?
Employers report a very high level of taking action regarding serious harm events and near misses and recording these incidents. But workers report a much lower level of recording these events.

Employers also report a high level of taking action as a consequence of serious harm incidents and near misses occurring (76% and 88% respectively in 2017).

A high level of these incidents were recorded (68% of serious harm incidents and 66% of near misses). In addition, a quarter of serious harm events (26%) were investigated in 2017.

**RECORDING OF EVENTS: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Workers/Employers % Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recording serious harm events</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>41% pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording near misses</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31% pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTIONS TAKEN THE LAST TIME A SERIOUS HARM INCIDENT OR NEAR MISS OCCURRED: AGRICULTURE EMPLOYERS, 2014 to 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>2014 (n=127)</th>
<th>2015 (n=90)</th>
<th>2016 (n=77)</th>
<th>2017 (n=44)</th>
<th>% Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOTHING</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET RECORDERED</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET ACTION</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET INVESTIGATED</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINE AGAINST WORKER</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL ASSISTANCE SOUGHT</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC CLAIM FILED</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEAR MISSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>2014 (n=116)</th>
<th>2015 (n=96)</th>
<th>2016 (n=116)</th>
<th>2017 (n=104)</th>
<th>% Points Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOTHING</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET RECORDERED</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET ACTION</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINE AGAINST WORKER</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Employers from the Agriculture sector who have experienced serious harm incidents or health problems/near misses in their business in the last 12 months.

Q35 (E) And what happened the last time when a person or people were seriously hurt at work?
Q38 (E) What happened the last time you had a near miss at work?
NEW HAZARDS

Around six out of ten Agriculture workers and employers have noticed hazards at work. Actions taken in response to these hazards are fairly similar for both groups and there is a very low level of doing nothing.

Around six out of ten Agriculture workers and employers (59% and 61% respectively) have noticed hazards at work (a lower proportion than in other high-risk sectors).

For both groups the incidence of noticing these hazards is higher than in 2014 (Workers 2014 - 51%, Employers 2014 – 48%).

Feedback from employers and workers is fairly similar regarding the action taken after noticing hazards.

HAZARDS IN THE WORKPLACE: AGRICULTURE WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers have noticed hazards</th>
<th>Employers have noticed hazards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector (n=501) Employers from the Agriculture sector (n=375)

Q44 (W) What happened the last time you noticed a new hazard at work?
Q39 (E) What happened the last time you noticed a new hazard at your business?

PROPORTION WHO HAVE NOT NOTICED A NEW HAZARD, AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE (W n=501) (E n=375)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (W n=444) (E n=337)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORESTRY (W n=362) (E n=225)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING (W n=555) (E n=363)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions taken the last time you noticed a new hazard at work: Agriculture workers, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAZARDS</th>
<th>WORKERS 2017</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAVEN’T NOTICED ANY</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DID SOMETHING IMMEDIATE</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. stopped work till hazard removed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGED WAY WE DID SOMETHING</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. changed process to eliminate hazard)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITTEN INTO HAZARD BOARD/REGISTER</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTED BUT NO ACTION</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions taken the last time you noticed a new hazard at work: Agriculture employers, 2017
LOUD NOISE ON THE FARM

This section focuses on loud noise in the Agriculture sector: workers’ exposure to loud noise, injuries from such exposure and protection against loud noise. As these were new questions in the 2017 survey, there is no trend information.

Workers were asked about their own experience of loud noise:

- **Exposure to loud noise**: Are you ever exposed to loud noise in your everyday work? That is, noise at a level where you would have to raise your voice to speak to someone a metre (3 feet) away from you?

- **Re hearing damage**: Which of the following have you had from your work and which was the most recent incident? (Permanent loss of hearing from exposure to noise, Temporary, but serious loss of hearing from exposure to noise)

- **Actions taken to protect against loud noise**: During the last 12 months which, if any, of the following have you done, or has your employer done to protect you against exposure to loud noise (list of ten things)

- **How often would you say you wear hearing protection (e.g. ear plugs or ear muffs) when exposed to loud noise in your workplace?** Which of the following applies to your hearing protection (e.g. ear plugs or ear muffs)? (list of five responses including It has been fitted to you individually).

Employers were asked similar questions from the perspective of their business as a whole.
Almost seven out of ten Agriculture workers are exposed to loud noise at least some of the time in their day-to-day work, but only 10% most of the time. Of the four high-risk sectors, Agriculture has the lowest level of workers being exposed to loud noise most of the time.

**EXPOSURE TO LOUD NOISE IN EVERYDAY WORK: AGRICULTURE WORKERS, 2017**

- Yes, most of the time: 10%
- Yes, some of the time: 58%
- No: 33%

**EXPOSURE TO LOUD NOISE MOST OF THE TIME BY SECTOR: AGRICULTURE WORKERS, 2017**

- Manufacturing: 44%
- Forestry: 40%
- Construction: 25%
- Agriculture: 10%

**AGRICULTURE WORKERS MORE LIKELY TO BE EXPOSED TO LOUD NOISE MOST OF THE TIME:**

- Māori workers (24%)
- Workplace has 20 or more workers (21%)
- Aged 25 to 34 years (20%)
- Personally had a serious harm event in the last year (19%)
- Personally had a near miss in the last year (18%)
- An employee rather than a self-employed worker (16%).

2% of agriculture workers report temporary but serious hearing loss while 1% report permanent hearing loss.

**PROPORTION OF AGRICULTURE WORKERS WITH HEARING LOSS INJURIES FROM EXPOSURE TO LOUD NOISE IN THE LAST YEAR: AGRICULTURE WORKERS, 2017**

- Permanent hearing loss: 1%
- Temporary but serious hearing loss: 2%

No employers report permanent hearing loss injuries, while only one employer reports temporary but serious hearing loss among their workers.

**PROPORTION OF AGRICULTURE BUSINESSES WITH HEARING LOSS INJURIES FROM EXPOSURE TO LOUD NOISE IN THE LAST YEAR: AGRICULTURE EMPLOYERS, 2017**

- Permanent hearing loss: -
- Temporary but serious hearing loss: <0.5%
PROTECTION AGAINST LOUD NOISE

While almost all Agriculture employers (96%) report taking at least one action to protect against exposure to loud noise, only 84% of workers said at least one action had taken place. Potentially this may mean that some employers are not communicating effectively with workers about noise and the provision of protection.

Workers being provided with hearing protection and identifying ‘noise’ as a workplace hazard were the two main actions taken to protect against loud noise, reported by both workers and employers.

Aside from these, all other actions (such as making changes to reduce noise, providing information and training and conducting hearing tests) are reported by fewer than one in five of those surveyed.

**Base:** Workers and employers from the Agriculture sector 2017. Workers exposed to loud noise n=335, Employers who said workers are exposed to loud noise n=219

Q126 (W) During the last 12 months which, if any, of the following have you done, or has your employer done to protect you against exposure to loud noise?

Q121 (E) Which of the following does your business do for your workers’ hearing protection (e.g. ear plugs or ear muffs)?

**Note 13 % points 'gap' between employer and worker views**
Almost three-quarters of Agriculture workers mostly or always wear hearing protection when exposed to loud noise at work. But over a quarter do this less often, with workers on dairy farms and those aged 45 to 54 being relatively less likely to wear such protection.

Workers and employers are in fairly close agreement about how often workers wear hearing protection when exposed to loud noise at work – 73% of workers and 80% of employers say this happens most of the time or always.

More worrying, is the proportion who say this happens half the time or less – 27% of workers and 19% of employers.

Groups of workers who are significantly less likely to wear ear protection mostly or always when exposed to loud noise include those who:
- Had a serious harm event in the last year (62%)
- Work on dairy farms (63%)
- Are aged 45 to 54 (64%)
- Had a near miss in the last year (65%).
Replacing ear plugs or ear muffs when they are worn out or damaged occurs fairly frequently. However, other types of assistance such as regularly maintaining equipment, fitting it to workers individually and providing training on their use is comparatively rare.

Replacing hearing protection when it is worn out or damaged is the main hearing protection assistance provided to Agriculture workers, mentioned by 63% of workers and 73% of employers. Note that just over half of workers (51%) and four out of ten employers (37%) feel they have the right level of protection for the noise they/their workers are exposed to.

Employers tend to be more positive than workers about the level of assistance provided. For example, 37% of employers say that hearing protection is regularly maintained cf. 20% of workers. Note that employers are commenting on the business as a whole whereas workers are talking about their own personal hearing protection.

Base: Workers and employers from the Agriculture sector 2017. Workers n=336, Employers n=218
Q32 (W) Which of the following applies to your hearing protection (e.g. ear plugs or ear muffs)?
Q30 (E) Which of the following does your business do for your workers’ hearing protection (e.g. ear plugs or ear muffs)?
8. ADVICE AND INFORMATION SOURCES
INTRODUCTION

This section of the report is about where workers and employers prefer to seek advice and their preferred mediums for receiving this advice.

Understanding where workers and employers prefer to access health and safety information is important to ensure that communication channels are appropriate for the sector.

Also, with the increasing prevalence of social media channels and mobile apps, understanding use of these is also important.

Workers and employers were asked:

- Where they would go if they needed advice in the next few weeks about something to do with health and safety
- Which types of information they would find most useful for communicating health and safety messages.
Agriculture workers and employers regard WorkSafe NZ as their main source of advice.

WorkSafe NZ is the preferred source of health and safety advice for both workers (40%) and employers (58%).

Types of workers who were more likely to turn to WorkSafe for advice included:
• Supervisors of three or more workers (51%)
• Those aged 35 to 44 (51%)
• Self-employed workers (45%).

Types of employers more likely to turn to WorkSafe included:
• Those aged 50 to 59 (67%)
• Sheep, beef and other livestock farmers (66%).

CHANGES OVER TIME
Preference for using WorkSafe NZ for advice has not changed markedly for workers or employers since 2014.

However, workers are less likely to mention industry organisations as a source of advice (21% in 2017 cf. 30% in 2014).

Employers are less likely to mention the Internet/Google (26% cf. 38% in 2015 - this was not a prompted choice in 2014).

WHO WOULD YOU GO TO FOR ADVICE:
AGRICULTURE WORKERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WorkSafe NZ</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet /Google</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An industry organisation e.g. Federated Farmers, Dairy NZ</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A health and safety consultant</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend who works in the same industry</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The health and safety rep at my workplace</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in management (other than my boss)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trade supplier (e.g. Farmlands, Wrightsons)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing responses of 10% or more

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=511)
Q56 (W) If you need advice in the next few weeks about something to do with health and safety, who would you go to?

WHO WOULD YOU GO TO FOR ADVICE:
AGRICULTURE EMPLOYERS, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WorkSafe NZ</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An industry organisation</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety consultants</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Google</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other employers</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trade supplier</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My accountant or my lawyer</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing responses of 10% or more

Base: Employers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=375)
Q53 (E) If you need advice for your business in the next few weeks about something to do with health and safety, who would you go to?
INFORMATION FORMATS WHICH WOULD BE MOST USEFUL

For both workers and employers, the most useful information format is paper booklets, but preference for mobile apps is increasing.

Paper booklets/brochures are the preferred information format for both workers (61%) and employers (49%). Posters are second on the list for employers with 35% mention but are the fourth choice for workers (29%).

Among workers, the second most useful format is online training materials.

Preference for mobile apps is increasing.

Agriculture workers are more likely to mention mobile apps than in 2016 (31% in 2017 cf. 23% in 2016), although text reminders are not so preferred (13% in 2017 cf. 19% in 2016).

Nearly one in three employers (30%) nominate mobile apps in 2017 (a significant increase from the 20% mention in 2016).

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=511)
Q112(W) From the list below, which types of information would you find most useful for communicating health and safety messages?

Base: Employers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=370)
Q105(E) If you need advice for your business in the next few weeks about something to do with health and safety, who would you go to?
9. PERCEPTIONS OF AND CONTACT WITH WORKSAFE NZ
INTRODUCTION

This section discusses awareness and knowledge of WorkSafe NZ, and details of contact with WorkSafe.

The work carried out by Valerie Braithwaite for Safe Work Australia highlighted the importance of a respected and trusted work safety authority, with its presence known to workers and employers and with a reputation for being fair.

WorkSafe NZ had been in existence for just over six months when the 2014 benchmark was undertaken, but was well established by 2017.

WorkSafe has put increasing focus on connecting with farmers and the rural community to help reduce the number of people hurt on farms. Response to this was sought.

In relation to WorkSafe, workers and employers were asked questions about:

- Their awareness of WorkSafe NZ
- Their attitudes to WorkSafe, for example. Is an organisation I can have confidence in
- Their level of contact with WorkSafe in the last 12 months.

Workers and employers were also asked what they or their business has done as a consequence of WorkSafe’s increased focus on farmers and the rural community.
At least four in five Agriculture workers and employers (84% and 92% respectively) say they know at least a little bit about WorkSafe NZ. While those who know a lot or quite a lot grew sharply from 2014 to 2016, this level of increase in knowledge has levelled off in 2017.

34% of Agriculture workers say they know a lot or quite a lot about WorkSafe NZ, compared with 42% of employers.

**CHANGES OVER TIME**
Awareness and knowledge of WorkSafe NZ for both Agriculture sector workers and employers increased rapidly from 2014 to 2016, but now appears to have levelled off.

A campaign to promote awareness of WorkSafe could be developed for the sector.

### KNOW A LOT OR QUITE A LOT ABOUT WORKSAFE NZ OVER TIME: AGRICULTURE SECTOR, 2014 TO 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers and employers from the Agriculture sector.

Q70 (W) and Q66 (E). Before this survey what, if anything, did you know about the organisation called WorkSafe NZ?
CONTACT WITH WORKSAFE NZ BY THOSE WITH SOME KNOWLEDGE

Not surprisingly, employers are more likely to have had contact with WorkSafe NZ than workers, with both groups having materials or information produced by WorkSafe as their main point of contact. Worker contact has fallen back in the last year.

75% of Agriculture workers with at least some knowledge of WorkSafe NZ have had some contact with WorkSafe, compared with 87% of employers.

For workers, main points of contact include materials/information produced by WorkSafe (39%), media reports (32%) and WorkSafe advertising (19%). For employers, the main points of contact include materials/information produced by WorkSafe (45%), the website (40%), media reports and advertising (both 31%).

Contact with WorkSafe NZ for both Agriculture sector workers and employers increased from 2014 to 2015, but has now levelled off for employers and dropped back in the last year for workers.

HAD SOME CONTACT WITH WORKSAFE NZ OVER TIME: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS WITH SOME KNOWLEDGE OF WORKSAFE, 2014 TO 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>WORKERS</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers and employers from the Agriculture sector who know a little bit/quite a lot/a lot about WorkSafe NZ Q72 (W) and Q68 (E). In the last 12 months, in which of the following ways have you had contact with Worksafe NZ or heard about them?
Agriculture workers with at least some knowledge of WorkSafe NZ have an increasing awareness of four main ways they can contact WorkSafe.

These workers are most aware that they can get information or advice from WorkSafe (92% aware in 2017).

Awareness is lower for the potential to ask for an inspector to visit their workplace (76% in 2017), and the toll-free 0800 number (74% in 2017).

Not surprisingly, employers have more contact with WorkSafe NZ than workers, with both groups having materials or information produced by WorkSafe as their main point of contact. Worker contact has fallen back in the last year.

**Knowledge about Contacting WorkSafe NZ: Agriculture Workers with Some Knowledge of WorkSafe, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To get information or advice on health and safety</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make a complaint about health and safety</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask for an inspector to visit a workplace if you thought it was unsafe</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a toll-free 0800 phone number</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector who know a little bit/quite a lot/a lot about WorkSafe NZ. 2017, n= 407-409; 2016, n=528-533; 2015, n=371-379; 2014, n=298-307

Q74 (W) Did you know that you can contact Worksafe NZ to...?
PERCEPTIONS OF WORKSAFE NZ

Attitudes towards WorkSafe NZ are mixed with positive recognition of the positive role that WorkSafe plays but relatively weak levels of trust and confidence in the organisation. Only around a third of employers (37%) say that WorkSafe NZ works effectively with businesses like theirs.

Both Agriculture workers and employers are relatively positive that Worksafe NZ is helping the industry understand health and safety issues and is doing a good job helping workers be safe and healthy at work.

However, fewer than half agree with the following statements:

• Worksafe NZ is making a real difference to workplace health and safety in New Zealand (46% of workers and 50% of employers agree)
• Worksafe NZ is a trustworthy organisation (45% of workers and 47% of employers agree)
• Worksafe NZ is an organisation I can have confidence in (43% of workers and 42% of employers agree)
• Worksafe NZ Works effectively with businesses like mine (37% of employers agree).

These relatively weak results reflect some of the fairly negative and sceptical attitudes towards health and safety covered earlier in the report. As these attitudes have the potential to undermine the good work that WorkSafe does in the sector, they should be acknowledged and considered.

**AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT WORKSAFE NZ: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps workers in your industry/ businesses understand the health and safety issues and risks they face</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is doing a good job helping workers to be safe at work/ helping businesses improve workplace safety</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is doing a good job helping workers to be healthy at work/ helping businesses keep people healthy at work</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is making a real difference to workplace health and safety in New Zealand</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a trustworthy organisation</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an organisation I can have confidence in</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works effectively with businesses like mine</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Agriculture sector 2017, Workers n= 405-408, Employers n=330-335
Q120 (W), Q112 (E) To what extent do you agree or disagree that WorkSafe...
Agriculture workers and employers have significantly lower levels of confidence in WorkSafe NZ than do those in the three other high-risk sectors. Fewer than half of both groups agree that they have confidence in WorkSafe.

Given the relatively low level of confidence in WorkSafe NZ in the Agriculture sector, can WorkSafe NZ learn from its approach in the Forestry and Manufacturing sectors, where confidence is much higher, to lift confidence levels among Agriculture workers and employers?

**WORKSAFE NZ IS AN ORGANISATION I CAN HAVE CONFIDENCE IN (% AGREE): AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORKERS</th>
<th>EMPLOYERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>60%^</td>
<td>56%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>59%^</td>
<td>67%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>45%^</td>
<td>42%^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers 2017, Manufacturing n=362, Forestry n=311, Construction n=369, Agriculture n=406

Employers 2017, Manufacturing n=330, Forestry n=221, Construction n=298, Agriculture n=333

Q120 (W), Q112 (E) To what extent do you agree or disagree that WorkSafe...

**WorkSafe belittles farmers who are about the biggest bread winner for the country. So ponder that when drinking your next latte.**

Dairy farm worker - Age 47

**You can't wrap workers in cotton wool. Accidents will happen from time to time, not always in the workplace. Some things recommended by WorkSafe aren't practical.**

Beef farm worker - Age 67

**Do not fine farmers for not wearing bike helmets!!! The fact is a helmet will not save people from ATV accidents. But education on how to operate, operating safely and being mature on ATV's will.**

Deer farm worker - Age 33
IMPACT OF WORKSAFE FOCUS ON CONNECTING WITH FARMERS

WorkSafe has increased focus on reducing farm accidents by connecting with farmers and the rural community. Understanding the impact of this on farm businesses is important.

Two actions were most widespread as a consequence of WorkSafe’s focus over the last 12 months: nearly half the Agriculture workers and employers make sure they use the right equipment for the job and over a third are talking about safety more often with people who work on and visit the farm.

Employers are more likely than workers to have read/downloaded resources about farm health and safety (36% cf. 22%), to have visited the WorkSafe website (31% cf. 16%), and/or to have downloaded materials from other websites (23% cf. 13%).

DONE NOTHING DIFFERENT
One in five workers (21%) have done nothing different as a consequence, with 13% of employers saying they have done nothing. Primarily this is due to learning nothing new or finding they are already doing things. A small minority (2% of workers) say that doing anything different is too hard.

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=486) Employers from the Agriculture sector (n=369)
The information and advice is considered to have helped Agriculture workers and employers in three main ways:

- Better at identifying hazards and risks on the farm (66% and 62% respectively)
- Better at managing hazards and risks on the farm (64% and 74% respectively)
- Knowing more about what they need to do about health and safety on the farm (58% and 61% respectively).

In addition, nearly four in ten of the Agriculture workers (38%) who did something say that they know more about who they need to talk to about health and safety on the farm (38% mention).

HOW INFORMATION AND ADVICE ABOUT FARM HEALTH AND SAFETY HAS HELPED: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

- I am better at identifying hazards and risks on the farm (66%)
- I know more about what I need to do about h & s on the farm (74%)
- I can better manage hazards and risks on the farm (61%)
- I know more about who I need to talk to about h & s on the farm (42%)
- None of these (5%)
Among Agriculture employers, factsheets are the most popular form of guidance material from WorkSafe NZ, along with forms and templates, checklists and Good Practice guidelines.

In 2017, 63% of Agriculture employers have used at least one type of WorkSafe NZ guidance material in the last 12 months. This result is lower than in 2016 (72%).

**Factsheets (36%), forms & templates (31%) and checklists (also 31%) are the main types of material used.**

The use of WorkSafe online interactive tools increased significantly from 4% in 2016 to 10% in 2017.

Amongst employers, the most useful materials are forms & templates (75% very useful) and checklists (72%). By contrast, quick references guides are less useful overall (from a small base only 42% rated these as very useful).

### USEFULNESS OF WORKSAFE NZ GUIDANCE MATERIALS: AGRICULTURE EMPLOYERS 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MATERIAL</th>
<th>Base (Users) n</th>
<th>Very useful %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factsheets</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms and templates</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklists</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best/Good Practice Guidelines</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkits</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Codes of Practice (ACOPs)</td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety at Work Interpretive Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online interactive tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note small sample sizes – results are indicative*
Encouraging the use of common sense and personal responsibility were the two main suggestions made by Agriculture workers and employers.

Appropriate and relevant training is considered important, including familiarisation with equipment.

The need for ongoing reminders about hazards was stressed.

Employers talked about the need for workable, practical health and safety policies, that are relevant to the farm type. They also spoke of the need to focus continually on safe work practices, and of the value of workplace site inspections.

Some farmers (employers and workers) expressed their frustrations with the health and safety regulations, commenting that they add additional layers of cost and administration, and/or do not take farm type and/or individual circumstances into account.

Workers and employers were asked what suggestions they have for improving health and safety in their industry sector.

WHERE WORKSAFE SHOULD FOCUS TO IMPACT HEALTH AND SAFETY: AGRICULTURE SECTOR WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS, 2017

- Encourage use of common sense: 9% (Workers), 7% (Employers)
- Encourage personal responsibility: 8% (Workers), 6% (Employers)
- Proper training for the job / familiarisation with equipment: 4% (Workers), 2% (Employers)
- Awareness and management of hazards: 4% (Workers), 5% (Employers)
- Continued communication - reminders of hazards: 3% (Workers), 5% (Employers)
- More awareness of health and safety and paying attention to safe work practices: 3% (Workers), 5% (Employers)
- Have clear, workable health and safety policy: 5% (Workers), 6% (Employers)
- Education for workers and employers on safe practices, legal rights, etc.: 3% (Workers), 6% (Employers)
- Greater level of workplace site inspections: 2% (Workers), 2% (Employers)
- Less pressure to meet production targets: 2% (Workers), 1% (Employers)
- Visits/ mentoring by h & s reps: 4% (Workers), 1% (Employers)
- Have information readily available: 2% (Workers), 3% (Employers)
- Employers take more responsibility/ Be more accountable: 1% (Workers), 1% (Employers)
- Stop going over the top about health and safety: 3% (Workers), 5% (Employers)
- Don’t focus on threats and negative consequences: 5% (Workers), 4% (Employers)
- Change the ‘she’ll be right’ culture: No suggestions (Workers), 4% (Employers)

Base: Workers from the Agriculture sector (2017 n=504) Employers from the Agriculture sector (n=365)

Q84 (W) Q79 (E) Thinking about all the things covered in this survey, what could make the most difference to improve health and safety in your industry?

MADE A SUGGESTION

45% of workers  48% of employers

Workers
Employers

55%
52%
SUGGESTIONS - VERBATIMS

**It is a growth industry crippling the country it is putting stress on farmers and making them want to give up farming even people who are health and safety conscious are sick of it.**
Sheep farmer - Age 59

**People need to be personally responsible for their safety as well as their employer provide them with the correct gear and safe environment.**
Dairy farm worker - Age 42

**Random drug tests should be a must in the shearing ahead industry.**
(Sheep shearer, 23 years)

**Working for a large corporate company who has a large profile H&S is a serious consideration every day.**
Horticulture supply company advisor, 52 years

**Worksafe should endeavour to make safety regulations practical with common sense. Over the top regulations are often ignored.**
Orchardist - Age 67

**I think this is bureaucracy gone mad and is adding unnecessary costs.**
Grain farmer - Age 65

**I think health & safety awareness is a good thing and a good habit to get into on farm for both employer and employees. I believe that immigrants are most at risk as they have a lack of understanding and knowledge of NZ farms and this puts them at a higher level of injury. I think they don’t point out hazards to the employer and can and will work in bad situations as they might think that their job is at risk! And yes some farms have really bad or now health & safety in place and yes these farms should be targeted and made to put a h&s plan in place to protect everyone! not just because it's law...!**
(Dairy worker, 47 years)

**I normally use my rule of; if I have to ask myself a question about the task I am doing, ie will the sparks set something on fire? I stop and assess the scenario until the question is answered. With all the H&S stuff the question asked is will I get into trouble with H&S if I do this job this way? And that is a distraction away from the actual safety of the job.**
Viticulture worker – Age 60

**I'm all for safety but it's all gone bloody mad and all the rules, regulations etc. are going to do bugger all.**
Sheep & beef farm worker - Age 69

**Some of the rules don't always fit for different work situations.**
Dairy farm worker - Age 23
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1. SAMPLE PROFILE

Following is a profile of those working in the Agriculture sector and the businesses they work in.
Agriculture workers are largely male, NZ European, aged 45 or more, experienced in the industry and with no tertiary qualifications. Note that Māori, Pacific and Asian peoples are under-represented in the Agriculture sector workforce.

**Gender**

Seven out of ten workers (69%) are male.

**Age**

- 18–24 years: 4%
- 25–34 years: 12%
- 35–44 years: 14%
- 45–54 years: 20%
- 55+ years: 49%

An older age skew — seven out of ten (69%) aged 45 or more and almost half are aged 55 or more.

**Ethnicity**

- New Zealand European: 89%
- Māori: 8%
- Pacific Peoples: 0%
- Asian: 1%
- Other European: 3%

Almost nine out of ten are New Zealand European.

**Years in the Industry**

- Less than one year: 1%
- 1-2 years: 1%
- 3-5 years: 7%
- 6-9 years: 9%
- 10-19 years: 17%
- 20 years or more: 65%

Two-thirds (65%) have worked twenty or more years in the industry.

**Highest Qualification**

- No qualification: 24%
- NCEA Level 1 to 3: 37%
- Level 4, 5 or 6 - Trade or Polytechnic: 17%
- Bachelor or Postgraduate Degree: 18%
- Other: 4%

Just over six out of ten (61%) have an NCEA, trade or polytechnic qualification or no qualification.
The Agriculture businesses workers reported on are mainly Dairy farms and Sheep, beef and other livestock farms. They are broadly spread through New Zealand and around eight out of ten have one to five workers. Almost three out of ten (28%) have pre-school children living on the property.

**LOCATION**

- **39% Upper North Island**
- **24% Central & Lower North Island**
- **38% South Island**

**TYPES OF BUSINESS (SUB-SECTORS)**

- **Dairy Farm**
  - 40%

- **Sheep, Beef & Other Livestock**
  - 40%

- **Horticulture**
  - 22%

- **Agriculture Support Services**
  - 10%

- **Other**
  - 6%

Dairy farms and Sheep, beef and other livestock farms are the main types of business (both 40%).

**SIZE OF WORKPLACE**

- **1 Worker (Just You)**
  - 26%

- **2 to 5 Workers**
  - 50%

- **6 to 9 Workers**
  - 8%

- **10 to 19 Workers**
  - 5%

- **20 to 49 Workers**
  - 4%

- **50 to 99 Workers**
  - 2%

- **100 or More Workers**
  - 3%

- **Don't Know**
  - 1%

Three quarters of the businesses (77%) have 1 to 5 workers.

**YOUGNEST CHILD ON THE PROPERTY**

- **Pre-School Age (Less Than 5)**
  - 28%

- **Primary/Intermediate School Age (5-12)**
  - 17%

- **Secondary School Age (13 to 18)**
  - 8%

- **No Children Living on the Farm or Property**
  - 47%

Just over half of farm properties (53%) have children living there.
Around six out of ten Agriculture sector employers are male and again around six out of ten are aged fifty more. Around eight out of ten are owner operators.

### AGE

- **18 – 29 YEARS**: 4%
- **30 – 39 YEARS**: 14%
- **40 – 49 YEARS**: 21%
- **50 – 59 YEARS**: 33%
- **60 + YEARS**: 27%

Six out of ten employers are aged 50 or more

### ROLE

- **OWNER OPERATOR**: 77%
- **CEO/MANAGING DIRECTOR/GM**: 7%
- **HEALTH & SAFETY MANAGER/DIRECTOR**: 4%
- **OTHER**: 2%

Almost eight out of ten employers (77%) are owner operators
**AGRICULTURE EMPLOYERS 2017: THE BUSINESS**

Sheep, beef and other livestock and dairy farms are the main types of business. The majority of businesses have a small number of employees with 88% employing fewer than five workers or no workers at all. Almost six out of ten businesses have been operating for at least 20 years. Around a quarter have recently employed migrants, typically from India, the Philippines or other countries in Asia.

### TYPES OF BUSINESS (SUB-SECTORS)

- **Sheep, beef & other livestock** - 39%
- **Dairy Farm** - 38%
- **Horticulture** - 21%
- **Agriculture Support Services** - 4%
- **Other** - 3%

Dairy farms (38%) and sheep, beef and other livestock farms (39%) are the main types of business (very similar to workers).

### SIZE OF THE BUSINESS (NO. OF EMPLOYEES)

- **None** - 14%
- **1 to 5** - 74%
- **6 to 9** - 6%
- **10 to 19** - 3%
- **20 to 49** - 2%
- **50 to 99** - 1%
- **100 or more** - 0%

Almost six in ten businesses (56%) have been operating twenty or more years.

### LOCATION

- **Upper North Island** - 44%
- **Central & Lower North Island** - 19%
- **South Island** - 38%

Three-quarters of the businesses reported on by employers have 1 to 5 employees.

### YEARS BUSINESS HAS BEEN OPERATING

- **Less than two years** - 4%
- **2 to 9 years** - 17%
- **10 to 19 years** - 23%
- **20 years or more** - 56%

Almost six in ten businesses (56%) have been operating twenty or more years.

### DOES THE BUSINESS HAVE RECENT MIGRANTS?

- No - 76%
- Yes - 24%

Around a quarter of businesses have employed recent migrants.

### MAIN COUNTRIES RECENT MIGRANTS ARE FROM

- **India** - 32%
- **Philippines** - 22%
- **Other Asia** - 13%
- **UK (Other than Ireland)** - 21%
- **South America** - 17%
- **Pacific Islands** - 15%
- **Germany** - 14%
- **Ireland** - 10%

*Multiple responses allowed*
### APPENDIX II

## ENGAGEMENT AND PARTICIPATION MEASURES BY SECTOR: WORKERS

### Engagement measures by sector: Workers 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Agriculture (n=190-477)</th>
<th>Construction (n=278-437)</th>
<th>Forestry (n=286-355)</th>
<th>Manufacturing (n=493-543)</th>
<th>Other Sector (n=788-968)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workers always have a say in health and safety decisions (% agree)</td>
<td>83%^</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%^</td>
<td>65%*</td>
<td>62%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety risks are discussed openly (% always or most of the time)</td>
<td>81%^</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>88%^</td>
<td>70%*</td>
<td>70%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety issues are reported by workers (% always or most of the time)</td>
<td>75%^</td>
<td>62%*</td>
<td>77%^</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers really do make a difference to health and safety (% agree)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%^</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work environment measures by sector: Workers 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Agriculture (n=182-187)</th>
<th>Construction (n=274-420)</th>
<th>Forestry (n=284-349)</th>
<th>Manufacturing (n=493-536)</th>
<th>Other Sector (n=775-799)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone from the boss down is always trying to improve safety (% agree)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%^</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss and the workers work together to make sure everyone is safe at work (% agree)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%^</td>
<td>71%*</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss encourages us to come up with ideas for how to make our work safer (% agree)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%^</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel confident about approaching the boss/site supervisor on the site I am working on now about a health and safety issue (% agree)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%^</td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss would totally support me if I suggested we stop work because of a possible hazard (% agree)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%^</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication measures by sector: Workers 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Agriculture (n=182-416)</th>
<th>Construction (n=274-419)</th>
<th>Forestry (n=284-349)</th>
<th>Manufacturing (n=494-536)</th>
<th>Other Sector (n=778-895)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My boss encourages us to speak up if we feel something is unsafe (% agree)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%^</td>
<td>73%*</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always tell my co-workers if they aren't working safely (% agree)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>86%^</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>62%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss always shares relevant health and safety information and updates with workers (% agree)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>83%^</td>
<td>66%*</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss always gives workers health and safety information that is easy to understand (% agree)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%^</td>
<td>64%*</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my boss makes decisions about workplace health and safety, workers are always told how their views have been considered (% agree)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>67%^</td>
<td>49%*</td>
<td>48%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ significantly higher than total; * significantly lower than total
### APPENDIX III

**WORKER PARTICIPATION PRACTICES BY SECTOR: WORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Agriculture (n=506)</th>
<th>Construction (n=445)</th>
<th>Forestry (n=361)</th>
<th>Manufacturing (n=556)</th>
<th>Other Sector (n=1029)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety is included as a regular team/group meeting item</td>
<td>38%*</td>
<td>59%*</td>
<td>77%^</td>
<td>62%^</td>
<td>47%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular health and safety meetings</td>
<td>35%*</td>
<td>57%^</td>
<td>83%^</td>
<td>66%^</td>
<td>47%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a health and safety committee in our workplace</td>
<td>12%*</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>61%^</td>
<td>49%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have an elected health and safety representative</td>
<td>23%*</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>58%^</td>
<td>71%^</td>
<td>53%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a health and safety champion</td>
<td>9%*</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%^</td>
<td>24%^</td>
<td>25%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our workplace has a noticeboard, a website or another area where there is good up-to-date information about health and safety</td>
<td>27%*</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%^</td>
<td>59%^</td>
<td>48%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal safety audits are carried out regularly</td>
<td>18%*</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>78%^</td>
<td>53%^</td>
<td>43%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been given a health and safety mentor</td>
<td>10%*</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%^</td>
<td>19%^</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal discussions about health and safety</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a health and safety policy (incl. Codes of Practice)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are all experienced and use commonsense</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a process to make sure staff are briefed on health and safety for every site they work on(^1)</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>53%^</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ways to discuss or give feedback on health and safety in your workplace</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>31%^</td>
<td>12%*</td>
<td>6%^</td>
<td>11%^*</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Workers excluding self-employed

**Q54 (W)** Which, if any, of the following things happen at your workplace?

\(^1\) Note: In 2016 separate response options were provided for elected health and safety representatives and champions. Previously, both of these options were combined. As such, no changes over time are presented.

---

1: Asked only of Construction

^ significantly higher than total; * significantly lower than total
## APPENDIX III

### WORK PRACTICES AT YOUR BUSINESS BY SECTOR: EMPLOYERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE (n=374)</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION (n=338)</th>
<th>FORESTRY (n=225)</th>
<th>MANUFACTURING (n=363)</th>
<th>OTHER SECTOR (n=425)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety is a regular item at team/group meetings</td>
<td>47%*</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>85%^</td>
<td>60%^</td>
<td>44%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular health and safety meetings</td>
<td>39%*</td>
<td>60%^</td>
<td>92%^</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>37%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A health and safety committee</td>
<td>4%*</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%^</td>
<td>21%^</td>
<td>15%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have an elected health and safety representative</td>
<td>25%*</td>
<td>41%^</td>
<td>50%^</td>
<td>41%^</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a health and safety champion</td>
<td>7%*</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%^</td>
<td>15%^</td>
<td>17%^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A regular system for health and safety communications (e.g. noticeboard, website)</td>
<td>33%*</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%^</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal safety audits are carried out regularly*</td>
<td>36%*</td>
<td>53%^</td>
<td>84%^</td>
<td>52%^</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A formal mentor system</td>
<td>16%*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%^</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General/ongoing discussions (incl. informal, at smoko, while working, on site)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A process to make sure staff are briefed on health and safety for every site they work on¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66%^</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal communications (newsletters, intranet, email)</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever necessary/as hazards/situations arise</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one discussions/face to face</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open door policy/encourage workers to report hazards/concerns</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident register</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;0.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ways to discuss health and safety with your workers or get feedback from them</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>21%^</td>
<td>9%^</td>
<td>6%^</td>
<td>11%^</td>
<td>21%^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Employers

Q51(E) Which, if any, of the following does your business have?¹ Note: responses for ‘Formal safety audits are carried out regularly’ come from Q43. Formal safety audits at regular intervals are a normal part of our business

¹ Note: In 2016 separate response options were provided for elected health and safety representatives and champions. Previously, both of these options were combined. As such, no changes over time are presented.

1: Asked only of Construction

^ significantly higher than total; * significantly lower than total