

Health and Safety Executive Board		Paper No: HSE/11/14	
Meeting Date:	23 February 2011	FOI Status:	Fully open
Type of paper:	Above the line	Exemptions:	
Trim reference:	2011/87483		
<b>Agriculture Revisited – Evaluation And Future Direction</b>			

### Purpose

1. To advise the Board on the outcomes of the independent evaluation of the Agriculture Revisited Initiative
2. To update the Board on HSE's evolving approach to and work within the agriculture sector in an environment of restrictions on communications spend, and
3. To invite the Board to agree to proposals for the future delivery of the programme of work.

### Background

4. The Agriculture Revisited initiative was developed to make greater impact on the toll of fatal injuries in the farming sector. Farming stood alone among the major sectors of industry in not seeing any reduction in fatalities in recent years and consistently had the highest rate of fatal accidents. Typically 45-50 people are killed on British farms each year.

5. Agriculture Revisited sought to build on the best of what HSE was already doing through a range of coordinated activities, namely:

- The "Make the promise" (MTP) direct mailing campaign
- Development of the farming Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADs)
- Development of the HSE presence at Agricultural Shows
- Promotion of the uptake of training and vocational qualifications in farming
- Work with the equipment supply chains to improve machinery safety; and
- Stakeholder mapping and engagement.

6. In May 2009 the Board committed in principle – subject to evidence of impact and conditional on HSE's future financial settlements – to extending Agriculture Revisited beyond March 2011, recognising the time required to bring about sustained behaviour and cultural change.

7. In March 2010 the Board reviewed HSE's work across agriculture including progress with its Agriculture Revisited initiative (HSE 10/33 refers). The Board reinforced its commitment to seek ways to achieve a change of culture in the industry and wished to revisit the issue in the light of the findings of a retrospective evaluation to be carried out during 2010/11.

8. The outcomes of the evaluation are supplemented by:

- feedback from HSE staff involved in the delivery of Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADs) and the programme of agricultural shows; and
- ongoing monitoring of progress in the other work streams in the initiative.

9. From the outset, the Make the promise (MTP) campaign was never envisaged as a long-term tool for embedding behavioural change in the farming sector. Rather it was part of the strategy for promoting awareness of the risks and encouraging

greater ownership and responsibility by the industry for its poor health and safety performance. The change of operating environment for HSE and the impact of spending controls have accelerated and given impetus to the need for this transfer of ownership of the problem.

10. The intervention of the Chair and Board members has acted as a catalyst in persuading industry leaders to accept ownership of the problem and to demonstrate leadership in finding solutions. Recent initiatives led by the National Farmers Union (NFU) and NFU Cymru are early signs of progress in this respect. These intentions still need to be translated into practical actions and delivery of outcomes sustained over time.

11. In addition, there have been major changes to the 'map' of stakeholders with whom we need to engage. Some agencies and Departments have been subject to reductions and others will cease to exist. Further change can be anticipated; for example with the outcomes of the DEFRA Task Force on Farming Regulation, the report of which is expected in or about April 2011.

12. The development of sector based strategies as the focus for delivery of the Strategy for Health and Safety will bring further clarity.

## **Argument**

### **Evaluation of Agriculture Revisited**

13. The fatal injury figures have remained static during 2010/11. Whilst disappointing at a number of levels we have always believed that achieving the necessary attitude and behavioural changes towards health and safety in the farming community would take more than two years. However, the independent evaluation indicates that early, but encouraging progress is being made. Farmers have changed their awareness of the risks and appear ready to change. We now want to do more to change farmers' behaviour within the constraints that now exist.

14. Ipsos MORI carried out a major social survey to evaluate the extent of behavioural or attitude change towards health and safety within the farming sector since the start of the Agriculture Revisited initiative. A summary of the findings is set out in Annex 1. The key conclusions of the research are that:

- The Agriculture Revisited initiative has been very successful in attracting farmers' attention and to a more limited degree involvement.
- The extension of the MTP campaign to a wider audience does not seem to have diluted this success.
- Many farmers claimed to have made changes and the largest number claimed to think more of their family. This was a core proposition of the MTP campaign.
- The campaign does seem to have had an impact on those farmers targeted in terms of increasing their consciousness of risk and increasing their motivation to take action to reduce risks. However, given the timescale of the research undertaken, it was not possible to robustly evaluate the scale of actions taken (or yet to be taken).

15. Early on in the initiative, the MTP campaign was vital in raising the profile of the poor safety record in agriculture and in particular farming. However, it was only

ever one element in the initiative and over time the other work streams will play a greater role in delivering results. The initiative and MTP campaign have also been drivers in initiating action amongst industry leaders to tackle health and safety in the industry.

### **Future direction of Agriculture Revisited**

16. An approach based on direct mailing or primarily reliant on paid publicity is not a long-term solution for driving behavioural change in the farming industry. We propose using the current constraints on communications to accelerate plans for developing partnership marketing with stakeholders and third parties and applying 'nudge theory' to encourage people in the direction of behavioural change by harnessing other drivers and self interest.

17. That being the case, and informed by the results of the evaluation and internal feedback, we propose to focus more effort on encouraging the industry to take greater responsibility. Subject to the availability of resources, the revised plan is based on a combination of stakeholder, Sector and FOD delivery.

18. It is proposed that:

- the future direction of the initiative should continue to reflect the new strategy (see paragraphs 11 and 17 above) and deliver the strategic objectives through a number of work streams
- continue to target farming, but that the scope be extended to include larger farms, in addition to the initial target of small and family farms
- The wider land based industries (e.g. forestry, arboriculture and amenities) should not be part of the initiative, but should be tackled by similar thematic activities.

19. The key work activities proposed are:

Make the promise activity: The MTP Campaign has achieved its objective in focusing attention on a narrow target audience in a way that we could not otherwise have done. The first three phases of the campaign were completed and as originally planned the industry now needs to take responsibility for and demonstrate leadership in tackling its health and safety performance. Activity with stakeholders will be designed to ensure MTP does not lose momentum. HSE's future role in this process would be to stimulate and support the industry in taking the MTP messages forward.

This process has begun with the NFU and NFU Cymru's Agricultural Safety Summits which challenged industry leaders to accept responsibility for tackling the industry's poor health and safety performance. An industry working group has been set up to find solutions to the issues and has agreed, in principle, to take MTP messages forward in a series of industry led campaigns. Other organisations, such as Cooperative Farms, are keen to work with HSE as Promise partners. The legal and practical issues around brand licensing are being taken forward so as to maximise any financial benefits to HSE (e.g. venues for SHADs or shared stands at shows), that may arise from such partnership marketing.

SHADs: a programme of 26 farming SHADs has been agreed with FOD for 2011/12 (subject to the availability of resources). A streamlined delivery process has been agreed with FOD HQ who will take on some of the roles previously carried out by divisions. In addition the training contract for management and delivery of the programme has been outsourced which will reduce the administrative burden on HSE.

Offers of venues, for example from the Crown Estate and Co-operative Farms are being followed up. If successful these will reduce the cost to HSE and widen the involvement of stakeholders. Other organisations have expressed interest in hosting and running SHAD type events and a model for such activity is being developed.

Agricultural Shows: Feedback from Ipsos MORI and FOD staff support the view that attendance at national, regional and local agricultural shows represents neither the best way of reaching farmers nor a good use of resources. It is proposed that the programme for 2011/12 should focus on a limited number of technical shows which we know are attended by our target audiences rather than the general public. Any future attendance at the Royal Highland and Royal Welsh shows will be for local 'political' reasons rather than in support of Agriculture Revisited and on the basis of scaled down HSE resource and sharing a stand with partner organisations.

Training and vocational qualifications (VQs) in farming: we will continue to encourage the take up of VQs and propose to build on relationships within the retail supply chain to influence larger farming operations to raise levels of training among employees. We will also re-focus attention on the limited uptake among smaller scale farmers and look to influence stakeholders to develop and provide Bite- sized training for farmers at a local level to increase uptake and professionalism in the industry.

Machinery supply chain: Activity during 2010/11 has included publicising research on the safe operation of tractor/trailer combinations and revision of guidance on the safe design and supply of agricultural machinery. In 2011/12 it is proposed to focus attention on (a) safe supply of second hand equipment and (b) safe use/maintenance of equipment. The former will use a pilot project with FOD to test a new approach to auctioneers who supply second hand equipment and may lead to enforcement opportunities. The latter will be based around a number of industry led projects, including input to proposals for Bite- sized training e.g. covering safe use and maintenance of equipment.

Stakeholder engagement: A mapping exercise has shown those stakeholders who are already close to us and those who need more work. It has identified a number of potential stakeholders, with emphasis on the retail supply chain, who may be able to inject leadership into the industry. The exercise links with a review of Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee (AIAC) membership to ensure it reflects those who can make a difference.

### **Financial/Resource implications for HSE**

20. The issue of resources for the Agriculture Revisited initiative was addressed in Board paper HSE/09/46. Programme management of the initiative is operating within the allocated budget. The other work streams continue to be delivered by planned resources from the Sector and FOD Divisions.

21. Some potential savings in staff resource due to cancellation of the direct mailing campaign has been redirected to supporting industry stakeholders in developing industry- led initiatives aimed at tackling the poor health and safety record in farming.

### **Actions/Next Steps**

22. The Board is invited:

- To consider and comment on the outcomes of the independent evaluation; and
- To consider and agree the proposals for taking forward the Agriculture Revisited initiative in the changed regulatory environment.

### **Paper clearance**

23. This paper has been cleared by the SMT at its meeting on 2 February 2011.

## Summary of Results from evaluation of Agriculture Revisited by Ipsos MORI

**Overall aim of the evaluation:** to determine the extent to which Agriculture Revisited has changed attitudes and behaviour around health and safety in the farming community.

In particular to evaluate the impact of the programme on:

- awareness of risks and how to assess and manage them;
- improvements in procedures to manage risks;
- improvements in maintenance and use of machinery and vehicles;
- increases in awareness of, and willingness to use, suitable training;
- willingness to try new methods and if this is due to training;
- awareness of the skills needed by staff and contractors to reduce risk.

### **The main elements of the research programme were:**

#### a) Communications tracker survey

- Telephone tracker surveys with farmers. A sample was provided by HSE/Defra and was broken into three groups:
  - i) Responders – farmers who had received a MTP Direct mailing(DM) pack and had responded by asking for more information and/or more knots
  - ii) Receivers – farmers who had received a DM pack, but had not responded yet
  - iii) Non – contact – farmers who had not been sent the DM pack.
- Ipsos MORI undertook two waves of research. Wave 1 was conducted at the end of February 2010 and consisted of 300 receivers and 300 responders. In waves 2a/2b 400 responders and 300 receivers were interviewed over July and August 2010. (A 3<sup>rd</sup> wave was withdrawn following the cancellation of the 4<sup>th</sup> phase of the MTP direct mailing campaign.)

#### b) Assessment of SHADs

- Analysis of 1304 feedback forms self completed by farmers attending SHADs between 7 April and 17 October 2010.
- Questions to farmers within the tracker survey.

#### c) Assessment of HSE's presence at Agricultural Shows

- 78 interviews (36 farmers and 42 non farmers) with randomly selected visitors as they left the HSE Show stand.
- Questions to farmers within the tracker survey

#### d) Stakeholder interviews

- 26 in-depth interviews were carried out to explore the views of stakeholders on their involvement with the Agriculture Revisited initiative. The groups included external stakeholders from the Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee, Machinery and Education work streams and HSE's internal stakeholders.

### **Make the promise campaign**

The campaign has penetrated very effectively and this has not been diluted as the campaign progressed. (Awareness levels of 76% in those targeted)

All communications channels seem to have played a role, though the web site was confirmed as a minor channel for farmers to receive information.

The case studies were a major tool for engagement – whether in “How lives are Lost”, at Show stands or at SHADs:

- 51% of all farmers interviewed in the summer of 2010 who had received or received and responded to a mailing, had read the case studies
- and of those 88% had found them helpful or very helpful.

The knot and make the promise message were key to engaging farmers and there are also indications that family orientation was a key element in communication effectiveness.

### **SHADs**

Only 12% of responder/receiver farmers interviewed in summer 2010 had attended a SHAD, but the feedback from 88% of them was positive:

- 48% of those who had attended thought they were very helpful
- 40% of those who had attended thought they were helpful

A further 44% of farmers in the summer survey had heard of, but not attended a SHAD.

Analysis of the feedback forms was very positive over a range of issues:

- quality of trainers – 80% rated them very good and 19% fairly good,
- information it covered – 75% rated it very good and 24% fairly good,
- suitability of venue – 75% rated it very good and 21% fairly good,
- opportunity to ask questions – 48% rated this very good and 41% fairly good, but of those who did ask a question 88% felt they had been answered satisfactorily.

### **Agricultural Shows**

The telephone survey asked farmers if they had ever visited the stands run by HSE at some agricultural shows in order to obtain guidance on ways to improve safety. An average of 30% of farmers across the different waves of the survey had visited HSE stands, which is a good result.

HSE’s show stand in 2010 carried the Make the promise message and branding and was intended to target farmers in particular rather than health and safety in general.

78 interviews were carried out of visitors leaving the show stand at 3 shows this summer. Just over half of the visitors were non- farmers which reflects the diverse profile of visitors at county or national agricultural shows.

Of the 36 farmers who were interviewed on leaving the show stands this summer:

- 75% rated the information as very relevant

- 58% found the staff very helpful.
- 86% were already aware of Make the promise
- 64% had already made a promise and 78% of these said they would reiterate their promise following the show
- All of the 36% who had not yet made a promise said they would think about doing so.

We are able to compare the impact of the show stand v SHAD attendance in changing the awareness of farmers of key risk issues by asking the two groups the same questions and looking at their responses:

<b>How much did visiting the HSE stand/attending the SHAD today increase your understanding of....?</b>		A lot	A little	Not much/not at all
Potential causes of accidents on your farm	Shows	31%	33%	36%
	SHADs	73%	25%	2%
Actions you could take to avoid accidents	Shows	33%	25%	41%
	SHADs	76%	23%	1%

(Base: Farmers visiting the stands and SHAD attendees)

### **HSE Website – Agriculture pages**

The Make the Promise campaign did not direct farmers to the HSE website in particular, although PR activity and information on the show signs did signpost the Make the promise website as a source of further information. The tracker survey took the opportunity to update our information on the way in which farmers make use of our website and their preferred way of receiving information in order to inform our future planning.

Of the receivers and responders interviewed in Wave 2 only 13% had ever visited the HSE website to obtain information on farm safety. This represented only 18% of those with the internet and this data was typical of the results from the earlier surveys.

Farmers were asked how they would prefer to receive information and 49% of all the responders and receivers in wave 2 said they would prefer to receive information by post while 21% preferred farm publications and 12% preferred meetings. Email was the preference of only 10% of the group with website the minority at 3%. These figures remained largely the same when only those on the internet (70%) were considered.

### **Stakeholders**

Most of the stakeholders interviewed understood the aim of the initiative, but some had mixed views on the make the Promise (MTP) campaign. They felt they had been involved sufficiently and have been trying to promote and support it.

Stakeholders still believe that the main barriers to behaviour change are attitudinal and practical e.g.

- Farmers tend to think accidents won't happen to them and do not always regard their behaviour as risky;

- Pressure to keep costs down, time pressures and lack of staff, and lack of knowledge lead to risk taking.

Ideas for future contributions included

- involving industry more to set up partnerships with companies/organisations to take the financial burden off HSE
- the possibility of joint badging or sponsoring events by organisations
- making the initiative more hard hitting and continuing to run it over a longer period to ensure that it actually changes farmer's behaviour.
- Making use of the fact that farmers tend to take most notice of other farmers and leaders within industry. Other influences are farmer's wives and family.
- Training needs more funding and not all farmers receive the training.

### **Training and vocational qualifications**

Questions were asked of farmers about their awareness and attendance at formal training courses. The results of wave 2 reflect the pattern from earlier surveys:

Have attended or sent someone to a vocational training course on farm safety	11%
Have not attended or sent someone on a course, but likely to	17%
Not likely to send someone on a course or to attend, but have heard of the courses	39%

(Base: receivers/responders wave 2)

Of the 27% responding positively it was noted that the greatest take up was from larger farms:

Size of farm	Attended/sent someone	Not attended, but likely to	Total
<50 hectares	8%	21%	29%
50 – 100 hectares	14%	23%	37%
100+ hectares	22%	29%	51%

This was reflected in feedback from stakeholders on training among farmers.

### **What impact did the initiative have?**

- Farmers were questioned about how well informed they felt about the types of risks and hazards that exist on farms like theirs. Indications were that farmers felt confident and well informed prior to the campaign so there was little absolute shift on these measures following the campaign. It has to be taken into account, however, that some farmers may be overconfident about their knowledge and possibly misinformed and this will be reflected in their responses.
- This misperception of risk is affected by the size of unit farmed. In wave 2, only 14% of farmers on farms of <50 hectares thought there was potential for a serious accident on their farm compared with 31% of those on farms of > 200 hectares. This is not reflected in the fatal injuries reported to HSE.

- The more engaged the farmers were (e.g. sent for How lives are lost booklet, visited stand at shows, attended SHAD or read case studies) the more likely they were to feel they had learnt something new and this is attributed to the initiative.
- There was some indication that farmers had a better understanding of specific risks and of causes of work related deaths among farmers. The increased understanding of risks associated with working at height may also reflect influence from other HSE initiatives such as the ladder exchange and Shattered Lives.
- SHAD attendees seemed particularly influenced and showed much higher levels of understanding, for example regarding the risks associated with different jobs, following attendance at a SHAD (55%) compared with other responders (39%).
- Many farmers claimed to have made changes and the largest number claimed to think more of their family - this was a core proposition of the MTP campaign.