

Evaluation of the HSE slips and trips roadshows

Prepared by the **Health and Safety Laboratory**
for the Health and Safety Executive 2007

Evaluation of the HSE slips and trips roadshows

Shuna Powell
Health and Safety Laboratory
Harpur Hill
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK17 9JN

The research consisted of 102 interviews with people who had attended a slips and trips 'roadshow'. The objectives of this work were to establish:

- The extent to which participants have been able to make changes to reduce risk levels since attending a slips and trips roadshow.
- The barriers that participants have faced in trying to make changes.
- How else HSE can support work to reduce risk levels.

This report and the work it describes were funded by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Its contents, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect HSE policy.

© Crown copyright 2007

First published 2007

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to:
Licensing Division, Her Majesty's Stationery Office,
St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ
or by e-mail to hmsolicensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background and Research Objectives.....	1
2	METHODOLOGY	2
2.1	Overview.....	2
2.2	Design	2
2.3	Sample Profile	2
2.4	Pilot.....	4
2.5	Procedure	4
3	RESULTS	6
3.1	Recollection of The Event.....	6
3.2	Most and Least Useful Aspects of The Event	7
3.3	Main Messages	8
3.4	Handouts From The Event.....	9
3.5	Understanding and Awareness.....	9
3.6	Perception of Slips and Trips Following The Event	10
3.7	Historical Approach to Slips and Trips	12
3.8	Changes Made After The Event	12
3.9	What Was It About The Event That Encouraged The Changes?.....	13
3.10	Effective Changes?.....	14
3.11	Would Changes Have Been Made If You Hadn't Attended The Event?	15
3.12	Future Plans to Address Slips and Trips.....	15
3.13	How Well Does Your Organisation Now Manage The Risk From Slips and Trips	16
3.14	Barriers Preventing Action	16
3.15	Long Term Barriers to Change	16
3.16	Addressing Barriers	18
3.17	More Information to Address Slips and Trips?.....	18
3.18	Improving the Event.....	19
3.19	How Important Do You Think Slips and Trips are Compared to Other Hazards.....	19
3.20	Should HSE Be Looking at Slips and Trips?.....	20
3.21	Should HSE be Involved in These Roadshows?	20
3.22	Further Comments.....	21
3.23	Comments Specific to the NHS	22
4	DISCUSSIONS AND LIMITATIONS	23
4.1	Limitations	25
5	CONCLUSIONS	26
6	APPENDICES	27
7	REFERENCES	30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Objectives

The objectives of this work were to establish:

- The extent to which participants have been able to make changes to reduce risk levels since attending a slips and trips roadshow.
- The barriers that participants have faced in trying to make changes.
- How else HSE can support work to reduce risk levels.

The research consisted of 102 interviews with people who had attended a slips and trips 'roadshow'.

Main Findings

Based upon the evidence of this research the slips and trips roadshows do seem to have been effective in promoting positive changes in organisations. Whilst the extent to which reported changes in workplace practice were directly attributable to the roadshows does vary, the efficacy of any changes were likely to have been increased after attendance at a roadshow, and a large number of attendees did directly attribute the implementation of changes to their attendance at an event.

In terms of the actual changes made, the roadshows have been successful in raising awareness of slips and trips and providing actionable ways for participants to tackle the issue in their workplaces. Significantly, attendees who previously thought that they understood the issues realised there was more that they could be doing. Moreover, the roadshows appear to lend themselves to encouraging more long-term change, as they not only raise awareness, but also give people the necessary tools to identify risk factors for slips and trips (over and above 'good house keeping') and offer useable achievable controls that are not expensive (e.g. dry mopping).

The main barrier to making effective changes in the work place was identified as being financial, and interviewees did not generally feel that this was something that HSE could ultimately help with. Other barriers that were identified were lack of management support, culture and attitudes within organisations, and conflicting and competing tasks and priorities.

Although these are clearly positive findings it is important to recognise that HSE's objective to influence large numbers of workplaces cannot be met using the roadshow approach as the current scale of activity only reaches relatively small numbers of organisations and the people attending roadshows might a) already possess the right kinds of attitudes or b) have limited capacity for making change (however well engaged they might become).

This limited reach of the roadshows should be weighed-up against the more pragmatic consideration that peoples' perceptions do appear to have been genuinely changed by the event and that the speed and the extent of changes made back in their workplaces would not have occurred if they had not attended. This can be contrasted with the evaluation of the 2005 Watch Your Step campaign which, whilst demonstrating that the campaign reached a large audience, is also inconclusive on how much actual change in workplace practice was achieved. Therefore, whilst the roadshows reach a far smaller audience there is clear evidence that they have an impact on those workplaces involved. The key issue for HSE is either to find the right balance between effective small-scale interventions and activities that reach a larger audience or develop new interventions that are better at doing both.

Finally, it is also important to emphasise that these roadshows appear to be viewed particularly positively by those who attended them. This degree of success, is certainly in part, is a result of the entertaining speakers and the format. In drawing more general conclusions about the roadshow format it could be that less well received roadshows might have less impact on their audiences.

Recommendations

Roadshows should continue and be extended if possible. In terms of development the following might be considered:

- Targeting of people at all levels within the organisations and from backgrounds other than health and safety e.g. managers, facility management, designers.
- Including sessions on influencing culture and attitudes.
- Highlighting the cost of not taking action to reduce slips trips and falls.
- Extending the roadshows to cover other important sectors.
- Follow up events after the roadshows to check progress and give technical support where required or other ways to stay in touch with, or continue to inform roadshow delegates such as newsletters or email updates.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

For the past few years, HSE has been running a series of roadshow events for a range of audiences (duty holders, inspectors, health and safety managers). The broad aims of these roadshows have been to highlight slips and trips issues, prompt people to take action on slips and trips and to provide attendees with some basic information about how risks might be reduced.

An earlier evaluation (conducted by Kings College) looked at the response to three roadshows held in January to March 2005. This evaluation showed that the events were very well received and that many participants had started to take some action to reduce slip and trip risks in the workplace. Beyond this small-scale evaluation project, there is plenty of anecdotal evidence of participants having become enthused about the slips and trips issue following an event and of participants taking many different actions as a result. However, this previous evaluation project was more concerned with establishing that reactions to the events had been positive and that people had gained some new knowledge and attitudes from their attendance. The research project described in this report was intended to look at longer term and more fundamental questions that have not been researched elsewhere.

This research was aimed at gaining a better understanding of the extent to which roadshow participants have been able to make changes at their workplaces to reduce risk since attending the roadshow (after at least 3 months); what barriers or problems they have faced in doing so; and how else the slips and trips programme at HSE can help them in their work to reduce risks. Because of the focus on duty holders, roadshows delivered to HSE and Local Authority inspectors have not been covered by this research.

The objectives of this work were to establish:

- The extent to which participants have been able to make changes to reduce risk levels since attending the roadshow.
- The barriers they have faced in trying to make changes.
- How else HSE can support work to reduce risk levels.

It is anticipated that the findings from this project will help the Slips and Trips Programme team to better understand the effectiveness of the roadshow approach and how it might be developed for the future. More broadly, the project will provide the HSE with more information on whether this type of intervention is effective.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 OVERVIEW

The research consisted of, 102 telephone interviews with duty holders who had attended a slips and trips roadshow over the previous three years. Interviews were conducted between June and August 2006. Telephone interviews were selected as the most appropriate methodology because of the need to interview a large enough number of people to give confidence that the findings were robust.

2.2 DESIGN

The research design was essentially qualitative. Topic guides were used rather than closed questionnaires in order to encourage a more open discussion and to enable the researchers to explore issues in greater depth. However, a larger than average sample was used in order to give us more confidence about the proportions of respondents who were taking particular types of action.

The topic guide covered:

- Have people who attended the roadshows been able to take subsequent action to reduce slips and trips in their workplaces?
- What action have they been able to take/how far have they been able to make changes?
- How useful was the roadshow event in helping them make changes?
- How useful were the materials provided with the roadshow?
- What might make the event and the materials more useful?
- What barriers or problems have they faced in implementing changes?
- What would help them to make changes and what more could HSE do to assist?

A topic guide to address these issues was designed in consultation with HSE's Social Science Unit. The Topic Guide can be found at Appendix 1.

2.3 SAMPLE PROFILE

Participants were identified from two lists provided by HSE.

1) At all roadshows HSE distributed an evaluation form at the end of the day for attendees to fill out and record their immediate impressions of the day. These evaluation forms were returned to the presenters before the participants left the roadshow. However, it was only at more recent roadshows that the forms asked for participant's contact details. There was also a box for participants to tick to indicate that they were happy to be contacted again by HSE. These contact details were used to contact past attendees to take part in this evaluation.

2) For those roadshows where evaluation forms did not include attendee contact details, HSE provide past delegate lists were also provided by HSE. These lists included the names and company contact details of people who had been invited to the roadshow. The first task was to track down past attendees within their organisation (as sometimes only a switch board number was provided and not an extension number. In large organizations like the NHS, determining where the person worked within the NHS at the time of the roadshow required a number of phone calls) and to find out if they had actually accepted the invitation and attended the

roadshow and whether they still worked at the organisation and were happy to take part in the evaluation.

The research was conducted across a range of dutyholders, including NHS, Prisons, Rail, LA's as dutyholders, and large employers and intermediaries. Two different types of roadshow were evaluated, but the main emphasis of this evaluation was placed on the traditional HSE roadshow presented by Mr. Mark Thomas (HSE), Mr. Stephen Taylor (HSE) and Dr. Steve Thorpe (HSL) (the TTT roadshows). These were full day events, dedicated to slips and trips and tailored to the audience where possible (e.g. for an NHS event then the presentations may be backed up by case studies and photographs from hospital environments). There was a segment in this presentation, given by a local inspector that focused on the relevant legislation. A slightly different format to the traditional full day event was used for large employers and intermediaries' events. HSE's Safety Unit designed the template for these roadshows and different presenters (local to the area) were used to deliver the presentation. The presentations were designed so that they could be given by 'non technical' presenters. A total of 12 past attendees of this type of event were contacted. However, for the purpose of this research, these two versions of the roadshow will be analysed and discussed together, as no real differences were reported as a result of the different formats and also a sample of 10 interviews is too small to be able to report findings with confidence. Although Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADS) for slips and trips are also run by HSE, these are not covered by this research as they are quite different in terms of content and target audience.

The tables below show the numbers of attendees from each event, the type of event attended, the date of attendance and the range of duty holders. It was decided that no more than 15 past participants from any individual event could be contacted.

Table 1. Numbers of Interviewees and date of attendance (NHS)

Date	Venue	Number interviewed	Numbers Attended
08/02/05	Midlands NHS Coventry	4	15
02/09/05	Blackpool Victoria Hospital	6	31
17/11/05	Cardiff HSE offices	5	35
06/12/05	Kendal, Cumbria	1	45
12/01/06	Royal Bournemouth Hospital	12	31
17/01/06	Bedford Hospital	5	20
19/01/06	South Manchester Hospital	8	26
24/01/06	Pembury Hospital, Kent	1	22
09/03/06	Midlands NHS trusts Coventry	6	23

Table 2. Numbers of Interviewees and date of attendance (Prison Service)

Date	Venue	Number Interviewed	Numbers Attended
01/02/06	HMP Lindholme	4	36
21/02/06	Prison service training college	3	27
22/02/06	Newbold Revel (Rugby)	9	34

Table 3. Numbers of Interviewees and date of attendance (LAs as dutyholders)

Date	Venue	Number Interviewed	Numbers Attended
18/10/02	Bury St Edmonds	5	28
27/03/03	London	2	29
13/07/04	Llandrindod Wells	4	28

Table 4. Numbers of Interviewees and date of attendance (Railways)

Date	Venue	Number Interviewed	Numbers Attended
26/02/04	Rose Court	1	31
16/03/04	York	6	29
14/12/04	Manchester	1	9
20/01/05	Rose Court	4	32

Table 5. Numbers of Interviewees and date of attendance (Large employers and intermediaries)

Date	Venue	Number Interviewed	Number Attended
25/03/04	Murton, County Durham	5	36
03/02/05	Guildford	7	55

The participants held a variety of job roles including: environmental manager, house keeping manager and facilities manager but the most common job roles of the people who attended the events were health and safety officers/advisors/managers.

2.4 PILOT

The topic guide was developed in consultation with HSE's Social Science Unit and was initially piloted face to face with participants. The question set was then refined and piloted again. Questions that sought information outside the scope of this evaluation (e.g. the standard of catering at the event) were re-worded where possible. The interviewees for the pilot were past attendants at a Rail roadshow. Once the topic guide was refined, five telephone interviews were conducted and the interview tapes were then listened to and analysed, to assess whether the interviewee had understood the questions and whether the type of information elicited would answer the main research questions. After analyzing the responses from the interview, it was decided that no further refinement of the topic guide was required and the interview schedule commenced.

2.5 PROCEDURE

The interviewees had attended the Roadshow between 3 months and four years previously. It was decided to have a cut off point of 3 months since attending the roadshow as this was the time period used by King's College in their previous study.

A total of 102 telephone interviews were conducted and recorded. As a team of interviewers was used, each interviewer sat in and listened to at least one other interview to ensure consistency in approach. The recordings of the interviews were listened to and coded. Thematic analysis of the tapes was conducted and some direct quotes from the interviewees were noted. Once the thematic analysis was completed, the interviewing team got together and reviewed the

emergent findings. This was to ensure that no unnecessary emphasis had been placed on any particular theme and that all themes that the interviewers were aware of had been noted.

Interviews typically lasted about 20 minutes although obviously there was variation around this time depending upon the interviewee.

3 RESULTS

3.1 RECOLLECTION OF THE EVENT

When participants were asked, “What can you remember about the event?” the majority of participants could recall a lot of the presentations in detail. Only 3 participants replied that they could not recall a great deal about the event and one of these participants put that down to “*as so much has happened in the intervening time.*”

Past participants recalled the day as being entertaining and interactive. The speakers were often mentioned positively and some of the delegates had been in touch with the presenters after the event.

“Some very interesting speakers. I recall the speakers very well.”

“Really, really good day. It was so good I have recommended 2 other members of our staff go on a similar event going on in the North West some time this year.”

The demonstrations in the break out groups were often recalled in detail as was the difference in perception in what constituted a ‘good surface’ when the participants were asked to assess a range of flooring before and after the event.

“What really hit home to me was how we ...er... Before we actually went through the whole day we were asked to test out ...qualities of various different surfaces and what we thought their adhesive qualities were and do you know? I remember marking it how I thought it should be marked and then when it came to the end of the course, the difference was remarkable. What you thought at the beginning...at the end, it wasn’t.”

Specific issues recalled from the event presentations include:

- Good quality presenters and entertaining presentations
- The breakout groups
- Different floorings and their slip potential
“The one that really hit me was the talk about cohesion [coefficient of friction]”
- Different methods and availability of equipment for measuring slip resistance including specific references to surface roughness and Kenny (an adopted name for a surface micro-roughness meter) and the pendulum
- The need to measure/understand slip resistance correctly
“...learnt a lot of things, not just about problems with the flooring and surfaces, but the importance of testing them properly and of course... testing them improperly.”
- The reduction in slip resistance with addition of contaminants, particularly water
- The need for an effective cleaning regime and benefits of drying after spills, not just mopping
- Footwear trials for prison staff
- Ways to reduce risk
- Case studies backed up by photographs
- Legal obligations

Many of the comments showed that participants put the talks into the context of their organisations and lives.

“Suddenly aware of the dangers in our own organisation because we were just unaware of the suitability of many types of floors in our organisation.”

“I also remember it has influenced me to change my bathroom tiles!!”

3.2 MOST AND LEAST USEFUL ASPECTS OF THE EVENT

3.2.1 Most Useful Aspects of the Event:

When asked which parts of the event were the most useful, nearly all the participants said, *“all of it”* and then quantified this with examples of what they had found the most useful and why. In general, the prison service delegates were particularly interested in the footwear trial. Other participants reported the following areas to have been the most useful to them:

- The break out groups/practical demonstrations
- Measurement techniques
- The effects of contamination
- The opportunity to focus on one area and discuss the issue with colleagues
- The resource pack
- The availability of more suitable footwear/flooring/measuring techniques
- Importance of good cleaning methods
- Case studies.

Again, only one person reported the event was so long ago that they couldn't remember.

3.2.2 Least Useful Aspects of the Event:

When asked, “Which parts did you find the least useful?” the vast majority of delegates reported that there was nothing in the event that was not useful.

“I don't think there was anything that wasn't useful.”

“All quite relevant.”

“All very useful and could adapt it to all my sort of work areas.”

“I don't think that any of it was not useful... There wasn't anything that wasn't.”

“All good information as one of our most prolific accident causations.”

However, a minority of delegates did report some areas being of less use to them than others. Some examples of parts of the event that were reported to be less useful were: the inspector's talk at the beginning, a section on shoes (it had been seen before) and details of the SAT (although these examples have only been reported by one or two delegates each).

One participant felt that it was not useful to recommend the use of the pendulum when its availability is so limited.

Other delegates felt that they would prefer a stronger steer (i.e. being told which shoes/flooring was good/bad rather than characteristics) but it was generally recognised that HSE could not be seen to endorse specific products.

A minority of delegates felt that whilst the talks were interesting they would have limited powers to change the floors or design of their buildings so reported presentations relating to these as being the least useful.

One person felt that, whilst the talks were interesting, there still wasn't a lot that could be done about, the issues of slips and trips as people would always run and mess about and the issue was related to ignorance or stupidity. It was suggested that the event could have more information on influencing people's attitudes.

It should be noted though, that for nearly every example that was reported as being least useful, someone else reported it as being useful. This may have implications for targeting the presentations to audiences, although it is very unlikely that all delegates will find all information useful all of the time.

3.3 MAIN MESSAGES

When the participants were asked what they thought the main messages from the event were, a range of responses were reported:

- That slips and trips are manageable and that small changes can result in big rewards.
- Effects of contaminants (including very little water required for a slip on some floors)
- Importance of cleaning up spillages
- Economic and human costs of slips and trips
- Interaction of choice of flooring, cleaning processes, chemicals used and contaminants.
- That slips and trips are manageable and can be reduced
- Barriers and matting
- Management and awareness of flooring
- Appropriate use of warning hazards signs
- Good housekeeping
- Slips and trips aren't a laughing matter
- Footwear
- Proactive action rather than reactive action after an incident
- That one floor doesn't fit all
- That the use of the flooring and the environment should be considered

The range of responses may reflect the personalising of the presentations to the target audience or may reflect the aspect of the event that had the most impact on the delegate. No one reported that there were no main messages or that they couldn't remember the main message.

Some delegates could not distinguish the main message of the events from 'general knowledge', but they were in the minority.

Below are a selection of comments that reflect some of the range of responses.

“Proper prior planning prevents poor performance.”

“Responsibility as a train officer to make sure flooring still does its job long after it has been made, if you know what I mean.”

“The actual dangers of slips and trips and how we take it so blasé.”

3.4 HANDOUTS FROM THE EVENT

The handouts were generally perceived as being useful and were reported to have been used since the event in the workplace by the majority of delegates either in cascade briefings, training or for information. Specific examples were given of cascade talks when delegates return to the work place and used the presentations and materials from the event to disseminate information to colleagues. A minority of delegates (9) couldn't remember the handouts or whether they were of use. One past attendee has referred to the handouts during an accident investigation to show the flooring was not suitable for the location, environment and use.

“They were excellent.”

“Very good actually.”

“Off your presentations and everything, we actually put together a power point presentation to, to, deliver to our cleaning staff. We haven't done everyone at the moment because it hasn't been possible to do everybody, but we are working our way through it to get through all the cleaning staff.”

“Excellent, I brought extra ones back and given them out to other people who were also working in risk assessment and such like, no they were very good and very comprehensive as well.”

Past delegates reported that the CD was very useful and is still used. One delegate who couldn't remember the handouts said he had put them into the central library at work.

“They were quite good, but what was even more better is when they sent through the presentation CD.”

One delegate found the handouts useful, but was uncomfortable with the choice of examples of prosecutions.

“Excellent with the exception of one thing. That was, the company I work for were actually in there as we got prosecuted. That was a bit embarrassing.”

3.5 UNDERSTANDING AND AWARENESS

All respondents reported that the event had improved their awareness or understanding of the issues. There seems to be a perception amongst delegates that prior to attending the event they were confident they knew enough about slips and trips to adequately control the risk in the work place. However, when interviewed, the majority of participants felt they may have previously held a simplified view of slips and trips and the event had improved their understanding of the issues considerably, making them aware of risk factors and controls that they had previously been unaware of.

“First one really opened my eyes.”

“Has certainly highlighted it.”

“Yes, I have really let rip about it and told designers they know as much about it and have about as much use as a chocolate fireguard.”

“I suppose it did, yeah, I suppose I didn’t take it too much seriously until actually saw the photographs of that nurse and what happened to her leg.”

“Aware all the time but it made others more aware when we came back because we did push it forwards as something to be aware of and er, er think that did work.”

“Yes, we have been mindful of eliminating STF risks.”

“Most informative event, training event, I have been on in many years”

“..Useful networks created as well and I would say it (awareness) stems from that.”

The majority of past delegates reported being more enthusiastic about slips and trips after the event. However, a common response was that they were *“not more enthusiastic but more equipped”*, *“... weren’t necessarily more enthusiastic but... had been given more information”* to tackle the problems. Some of the delegates reported they were already enthusiastic as they were health and safety professionals, but the event had given them the necessary information to have an impact on slips and trips in their workplace. One delegate reported being more enthusiastic but having this enthusiasm *“knocked out of him”* on his return to work. This aspect will be discussed in more detail under barriers.

“Wouldn’t say enthusiastic, it has broadened my awareness and it is something that moved up my agenda.”

“Do you know it has [made me more enthusiastic]? It is very sad isn’t it?”

3.6 PERCEPTION OF SLIPS AND TRIPS FOLLOWING THE EVENT

When asked if the event had changed the way that delegates viewed slips and trips, opinions were divided. However, the majority of respondents who reported that the event hadn’t changed the way they view slips and trips, reported that the event had given them food for thought on how they might tackle the problem, or that it provided more information to *“challenge people with”*.

“Probably not the way I viewed it cause I realised it was a serious issues but it sort of gives you the push you needed to become a bit more enthusiastic and sort of include it more in inspections and stuff like that.”

“I’ve always viewed them as a hazard, I just didn’t realise what a hazard it is.”

“Without a doubt, yes.”

“Not just people needing to be more careful and so on.”

“Just opened my eyes to what is out there.”

“We actually had accidents and they were down to issues being addressed during the course.”

“Yes. How much the surface of the floor contributes to slips and trips even though you have specified particular flooring how after 6 months of use, the characteristics of the floor can totally change. So it is something, which we have - a high number of footfall around our areas and the flooring that was originally specified 10 years ago er again is it up to the job now? So it brought that up on my radar.”

3.7 HISTORICAL APPROACH TO SLIPS AND TRIPS

Very mixed responses were provided when asked, what historically their company did in relation to slips and trips. Responses ranged from “*paid out any claims without arguing*” and “*suffer the consequences There were procedures in place but nobody took any notice*” to accident investigation, “*cleaned the floor*” and monitoring accident trends. Some delegates reported consideration of surfaces prior to the event, following guidance (NHS) for flooring requirements. A lot of delegates reported that prior to the roadshow, all incidents were investigated and remedial measures put in place where possible but that the main emphasis on managing slips trips and falls was reactive rather than proactive. Some places had policies in place e.g. spill policies, but these examples were in the minority.

One company had assessed the slip resistance of flooring using a Tortus (one of the methods of determining slip resistance of flooring that is discouraged in contaminated conditions by the roadshow as it can give inaccurate results).

The most common response was monitoring accident trends and investigating accidents.

“Really not a lot to be quite truthful.”

“Prior to the event, nothing proactive.”

“...but not even sure if sure whether they (STFs) were regarded (within his organisation) as being RIDDOR reportable and this was down to an earlier experience, maybe 8 or 10 years ago where the issue was raised with HSE and they said they weren’t interested.”

“We had a serious accident, much around that time, where a woman tripped over a grate which had been highlighted with yellow paint and had the black and yellow hazard tape, but she still tripped over it and it cost us a few, a few you know, it is not just the money but it cost a fair few quid. Unfortunately now if you highlight something, you know it is a hazard so you have to do something about it so instead of just putting paint on it I believe things are now getting done... So before, you would see something....you know what its like, you just put a bit of yellow paint on it...so yeah, we are now much more immediate.”

3.8 CHANGES MADE AFTER THE EVENT

Approximately eight in ten of the respondents reported that they had made changes in their workplace after attending the event. Of these, at least one in four reported making few changes, which might include communications, introductions of new slip policies or changing physical properties in their environment. About half reported making lots of changes, which often included, communications, physical changes to the work place, other interventions and purchasing of surface roughness measuring kit. About one in five past delegates reported little or no change however a significant proportion of people who reported making little or no change in their organisation were from the prison service and were awaiting the results of the national foot wear trial to implement slip resistant shoes as a control. Other respondents who fell into this category either thought that they were already doing everything they could to address and control the risk so no further change was necessary, or cited cost as the reason they couldn’t make the changes they wanted to within their work place.

The range of changes made was large ranging from:

- Communication of the issues/awareness raising, training,
- Installation of entrance matting,

- Involvement in specification of new flooring,
- New anti slip footwear purchased,
- Influencing future procurement of floors,
- Changing cleaning regimes (introduction of dry mopping/cleaning completed over night rather than at peak times),
- Introductions of near miss policies,
- Better reporting procedures,
- Purchasing and use of the pendulum and Kenny (sometimes done jointly through or individually by a company) following the event; and
- Introduction of spill stations.

Changes made ranged from implementing one of these measures to several of them e.g. One delegate reported introducing a traffic management policy, risk assessments, changing flooring, publication of a newsletter to all staff which included information on footwear, buying slip resistant footwear for kitchen and prison staff, using the SAT and buying a Kenny. Only one company reported they were already doing everything prior to the event. Other delegates reported rolling programmes of changing flooring (because of cost issues). Another past attendee purchased a Kenny, had a cup and mug amnesty where they replaced cups and mugs with thermal mugs with integral lids to reduce slips and trips, trialling a micro fibre mopping system instead of wet mopping, had handed out fact sheets about slip and trips and developed a slips trips and falls policy for staff and visitors as well as patients.

Other examples of changes made after the event include:

“...Poor slip resistance of chequer plate stair cases. That really was an eye opener as historically we have always thought they were fairly safe. Obviously what we did was prioritise all chequer stair plates in the establishment in Wales and we spent a fair amount of money on putting anti-slip coating on the worst performers and most high-risk areas. That’s internal and external chequered plate stairs cases. There I think we identified the most high-risk areas and done these. There are a number of other risk areas that follow on from that which we haven’t done.”

“I went out and bought a Kenny.”

“...because it does reduce the risk if you are doing it (cleaning) at night rather than the day as there is a lot more people walking around.”

“Yes, we have done more proactive things, so we’ve put spill stations..on every 20/30m. There is an emergency response team with bleeps, so if there is a spill, they can go and clear it up.”

“We have trials for the final station up on one of the unused platforms, they put different tiles down, different bits of terrazzo, so we have been trialling that for final stations, which one has the best adhesion and coefficient of friction.”

3.9 WHAT WAS IT ABOUT THE EVENT THAT ENCOURAGED THE CHANGES?

What motivated people to make the changes to reduce slips and trip risks in their work places seems very personal to the individual. Some delegates reported that the case studies were the main driver as they had a big impact on them, especially if the case studies were directly relevant to their organisation.

One delegate reported that the photo of chip pan burns had a big impact on him, as there are catering facilities on site. He reported that, as a result of seeing this talk, he has done a lot of training to catering staff using the training material given at the event. He also contacted the speakers to request more posters.

Other people reported that the fact HSE had given the events, and identified it, as a priority area, was the main driver for change. This 'threat' of HSE was also used when the individual returned back to the work place to force changes through. Fear of enforcement if compliance wasn't achieved was also sometimes related to this. A minority of the delegates were of the impression that they were more likely to have an inspection as they had attended the roadshow and the expectation would be that they should have made changes after attending.

“Hearing that expert advice from the HSE, had I gone to a trade organisation or something like that, they would have been promoting a particular product etc whereas it was useful to see the types of equipment used in testing and also get really in depth understanding of the micro environment and how water and liquids spread on surfaces etc.”

Another motivator for change seems to be the new information that the roadshows conveyed, and that delegates previously thought they were working to best practice but were actually not aware of some of the underlying reasons for slips trips and falls which were not being addressed.

“Before were weren't probably, we were aware of it but we weren't taking too much notice of the fact that there was equipment on the market to check slipperiness and although we might have fallen in and initially complied, after a couple of years it wasn't complying (talking about changing properties of flooring over time).”

In many cases, the roadshow acted as the push needed to actually do something about slips, trips and falls and gave people ideas they had not previously thought of. The event was reported as showing a way forward. Respondents were often encouraged by the fact that many potential risk controls did not have large monetary implications but could impact on the reduction of slips and trips in the workplace and this also appeared to motivate them to make change. Finally, a number of people reported the enthusiasm of the speakers, the information imparted and the fact they had enjoyed the roadshow as the reason they had felt motivated to make the changes.

“ The way it was presented, lighthearted, made it so much more memorable than stats would be.”

“I went there to be honest thinking STFs not exactly the most exciting topic to spend the whole day discussing but the way it was presented on the day, it was like really interesting and I was quite surprised by that and obviously given the like the number of accidents caused by STFs etc when you went back, you felt empowered to actually do something about it more effectively if you know what I mean, It gives you more enthusiasm. It is the kick up the backside to go and do something.”

3.10 EFFECTIVE CHANGES?

No interviewees said that the changes they had made had been ineffective. Some companies (in particular those who had attended the event in the last year or so) reported that it was still too early to see if any real reduction had been achieved. It is therefore possible that they may later find that changes made prove to be ineffective. However, the majority of companies reported that there had been an improvement as a result of introducing changes (although this was

sometimes based on a general feeling rather than tangible evidence such as accident statistics). A number of companies reported a drop in accidents after implementing changes, others said, *“only time will tell”*. A number of work places reported a drop in claims.

“Touch wood yes, noticeable improvement on those statistics.”

“Yes, I think we have improved things, not to say never been more accidents after it, but we attach more importance to it.”

3.11 WOULD CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE IF YOU HADN'T ATTENDED THE EVENT?

There was a roughly even split between the people who reported they would have made the changes anyway and those who said they wouldn't have made the changes. Of the delegates who reported that they probably would have made the changes had they not attended the events, there was often a caveat saying that the changes may not have been as effective, timely or carried out to the same extent.

“I don't know, probably not the cleaning side of things.”

“Probably not, no... I wouldn't have given it a thought, in amongst with everything else it was just a bit of an eye opener that event.”

“This has been a really good way of getting lots of information from the experts.”

“Certainly not.”

“I would have tried but I wouldn't have had the kind of information and I can quote the fact I have just been on this and...we did have an incident where there was an accident and I though the paving was very slippery [and others did] but when the estates personnel went out they went out in safety boots of course and came back saying there wasn't a problem and I was able to use the information I had to point it out to them. It was on a slope, it was a compound slope and the coefficient of friction when wet was exceedingly low therefore the probability of having an accident was very high. I wouldn't have had that information before.”

3.12 FUTURE PLANS TO ADDRESS SLIPS AND TRIPS

The majority of people reported that reducing the risk of slips and trips was an on-going issue so further changes would be made as and when resource was available and that the area of slips and trips would always require further action.

“It's a constant battle.”

Approximately one fifth of the delegates felt, that having made changes, they had done all they could. As a result they had no further plans to address slips and trips.

“I shall continue to push the estate department to ensure we have decent flooring. We are going to be building a new hospital on this site over the coming years, so there is a key function there, but I think also, it is a case of me and I am doing this and will do more in the future, is in assisting mangers in starting up H&S inspections in the their areas...”

3.13 HOW WELL DOES YOUR ORGANISATION NOW MANAGE THE RISK FROM SLIPS AND TRIPS

When asked how well delegates thought their organisations managed the risks from slips and trips, the responses to this question fell broadly into three categories, ‘better than we did’, ‘reasonably well’ and ‘as best we can’ (usually within financial constraints).

“Better than we did before.”

“Best as we can.”

“Better than we did before, but not good enough yet.”

“A lot down to funding and things like that but overall, fairly well and we have reduced our STF’s over the last 12 months.”

3.14 BARRIERS PREVENTING ACTION

Barriers that prevented acting upon information received were almost always down to resources, competing demands, financial time and staffing. Closely related to this was the lack of support from senior and middle managers. This was most commonly reported within the prison service. A large number of delegates suggested compelling governors and senior managers to attend the events, as this would be the only way that changes could be made. A number of delegates reported that one of the reasons that little change was made within the prison service was because governors “hide behind crown immunity”. This refers to the respondent’s perception that governors didn’t proactively act on slips and trips, as they wouldn’t be prosecuted in the event of an accident as they were civil servants and therefore couldn’t be prosecuted.

“Only funding and senior management commitment.” Laughs.

“Money of course, can only get bits of it sorted rather than the whole thing, but you just keep chipping away at it don’t you?”

“Cost. It is as simple as that.”

Staff attitudes were usually reported as being good, with good safety cultures reported in companies where staff were willing to adopt new policies and take personal responsibility for slips and trips, e.g. clean up a spill whether they spilt it or not. However, there were examples where staff attitudes were reported as being problematic with some staff being less willing to change or a lack of perception of the consequences of a slip or trip. In these cases additional information on changing and influencing attitudes may be useful. Examples were given where staff did not perceive the consequence of a slip or trip as being particularly serious. Hence any action was seen as dis-proportionate to the risk and as a result staff take up for initiatives was reported as being reluctant.

However, a significant proportion of the delegates reported no barriers to acting on the information received.

3.15 LONG TERM BARRIERS TO CHANGE

As in the previous section the main Long-term barriers to change were reported to be financial constraints and workplace culture. Workplace culture includes the attitudes of senior and middle

management as well as attitudes of other staff. The perception of consequences of a slip or trip accident in the work place were reported to be low in some companies and so culture was reported as a long term barrier. Examples were provided where the lack of perception of risk manifests itself in people not taking personal responsibility for spillages despite campaigns to encourage cleaning up of spills regardless of who saw or spilt it. Examples of people not wearing appropriate footwear were also given.

“Because the injuries are more often than not minor for us, in other words, there is no falls from height, um people tend to regard them as minor accidents and an annoyance rather than something to be avoided.”

“We have miles of paving at the university and it is difficult to manage, particularly icy pavings, but in the South East of England that is quite rare so trying to persuade people, well actually no, we need a bit more of a policy here than just.. getting a couple of guys to go out and throw salt around and gradually work their way out around campus, cause even if they start early by the time they get round and gradually work their way around campus, cause even if they start early by the time they get round to some of it there is exposed paving but it is a resource issue.”

The majority of companies who reported workplace culture to be an issue were not sure how to address this problem other than continued awareness raising within the organisation. It may be that this is an area that could help companies with.

“How the information and messages are cascaded down to the people who need to implement change. I would say that is the most difficult thing really.” It was also reported by a number of companies that changing perceptions was difficult when lack of action to address slips and trips had previously not been thought as having severe consequences for individuals.

“Financial, cultural, because the NHS is a bit of a beast in itself and we have had crown immunity for so long, changing the culture in the NHS is quite challenging.”

Other long-term barriers to change were reported to be architectural design and staff resource and knowledge management.

The lack of support from management was often reported as being manifested in a lack of financial support for initiatives to reduce slips and trips in the work place. It was reported by a number of respondents that the message that money could be saved by addressing slip and trip risks was not reaching managers so resource (financial, time and staff) was not made available to introduce interventions.

“Persuading people to spend to save.”

“Time, people, money, resources, the usual.”

Examples were also given where senior management failed to appreciate what constitutes a slip hazard and so, for example, may insist on polished floors for appearances sake.

“[Everything comes out of London] ...Trying to explain to idiots in London that no, you can't have a sheer floor no more and no we don't polish them anymore and they want to know why...Need the same thing for idiot architects that design prison buildings.”

Finally, some respondents indicated that knowledge management posed a long-term barrier to change; when people moved on their knowledge on slips and trips was lost, or training was

perceived to be wasted, as it was felt that no sooner were people trained then they left and the training had to begin again.

“Might educate 1 group of staff and they may be extremely good but 6 months later, that whole staff group has now changed completely...so if you haven’t got the on-going commitment and awareness of people who are dealing with these different problems then you have to go back and do it all again.”

However, some participants (approximately one tenth of those that responded) reported that there were no barriers.

3.16 ADDRESSING BARRIERS

As a majority of interviewees reported that financial constraints were the main barrier to addressing slip trip and fall hazards, it was not felt that HSE could help with this.

However, respondents did suggest a number of other ways that HSE could assist them with tackling other barriers. Ideas included the opportunity for interviewees and colleagues to attend the roadshow again, to a direct point of contact for information when required rather than having to sift through guidance, to promulgation of the message to other sectors, particularly to designers and architects to reduce inherent problems with new buildings, better liaison with floor manufacturers to ensure floors that are fit for purpose, more literature and training courses, continuing to raise the profile of slips and trips, getting the information through to the budget holders, more case studies on the costs of slips and trips (both economic and human). Targeting managers for attendance on these events was mentioned by a number of delegates, as were requests to re-attend the events to ‘keep up to date’. Giving awards for good practice as well as serving notices was also suggested as a way of encouraging change.

Typical comments included:

“Would do me good to do the course again.”

“Need to preach to the unconverted.”

“Anything really to keep it in the minds of staff.”

“I use the HSE website, most days.”

“Posters from time to time so they know it is not just you nagging away if you’ve got nice official posters.”

“Organisations like the public sector only have a short corporate memory if that makes sense. People change, people come, people move and it needs to be re-addressed and thought about.”

3.17 MORE INFORMATION TO ADDRESS SLIPS AND TRIPS?

Opinion was split 50/50 on the question of whether more information on slips or trip reduction was needed. Approximately half of the interviewees felt they had enough information and knew where to find it, whilst the other half would welcome more information. Of the half that felt they had enough information, the majority reported regularly using the HSE website and e-mail alert service and felt that they were up to date and had enough information to allow them to

tackle slips and trips confidently. Of the delegates who would like more information, the majority of them requested more roadshows so that other people in their companies could have the opportunity to attend and so that different groups of people (e.g. management, estates) could also attend. Some past participants also requested information in the form of leaflets and posters that could be used to cascade the message in their work place. More case studies and accident statistics were also requested to both cascade the message and to use for benchmarking purposes. Some delegates requested e-mail updates to inform them of changes in guidance and regulations and to keep them up to date with new footwear, flooring and research findings. Guidance was also mentioned as something that would focus senior management in a way that general information wouldn't achieve. Finally, a small number of participants used this opportunity to ask for standardised information/guidance to be given to manufacturers, so that they could be clearer that what they were buying would be slip resistant. .

A number of delegates had made further contact with the speakers following the events and used HSL to measure the slip resistance of flooring. As mentioned previously, some delegates would welcome the opportunity to go on a refresher course and a time line of 12 – 18 months after the event was suggested.

A number of delegates requested more information on tripping and pointed out that the roadshow was predominantly concerned with slips.

“...but perhaps in industries like ours where we have got people working track side then look maybe more at the tripping..”

3.18 IMPROVING THE EVENT

When asked how the event could be improved the majority of interviewees felt that the event couldn't be improved. Of those that thought it could be improved suggestions included; more information on tripping, a survey of interviewees to determine their needs prior to the event, increasing attendance of budget holders and planners, specifying flooring and shoes suitable for certain events, more frequent events held more locally, sector specific training events, examples of what works and cost benefits and a follow up event.

“only one way I could imagine....HSE come into each trust with Pendulums...”

“All the people I've been on it with have been impressed with it...We had an area meeting since then and its been discussed at the meeting.”

“To be honest, it was fairly well structured.”

3.19 HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU THINK SLIPS AND TRIPS ARE COMPARED TO OTHER HAZARDS

The vast majority of past delegates reported that slips and trips were equal to other health and safety issues or at the top of the list. *“They are high up the scale”*; *“They are one of our major problems”*, *“God, I think it is the top.”*, *“After attending realising they are as important as everything else.”*, *“It is our biggest risk so it is out number one priority.”*, *“A lot are preventable and people are injuring themselves when it shouldn't be happening.”*.

The NHS reported manual handling and needle stick injuries as more severe problems but that slips and trips were in the top three.

3.20 SHOULD HSE BE LOOKING AT SLIPS AND TRIPS?

Nearly all delegates thought that HSE should be looking at slips and trips as compared to other hazards *“If HSE didn’t, who would?”*. The remaining interviewees felt that HSE involvement should be proportionate to the risk or *“not more specifically than other hazards...I think HSE have done as much as they can”*.

3.21 SHOULD HSE BE INVOLVED IN THESE ROADSHOWS?

When asked if HSE should be involved in the events all but one delegate, who didn’t have a strong opinion one way or the other, felt that it was important for HSE to be involved, as it lent weight and credibility to the event, meant the information was independent, cheap and let the attendees know which issues were likely to be enforced. It was also reported that the events allowed people to see that *“HSE are real people”*.

Respondents also reported using HSE as a ‘stick’ to encourage compliance and force through changes in the work place. This would not be possible if the events were run independently. It was suggested by a number of participants that if HSE followed up attendance at the roadshows, either by an inspection visit or a follow up event to discuss changes made in the work place implemented since the roadshow, more changes may result.

“Reinforced the need to do more and using the HSE the word health and safety executive, which I do quite often, urm, actually, not instils fear in people, but makes people kind of sit up and think well, actually he has been on an HSE roadshow, they are going to be targeting us and we need to sort it out, so I always use that as a bit of a stick sometimes rather than a carrot.”

“oh, not half, yeah.”

“Gives an enormous amount of credibility to it...impartiality.”

“Adds weight to just another training course.”

“Can see that HSE are real people.”

“I haven’t been to many HSE run events in the past, but if they are all like that, to that standard, I would certainly go again and would encourage my colleagues to go to the event.”

“Oh yes, definitely.”

*“Oh yeah, it was a bl**dy eye opener for everybody. I mean everybody who went there thought it was absolutely brilliant.”*

“They are the enforcing authority.”

“I just hope it doesn’t sort of die and die off and revisions keep coming out so er just keep the communication open on the subject.”

“Yes. It elevates the subject to that higher level on the agenda. We all have huge agendas ranging from, oh I don’t know, stress, manual handling to work our way through and if you are not careful STF fall off the end because it is seen as a minor thing.”

3.22 FURTHER COMMENTS

When asked if they would like to add any further comments, the majority of delegates took the opportunity to reinforce how much they had enjoyed the event and how useful they had found it. Other responses varied with comments such as, the evaluation should have taken place earlier when it was still in the delegate's head; others took the opportunity to ask what was coming up in the areas of slips and trips or suggestions for follow ups to keep the momentum going.

"It was two years ago, I just can't remember."

"I found it extremely useful and was very impressed with it."

Just it was a very, very useful event, I enjoyed it... Good venue. It was a very useful day...and the style of presentations were good as well."

"I used to think there wasn't a decent speaker that works for the HSE, I don't think that now."

"We just... built a new part of the hospital, up on our second site. Yesterday I've been told about people who have fallen on this new flooring.... fitted by water and it is probable that this flooring would fail the Pendulum test and whatever, so I will be writing off a bit of a report this afternoon, and by pure coincidence, to key people to say we have got to extend the carpeted area of this entrance to absorb the water so the wet tiles don't become wet. But I think really when it comes to putting down flooring erm... particularly in new builds, we have got to ensure the architects and designers are aware of the requirements of the HSE. If you run any further events like this, please contact me."

"I don't think I have ever been to something for a whole day and come away sort of like oh that was really good, cause normally it is like yeah, the 1st bit was good and the last bit but I missed the middle as I was asleep."

*"It didn't cost a lot to get the ball rolling on it, alright, Kenny cost about £800 quid but other than that, it was just sitting down there and being a bit of a nosey bu** er, you know, checking all the plans for all the new builds, seeing what was changing..yeah, well don't put that in there, change that for that, for practically nil cost, just for a day out with HSE on that thing and except for Kenny it didn't cosy us a blind bit of anything."*

"Keep the same guys on."

*"All the people who were doing the talks were excellent. They put it across in a very, very, easy way. They weren't talking jargon and all that c**p most people do. They were very approachable. It was just a very well run day."*

"Went to 1 training event with apprehension but came away very confidant and enlightened about what we had been told."

"Send questionnaires out a damn sight sooner."

3.23 COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO THE NHS

In general, the people attending on behalf of the NHS reported the majority of their slips trips and falls occurring as a result of patient falls and so wanted more advice about patient safety rather than information about the safety of their staff and safety of the public on their site.

Comments included the fact that the Roadshow didn't cover slips and trips as a result of elderly people or patients with special needs.

“For NHS, the people related stuff was missing.”

However, it is possible that this was addressed to some extent as at a later event one of the main messages received was reported as being:

“There is a semi quantitative approach to solving this problem and its about making people more aware of such issues as, one thing that came up, that any normal healthy human being could walk and avoid a trip hazard of about 20mm but then if you have children or older people involved, it might be 9 (mm) so when looking and ST&F need to look at those factors.”

Cost was the main barrier to change in hospitals and attendees saw themselves as competing for funds that could take money away from operations to address slips and trips hazards.

When asked if they thought changes had been effective one respondent replied:

“Think they are. We still have STFs, we probably always will. We will only make any real improvements with long-term investments. Just to give you an example on that. Our entrance matting was put in 25 years ago when the hospital was built and it is totally inadequate. Now, we are fighting for money like every other department is in hospitals to try and get some bigger better entrance mats and we will over time, but I can't expect the trust to put in a few hundred thousand pounds and cancel operations...certainly HSE/HSL gave us the information to be able to do that over a long period of time.”

4 DISCUSSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The roadshows do seem to promote long-term changes in organisations. The extent to which these changes are directly attributable to the roadshow varies but the efficacy of any changes made is very likely to be increased after attendance at a roadshow. However, a large number of attendees directly attributed changes to reduce slip and trip risks in the work place as a result of attending the event.

The roadshow events serve to raise awareness of slips and trips, and also give manageable ways to tackle slips and trips in the work place. People who previously thought they understood and were managing slips trips and falls realised there was more that they could be doing. This type of intervention appears to lend itself to encouraging more substantial long term change as it not only raises awareness, but also gives people the necessary tools to identify risk factors for slips and trips (over and above ‘good house keeping’) and offers useable achievable controls that are not expensive (e.g. dry mopping).

Past delegates generally commented on the high quality of the presentations and speakers, and found the events useful, entertaining and interesting. These statements were often unprompted and reiterated throughout the phone conversation. The speakers were also often the first thing that was recollected when asked, “What can you remember about the event?” It is very probable that the success of the roadshow is in part a result of the entertaining speakers and format. A number of people noted that they would usually “fall asleep” during this type of presentation, however, the interactive nature of the event and the humour that was injected into it as well as the novel ideas being introduced seem to have enthused and prompted action by the participants after the event. It is therefore quite difficult to determine whether the success of the roadshows is down to the individual speakers or the format in general. However, aspects of the event not specifically related to the speakers such as the interactive nature of the event was commented on as being useful. It is probable that if the format of the event is kept light hearted and practical, whilst conveying a serious message, that the event will continue to be successful even if other speakers are used. This format seems to engage stakeholders and provide them with the tools they need to tackle slips and trips, going one-step further than raising awareness.

Level of recall does not seem to be dependent upon the time elapsed since attending the event – some who attended a number of years ago could remember it clearly but others who attended within a year of the evaluation year struggled to recall specifics. Recall is possibly dependent on relevance to the individual and opportunity to put the event into practice in their workplaces.

Influencing workplace behaviour, culture and attitudes were also reported as being problematic. The inclusion of a segment in roadshows on influencing behaviour, cascading information and targeting people at all levels in the organisation may further increase slips and trips risk reduction in the work place.

Interviewees expressed a preference for refresher roadshows and the opportunity for colleagues to attend the event. The provision of more information may help further reduce the risk of slips and trips in the work place. A large number of people reported accessing and using the HSE website, so this may be a useful way to disseminate information without overloading people who feel they have enough information.

The main barrier to making effective changes in the work place is financial. It is not perceived by the interviewees that this is something HSE can help with. However, if HSE can provide more case studies on economic cost to companies in addition to targeting budget holders as well

as H&S advisors, it is possible that a business case for safety could be made to release funds in some instances.

The fact that HSE was involved in the events resulted in more people attending the event than if they were privately run, as well as more importance being attached to the event. It is likely that, if HSE followed up some of the companies after an event and that this possibility was announced at the roadshow, more changes would be made. The reason for this is the reported perception by the interviewees that HSE could be used as a 'stick' to encourage change in the workplace which may be otherwise difficult to achieve. However, this follow up action may be difficult given the demands on inspectors.

There was a marked change in perception in the majority of people who had attended the event with regards to what they thought constituted a slips hazard. People seem aware of the obvious slip and trip hazards, e.g. trailing cables, but reported this event to open their eyes to new risk reduction methods they had not previously been aware of. On the whole, people were better informed when they left the event on slip risks and were therefore better armed to reduce the risks in the work place. This was demonstrated a number of times where people thought they had slip resistant flooring but had subsequently found this not to be the case. In many cases, the roadshow acted as the push they needed to actually do something about slips, trips and falls and gave people ideas they had not previously thought of, many relatively cheap. When potential shortfalls were pointed out, this may have been the first time they were aware of the issues.

Although the majority of attendees felt that tackling slips and trips was an ongoing issue some of the delegates felt that having made changes, they had done all they could so had no further plans to address slips and trips. It may be that refresher courses or other ways to continuously engage participants such as a regular newsletter or emails to pass on new ideas as and when they become available, will result in more continual changes.

It is suggested (as and when information becomes available) that tripping is covered in more depth in the roadshow as a number of delegates found this area to be lacking.

In general, the findings are positive in that the event was well received and there is evidence from nearly all respondents that changes have been made in the work place following attendance at the roadshow. However, HSE's objective to influence large numbers of workplaces may not be fully met using this format as, currently, only relatively small numbers of people are reached through the roadshows. The relatively small number of people reached should be weighed against the fact that people's perceptions and the way they viewed slips and trips were significantly changed after attending the roadshow and the speed of changes and the extent of changes made would not have occurred in general, if these delegates had not attended the roadshow. Some of the delegate interviewed had attended the roadshow after the 'Watch Your Step' campaign, which admittedly would have reached a larger target audience. However, the fact that the changes in perceptions, views and physical changes in the work place were made after the roadshow rather than as a result of the awareness raising campaign may indicate that more resource needs to be put into the roadshows to ensure that they can cover a larger audience incorporating people from different backgrounds (seniority in the company as well as job type), rather than in simple awareness raising campaigns. Some of the issues discussed at the roadshow are technical and therefore difficult to convey through posters and written communication. The practical nature of the demonstrations allows the message to be conveyed in a very non-technical way facilitating understanding. It may be that with better targeting of the audience as previously discussed (i.e. not just health and safety personnel) even more changes in the work place will be seen.

Finally, it is worth noting that whilst only one or two attendees from each organisation may attend the event, the extent of some of the changes made are quite far reaching within their organisations. As discussed, examples of campaigns run within the workplace's of past participants included replacement of non-slip flooring and stairs, identification of slip risks through purchasing of appropriate measuring devices etc. These types of interventions on behalf of the duty holders are likely to have far reaching consequences within their organisations.

4.1 LIMITATIONS

Some delegates found it difficult to separate out effects of attending the roadshows from other campaigns or actions that would have taken place anyway. However, when this was probed it became clear that many of the changes would not have occurred to the same extent or in the same time frame had the interviewees not attended the event.

It should be noted that for this evaluation, HSE is effectively evaluating HSE. People external to HSE may not appreciate the impartiality of the Health and Safety Laboratory, although this was explained at the beginning of the interview. This may have influenced some of the responses i.e. people may not have been as open and honest as they would have been if an independent consultancy had been used.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Prior to the event management of slips and trips risks was reactive. After the event, the emphasis has been placed on proactive management of the hazards.

The roadshows are an effective way of raising awareness of slips and trips in workplaces and their effective control.

People were enabled to make effective changes in their work place to reduce risk levels after attending the roadshows.

The main barriers people face in trying to make changes to reduce the risk of slips and trips are constraints on finance, resource lack of management support and competing demands.

More information on influencing behaviour and culture may aid further reduction of risk in the work place.

Roadshows targeted at management, designers, facility managers and cleaning contractors as well as health and safety representatives may further the reduction of slips and trips risks in the work place.

Follow up events after the roadshows to check progress and give additional technical support where required may be beneficial.

6 APPENDICES

Slips and Trips Training Event Evaluation Questionnaire

Name:
Organisation:
Date attended S&T Training event:

1 Introduction

Hello good morning/afternoon. My name is... and I am from HSL which is the research arm of the Health and Safety Executive. Would it be possible to speak to

If “no” have left organisation

Would it be possible to speak to their successor or someone who might know about the slips and trips training day they went on in....?

If speaking:

Hello. I am ringing about the slips and trips training event you went on in..... at Do you remember attending this event?

The Health and Safety Executive is looking to evaluate the effectiveness of these events and to check if the event was helpful to you and your organisation and if not, how it could be improved. HSE have asked HSL to speak to the people who attended these training events to obtain their views on the information provided on the day, whether you found the day useful and whether you have been able to make any changes in your work place as a result. We are asking for your assistance in this matter. Your participation in this questionnaire will take about XXX minutes and I can run through it now with you over the phone. Would this be convenient?

If “no” too busy etc

Could I arrange a time more suitable to speak to you?

If still “no”

May I ask the reason why? Your opinions on these slips and trips training events are very much valued by HSE which is why HSL have contacted you. It is important for us to speak with as many past delegates as possible so we can get accurate feedback to make sure the training events are as informative and helpful as possible for future delegates.

If still “no”

That is fine. Thank you for your time.

If “yes”

Thank you. Do you have any questions before we start?

The only people who will have access to your responses are HSE/HSL. When the final report is produced, you will not be identifiable in it.

Would you mind if I tape-recorded this conversation? It just makes it easier for us to listen to you rather than trying to write and listen at the same time?

If o.k. to be recorded, start the tape recording. If don't want to be recorded, don't start recorder and make detailed notes

First of all I just need to get some basic information from you. Is that o.k.?

Role in Organisation:

Type of event attended: TTT (full day)
Half-day event
Large employees and intermediaries

2 Recollection of the event

What can you remember about the event?

Which parts of the event did you find the most useful?

Which parts did you find the least useful?

What were the main messages?

What did you think of the handouts given to you at the training event?

Thinking back, did the event:

Improve your understanding of the issues?

Make you more enthusiastic about tackling slips and trips?

Change the way you view slips and trips? How?

3 Changes in Practice

Historically what did your organisation do with regards to slips and trips (prior to the event)?

Did your organisation make any changes following the event?

If yes:

What has changed?

What was it about the event that encouraged you to make the changes / how exactly did it help?

Do you think these changes have been effective?

Has anything prevented you from acting on the information you received?

Would you have done these things anyway if you hadn't been to the event?

If no:

Why not? What stopped you? What has prevented you from acting on the information you received?

How could future training events of this kind be improved to help you address the issues of slips and trips further?

4 Supporting future changes

How well do you think your organisation now manages the risks from slips and trips?

Do you have plans to (further) address slips and trips in the future?

What problems or challenges do you face?

What do you think are the main barriers to long-term change to address slips and trips in your organisation?

What would help you address these barriers? *PROBE FOR THINGS THAT HSE/HSL COULD DO.*

Do you feel that you need more information to help you address slips and trips?

What could HSE/LA do to help you further (STF)? *PROBE FULLY FOR SUGGESTIONS ABOUT WHAT WE COULD DO TO SUPPORT THEM*

5 Conclusion/slips and trips in general

How important do you think slips and trips are compared to other health and safety issues in your organisation?

Do you think HSE should be looking at slips and trips compared to other hazards?

Do you think it is worthwhile for HSE to be involved in these events?

And to conclude; is there anything else you would like to say about the slips and trips training event?

Case study material:

It is possible that HSE might want to contact you again, with a view to using your organisation as an example case study for good practice in relation to ST&F. Would this be o.k.?

7 REFERENCES

HSE RR375- Evaluation of Slip and Trip Roadshows for Government Departments and Insurance Industry. King's College London (2005).

Evaluation of the HSE slips and trips roadshows

The research consisted of 102 interviews with people who had attended a slips and trips 'roadshow'. The objectives of this work were to establish:

- The extent to which participants have been able to make changes to reduce risk levels since attending a slips and trips roadshow.
- The barriers that participants have faced in trying to make changes.
- How else HSE can support work to reduce risk levels.

This report and the work it describes were funded by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Its contents, including any opinions and/or conclusions expressed, are those of the authors alone and do not necessarily reflect HSE policy.