1 It does not occur by chance: a mediation model of the influence of workers'

- 2 characteristics, work environment factors, and near misses on agricultural
- 3 machinery-related accidents
- 4 Federica Caffaro^a, Margherita Micheletti Cremasco^b, Michele Roccato^c, Eugenio
- 5 Cavallo^a
- 6 ^{*a*} Institute for Agricultural and Earthmoving Machines (IMAMOTER) of the National Research
- 7 Council (CNR) of Italy, Strada delle Cacce 73, 10135 Torino, Italy. Phone: + 39 011 3977720. E-
- 8 mail: f.caffaro@ima.to.cnr.it ORCID: 0000-0003-3911-5924
- 9 ^b Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Torino, Via Accademia Albertina
- 10 13, 10123 Torino, Italy. Phone: + 39 011 6704526. E-mail: margherita.micheletti@unito.it
- 11 ORCID: 0000-0002-5948-7584
- 12 ^c Department of Psychology, University of Torino, Via Verdi 10, 10124 Torino, Italy. Phone: + 39
- 13 011 6702015. E-mail: michele.roccato@unito.it ORCID: 0000-0001-5817-7341
- ¹⁴ ^a Institute for Agricultural and Earthmoving Machines (IMAMOTER) of the National Research
- 15 Council (CNR) of Italy, Strada delle Cacce 73, 10135 Torino, Italy. Phone: + 39 011 3977724. E-
- 16 mail: e.cavallo@ima.to.cnr.it ORCID: 0000-0002-2759-9629
- 17
- 18 Corresponding author: Federica Caffaro, C.N.R. IMAMOTER Institute for Agricultural and
- 19 Earthmoving Machines of the National Research Council of Italy, Strada delle Cacce, 73, 10135
- 20 Torino, Italy; + 39 011 3977720; <u>f.caffaro@ima.to.cnr.it</u>
- 21

22

23 Abstract

24 Agriculture is among the most hazardous productive sectors, and farm machinery is a major 25 source of injury. In the present study, a mediated model was used to test the role played by 26 workers' characteristics, work environment factors, and near misses in predicting agricultural 27 machinery-related accidents in a sample of Italian users (n = 290). Hours worked per week 28 (via the mediation of an adverse work environment) showed a positive association and years 29 of work experience (via the mediation of risk perception) showed a negative association with 30 the probability of being involved in a near miss, which in turn showed a positive association 31 with the probability of being involved in a machinery-related accident. Implications for 32 tailored preventive interventions are discussed.

33

Keywords: agriculture; near miss; occupational accident; risk perception; mediation model

34

35 Introduction

36 With the mining and construction industries, agriculture is one of the three most hazardous 37 productive sectors both in developing and industrialized countries [1], with an incidence rate of 38 fatal accidents that is double the average of all other industries [2]. Based on data collected by the 39 International Labour Organization (ILO) [3], in the EU-15, the incidence of fatal accidents in 40 agriculture in 2005 was 0.8 per 10,000 farm workers. The corresponding incidence rate for the 41 mining and construction industries was 0.5. For the US, the National Safety Council [4] reported that the mean fatality rate for the US agricultural industry from 1992 to 2002 was 2.23 deaths per 42 43 10,000 farm workers, whereas it was 0.39 per 10,000 workers for all US industries. Farm machinery 44 is a major source of injury [5], and the highest number of fatalities involves tractors, mainly because of tractor rollover [6]. In the United States, Carlson et al.[7] reported 9.6 tractor-related 45 injuries/1000 persons/year. A similar picture emerges in European Union countries [8] and 46 47 particularly in Italy, where approximately 2,000 of 31,000 injuries that occurred in the agricultural 48 sector in 2013 involved machinery, and 1,000 were tractor-related injuries [9].

The literature about occupational accidents shows that the occurrence of an accident involves multiple variables related to the individuals and their environment [10]. The same holds true regarding accidents in agriculture [11]. Two different classes of elements have been identified as the main predictors of being a victim of a farm accident: workers' characteristics and work environment factors. In addition to these two classes of risk factors, another powerful predictor of accidents is the so-called *near misses*, i.e., unplanned events that do not result in any injury, illness or damage only because of a fortunate break in the chain of events [12].

56 Workers' characteristics

The main workers' characteristics are socio-demographic variables and those accounting for 57 58 workers' relation with work [13]. Being an older farmer, working long hours, working alone, and 59 operating on a large farm were found to foster the probability of being involved in farm injuries and 60 fatal tractor overturns [14]. Furthermore, having a low risk perception has been shown to increase 61 operators' exposure to occupational risks and accidents [15]. However, inconsistent results have 62 been found in the literature with regard to the factors affecting risk perception, in particular relating 63 to work experience and familiarity with tasks, machinery and equipment. In some studies, 64 experience and familiarity were shown to reduce risk perception [16]. According to these studies, this occurs because familiarity may lead to overconfidence in the use of the devices: the lack of 65 66 accidents in the person's history with the device contributes to the idea that 'I could do this with my 67 eyes shut', thus reducing risk perception and the attention rate and increasing the probability of 68 performing an unsafe behavior that may lead to an accident. For instance, a driver's accurate perception of the lateral tilt angle of a vehicle is an important factor in avoiding situations that may 69 70 potentially lead to a side overturn. Görücü et al. [17], in their study addressing the perception of the 71 lateral tilt angle of agricultural tractors, reported that older and more experienced participants 72 disclosed higher limits of the lateral angle at which they felt uncomfortable and would not have 73 driven the tractor. The result of this perception is depicted by the fatality statistics, which show that

older male operators usually represent a large percentage of tractor overturn victims [18]. Other studies, however, noted the opposite result [19]. According to them, individuals in familiar situations might be more likely to perceive the risks because they are more frequently exposed to the risky situation. This may increase compliance with safety practices and reduce the actual risk of accidents. Consistent with this, the results of an investigation of farmers' attitudes toward agricultural tractor innovations showed that the older the tractor users and the longer they had worked in agriculture, the higher their commitment to safe working conditions [20].

81 Work environment factors

82 Work environment factors represent the second group of predictors of accidents. They account for 83 workload and work organization [11]. Farm work exposes operators to a high workload due to a 84 combination of different factors. Indeed, farmers usually work longer hours, and mostly alone, than 85 workers in other occupations, and they must perform complex and varied tasks. They also handle 86 different machinery that they must care for and maintain; furthermore, their work may be frequently 87 interrupted by mechanical malfunctions – which occur especially in the case of old machinery – and 88 visitors [13]. These adverse working conditions put high external pressure on farmers, increasing 89 their fatigue and probability of being involved in an accident and being injured [21].

90 The near misses

91 Near misses are at the lowest level of the safety pyramid model [22]. they occur more frequently 92 and are smaller in scale than serious accidents, and each major accident is usually preceded by a 93 number of near misses [23]. Near misses have been investigated in different sectors: road and rail 94 traffic [24], plant engineering [25], building safety [26], home safety [27], and healthcare systems 95 [28]. Less is known in the literature about near misses and their determinants in the agricultural and 96 forestry sector than about other safety issues. Some exceptions are represented by the study by 97 Lilley et al. [29], who showed that accidents among forestry workers in New Zealand were 98 associated with having had near-miss injury events, and the literature review on accident prevention

by Lundqvist et al. [30], which included studies investigating near misses as a useful source of information about farm accidents. However, both the abovementioned studies considered near misses for their effects (accidents) rather than their determinants. Wright and Schaaf [24] showed that near misses and accidents substantially share the same determinants, confirming the idea that near misses may be considered a proxy of being exposed to the risk of suffering a more serious accident.

105 Motivations and aims of the present study

106 Many statistics are available worldwide about accidents in the agricultural sector, their incidence, 107 and the characteristics of the injured workers [1]. Less is known, however, about the processes and 108 the relationships between the critical variables leading to an accident. The two different classes of 109 risk elements identified in the literature (workers' characteristics and work environment factors) and 110 their role in predicting the probability of being involved in an accident have systematically been 111 investigated by analyzing survey data with multiple regression models [11,13]. Such models are 112 undoubtedly fruitful. However, they force the researcher to consider all the predictors considered in 113 the study at the same hierarchical level without taking into account that some variables may 114 simultaneously be predictors of some and outcomes of other variables.

115 Regarding this aspect, the review of the literature showed that many variables are involved 116 at different levels in the onset of a farm accident. Experience has an influence on risk perception 117 (though previous results are not consistent regarding the direction of such influence: see 118 McLaughlin et al. [16]; Rogers et al. [19]), and risk perception in turn affects the probability of 119 being involved in occupational accidents [15]. In addition, working for longer hours, alone, and on 120 a large farm has been shown to increase workers' exposure to adverse work environment factors [14]. These are conditions that can trigger near misses [31] and accidents [18]. Therefore, we 121 122 assumed that the processes leading to farm accidents may be more suitably investigated by adopting 123 a mediation model instead of a multiple regression model. In addition, we assumed that the model

tested should include the near misses, which have been reported as important predictors of accidents[12] but nonetheless have been under-investigated in previous studies of accidents in agriculture.

Based on these considerations, the present study aimed to investigate the risk factors for agricultural machinery-related accidents in a sample of Italian users, examining the role played by a) workers' characteristics, b) work environment factors, and c) near misses and adopting a mediated model to test the seven different hypotheses (Hs) described hereafter.

130 Based on Myers and Hendricks [13] and on Hwang et al. [14], we expected working alone 131 (H1), farm size (H2) and working hours (H3) to show a positive association with the exposure to 132 adverse work environment factors. Concerning the relation between years of work experience and 133 risk perception, because of the inconsistent results available in the literature, we made two 134 alternative competing hypotheses. If—as in McLaughlin et al. [16]—work experience leads mainly 135 to overconfidence in the use of devices, it should show a negative association with risk perception 136 (H4a); in contrast, if work experience—as in Rogers et al. [19]—leads mainly to an increased 137 situational awareness, it should show a positive association with risk perception (H4b). 138 Furthermore, based on Kogler et al. [31] and on Elkind [15], we postulated that exposure to 139 adverse work environment factors would show a positive association (H5) and risk perception 140 would show a negative association (H6) with near misses. Finally, based on Phimister et al. [23], 141 we expected near misses to show a positive association with being involved in an accident (H7). We 142 analyzed such relations via a mediated model rather than a standard regression to account for the 143 complexity of the associations we hypothesized, with accidents being the outcome of the model; 144 working alone, farm size, hours worked, and years of experience being the predictors (i.e., the 145 exogenous variables); and adverse work environment, risk perception, and near misses being 146 mediators (i.e., outcomes of working alone, farm size, hours worked, and years of experience and at 147 the same time predictors of accidents).

148 Method

149 Participants and setting

The study involved a sample of 290 users of agricultural machinery (272 men, $M_{age} = 45.46$ years, 150 SD = 17.40). The participants worked an average of 39.67 hours per week (SD = 23.72) and had 151 been working in agriculture for 26.45 years (SD = 18.00).¹ Participants' distributions of gender, 152 age, education, and occupation were in line with those of the Piedmont and Italian agricultural 153 154 population, as reported in the VI Agricultural Census of 2010 [32,33]. They were recruited from the 155 visitors to the 35th National Exhibition of Agricultural Mechanization in Savigliano, the largest 156 agricultural machinery exhibition in the Piedmont region (northwestern Italy). The 2016 edition of the show (18-20 March) was attended by over 65,000 visitors. The Piedmont region, one of the 157 158 twenty Italian regions, covers 35% of the Po River catchment, with agriculture taking place on the plain (41% of the utilized agricultural area – UAA), mainly maize-based systems, and on the hills 159 160 (31% of the UAA), mainly vineyards and winter cereals [34]. The Piedmont region is a good 161 representation of the Italian farming system and rural population since it includes approximately 10% of the total Italian UAA. Moreover, over 61,000 of the 1,620,884 Italian agricultural holdings 162 163 operate in this region [32].

Since the agricultural population is spread across the country and has varying operating schedules, agricultural machinery exhibitions are one of the few occasions at which a large and wide-ranging group of agricultural workers comes together. Such events therefore provide a suitable location for appropriate surveys and other data-collection activities [17,35].

168 Instrument

¹ As shown in Table 1 (see below), in our dataset, participants' age and years of experience in agriculture showed a very strong correlation. To avoid an excessive conceptual overlap and problems of empirical collinearity, both in the theoretical and in the empirical sections of the paper, we reasoned in terms of years of experience rather than in terms of age.

169 A 27-item self-administered paper-and-pencil questionnaire was used to gather information about 170 participants' work environment, risk perception, near misses, and accidents. The different sections and items of the questionnaire were designed based on previous instruments [11,29] and on the 171 172 evidence from a preliminary qualitative study [36]. Risky machinery-related tasks and types of accidents and near misses were selected after an analysis of the statistics regarding the most 173 174 frequent and serious machinery-related accidents and injuries in Italian agriculture [9]. The 175 questionnaire was pilot-tested with a group of 8 operators before being submitted to the sample of 176 the present investigation.

The questionnaire was composed of 3 sections. In the first section, participants were 177 178 administered a list of 4 adverse work environment factors: sufficient manpower (con-trait), 179 interruptions by machinery malfunctions, interruptions by on-farm visits, and work delay due to the 180 adoption of safety measures. Participants were asked to rate on a 4-point scale (1 = never, 4 =181 always) how often these 4 situations occurred on their farm. The 3 items related to manpower and 182 interruptions came from Glasscock et al. [11], whereas the adoption of safety measures was 183 indicated by farmers as often causing work delays and thus increasing time pressure in agricultural 184 tasks in a preliminary qualitative study [36]. A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), performed after 185 reversing the first item, showed that the scale was unidimensional, CFI = 1.00, IFI = 1.00, RMSEA $= .00 (90\% CI = .00, .08).^{2}$ 186

In the second section, participants had to report on a 4-point scale (ranging from 1 = not
risky at all to 4 = very risky) how risky they considered the following tasks in machinery
operations: moving equipment near power lines, manually feeding a wood chipper, using a woodsplitting machine/circular saw, using the tractor on a field without a seatbelt, handling round bales

² We tested the unidimensionality of this and the next scale using CFA instead of Cronbach α because the strength of the latter depends, beyond their mean correlation, on the number of items, and our first battery was composed of only 4 items.

with a front-end loader, working with machinery near ponds or ditches, cleaning a manure spreader while it is in motion, and descending from the tractor without turning the engine off. Items about power lines and working near ponds were taken from Whitman and Field [37], whereas the other items were operations or tasks that are more likely to lead to an accident according to Italian national safety statistics [9]. A CFA showed that the scale was unidimensional, CFI = .93, IFI = .93, RMSEA = .05 (90% CI = .00, .09). Participants' scores on these scales were computed as standardized factorial scores.

198 In the third section, participants had to indicate how often in the 12 months preceding the 199 survey they had been involved in 5 different types of events involving agricultural machinery, using 200 a 3-category format (0 = never; 1 = once; 2 = twice or more): fall/thrown from a vehicle; run over/crushed by a vehicle; struck by flying objects, broken parts, or hydraulic fluid; side/rear 201 202 rollover; and road accident with tractor/equipment. Participants were asked to answer the battery 203 twice, reporting for each event how often they had been involved with (i.e., accident) and without 204 (i.e., near miss) suffering an injury. The list of events was created based on the most common types 205 of accidents involving agricultural machinery according to the statistics from the Italian Workers' 206 Compensation Authority [9]. After dichotomizing participants' answers (contrasting the 0 and the 207 other responses), we computed two scores as sums of their responses to the first and to the second 208 version of the batteries that were used as operationalization of the number of accidents and of near 209 misses occurring in the 12 months preceding the survey. A standard socio-demographic form 210 assessing participants' relation with work (hours worked per week, years of experience in the 211 agricultural sector, farm size and whether they were a sole farmer) ended the questionnaire.

212 Procedure

Trained research assistants handed out the questionnaire to people walking through the exhibition.
They approached visitors and asked whether farming was their primary or secondary occupation
(i.e., being a part-time farmer) and whether they used agricultural machinery at least once a week.

In the case of a positive answer, the assistants explained the aims of the study and informed the participants that the questionnaire was anonymous. The questionnaire was in Italian, and its completion took approximately 6-7 min. No incentive was offered to induce visitors to participate in the survey. The response rate was approximately 85%.

220 **Results**

Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics for the variables that the study investigated and the correlations among them. Of the participants, 45.9% had been involved in at least an accident and 44.8% had been involved in at least a near miss in the 12 months preceding the survey.

224

---Table 1 about here---

225 A first path analysis model showed that H1 and H2 were falsified. Indeed, being a sole farmer (b = .04, SE = .12, p = .74) and the size of the farm where the participant worked (b = .00, 226 227 SE = .00, p = .13) showed no significant association with adverse work environment. Thus, we re-228 ran the model after deleting those variables. All the paths of the resulting model were statistically 229 significant (see Figure 1: betas and standard errors are displayed). The hours worked showed a positive association with working in an adverse environment ($R^2 = .06$), confirming H3. Consistent 230 231 with H4b and contrary to H4a, years of experience showed a positive association with risk perception ($R^2 = .08$). Consistent with H5 and H6, working in an adverse environment and risk 232 perception, respectively, showed a positive and a negative association with near misses ($R^2 = .07$), 233 which in turn, consistent with H7, showed a positive association with accidents ($R^2 = .08$). Table 2 234 shows that all the indirect effects we tested, even the small ones, were significant. The fit of the 235 model was satisfactory, $\chi^2(9) = 16.44$, p < .06, IFI = .92, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .05 (CI = .00, .09).³ 236 237 ---Figure 1 about here---238 ---Table 2 about here---

³ Parallel analyses, performed by substituting participants' years of experience in agriculture for their age, showed analogous results (available upon request).

239 **Discussion**

The present study investigated, via a mediation model, the risk factors for machinery-related accidents in the agricultural sector. The model showed that workers' characteristics are associated with exposure to adverse work environment factors and risk perception, which in turn are associated with the probability of being involved in near misses and accidents. Consistent with the literature about occupational accidents [10], in the present study, different variables were shown to be interwoven in the occurrence of an agricultural machinery-related accident.

Our mediation model noted the more critical variables and at what level they affect the chain of events leading to accidents, suggesting that machinery-related safety issues be addressed by an ergonomic approach (www.iea.cc) This approach considers the individuals in their interaction with the proper tools and tasks of their work environment and allows interventions to be developed in different dimensions (materials vs. practices) and at different levels (individual level vs. farm level) [38] to find the best fit between the worker and the job in terms of health, safety, comfort, and performance [21].

253 The results of the study showed that regarding workers' factors, working long hours 254 increased the exposure to accidents through the mediation of adverse working situations, such as 255 interruptions and time pressure. A positive association between hours worked and involvement in 256 accidents has already been noted by previous studies both in the agriculture/forestry sector [29] and 257 in other industries [39]. When an operator works long hours, he/she is likely to address many 258 different situations, which increases fatigue and reduces alertness, causing errors and thus 259 enhancing the possibility of being injured in an accident [40]. Interventions addressing this issue 260 may focus on redesigning the work process [41], for instance, by training workers to take systematic rest breaks during their working hours [38] or assisting farmers in managing external 261 262 pressures [18].

The worker's experience is another critical workers' factor that, according to the results of 263 264 the model we tested, enhances risk perception. The outcome of the study contributes to the discussion of the consequences of familiarity with tasks and machinery [16,19], strengthening the 265 266 assumption of the protective role of this variable. A lack of accidents or near misses in a person's history with a device/machine has been reported to lead to overconfidence in its use and lower risk 267 268 perception [16]. Similarly, it is reasonable to assume that previous exposure to near misses and 269 accidents is responsible for the positive association between work experience and risk perception 270 found in the present study. In this light, the longer the operator has been working in the field, the 271 more accidents and near misses he/she may have encountered, learning from these events and thus 272 increasing his/her risk awareness and perception [42].

The study showed that higher risk perception predicts lower occurrence of near misses and accidents. Risk perception is thus confirmed to play a crucial role in the occurrence of accidents [15], suggesting further investigation, especially in such a hazardous sector as agriculture. Identifying factors that lead to a higher risk perception in agricultural operators will allow the development of training interventions and information campaigns tailored to maximize their preventive effectiveness.

279 In the present study, near misses appeared to be a significant predictor of accidents. This 280 result confirms the importance of investigating near misses to prevent more serious accidents [12], 281 including in the agricultural sector, in which near misses have been largely neglected. Farmers may 282 be trained to recognize and annotate near misses to early identify critical aspects leading to 283 accidents and intervene to eliminate or reduce them. According to Kogler et al. [31], the main 284 preventive measures indicated by farmers to help them avoid near misses are, in order of 285 importance, increased training in agricultural operations, mechanical adaptations, and easy-to-286 understand and short written operating instructions. Regarding the importance of training, the 287 evidence by Burke et al. [43] raises some considerations about the need to adopt not only such

conventional training methods as pamphlets, lectures, and videos but also more engaging behavioral
 modeling techniques – such as hands-on demonstrations and behavioral simulations – to promote
 the correct and safe use of machinery and therefore reduce accidents.

291 Clear and short operating instructions, such as use and maintenance manuals, and clear and effective safety information about machinery, such as pictorial representations, are additional 292 293 important elements to promote the safe use of machinery. Operator manuals are supposed to be an 294 exhaustive source of information for the safe use and maintenance of agricultural machinery, but 295 previous studies have shown that they are often unread [44] due to poor document design, requiring 296 a non-negligible cognitive load to decipher pages packed with information that is mainly intended 297 for the legal protection of the manufacturer. Pictorial representations affixed to machinery are visual 298 tools to convey relevant safety information, but they are not as effective as they are supposed to be 299 [45,46]. A re-design of these sources of safety information must be considered to enhance safety in 300 machinery use.

301 Contrary to the findings of previous studies [13,14] no significant associations between 302 being a sole farmer and farm size on the one hand and exposure to accidents on the other hand 303 emerged. Accidents occur in all types of farms of any dimension and to all kinds of holders: safety 304 interventions and campaigns should therefore address all kinds of farms and farm operators without 305 considering some groups more at risk than others.

306 *Limitations of the present study and possible research developments*

Some limitations of the present study should be acknowledged. The survey was carried out in the Piedmont region of northwestern Italy. On the one hand, the Piedmont farming system is a good representation of Italian agriculture, and performing the study at a local level allowed us to test a parsimonious model: participants in the study had a similar cultural background; thus, we could manage comparable data without controlling for a plethora of socio-demographic variables [47]. Even though the socio-demographic characteristics of our participants were in line with those of the

313 Italian rural population reported in the last agricultural census, it is apparent that only the people 314 who attended the Exhibition of Agricultural Mechanization in Savigliano could participate in our 315 survey. More generalizable results would be available from a random sample of agricultural 316 workers.

Another limitation is that our data on near misses and accidents were based solely on selfreports, and the recall covered quite a long period (12 months). Even though self-reporting is a quite common strategy in this kind of investigation [29,48], and 12 months is the usually considered period [11], it is possible that the participants' responses were affected by memory bias, thus resulting in a gap between self-reported and actual involvement in the reported events [49]. To obtain more accurate information about these variables, a possible direction of study would be to register near misses and accidents weekly (as for the accidents studied in Glasscock et al. [11]).

Finally, it should be noted that the bivariate correlations between our variables were not very strong, like the variance of the dependent variables we have explained. Moreover, consistent with Chaplin [50], the indirect effects that we detected were small. The weakness of these effects may likely be attributed, at least in part, to methodological rather than theoretical reasons. Indeed, as we performed field research, we could measure our variables using short scales; thus, we had to manage measures that were plausibly distorted, at least in part, by measurement error. Stronger indirect effects will likely stem from new research performed using longer scales.

Possible future developments of the research could further explore the relationship between adverse work environment factors and accidents, considering the safety behaviors [11] and coping strategies adopted when dealing with adverse and stressful conditions [51] as mediators of the relationship. Moreover, it would be interesting to increase our understanding of the factors contributing to farm accidents in two ways: first, via more objective techniques of data collection, such as the observation of farmers interacting with different machines, to identify risky behaviors that can increase the probability of being involved in an accident (as in Mann et al., [52]), and

second, taking directly into account the issue of the age of agricultural machinery, which is known to play a role in the onset of agricultural accidents [53]. The use of aging machines with inadequate safety engineering represents a constant source of risk, as operations involving high numbers of disturbances, e.g., machinery breakdowns, have a higher accident probability [54]; our questionnaire item about frequent interruptions of farm work due to machinery malfunctions was based on this evidence. However, the age of machinery could be explicitly assessed as a factor that could affect the mediators or the outcomes of our model.

Furthermore, the reasons underlying the positive association found in the present study between work experience and risk perception could be further investigated. For instance, a farmer's previous history of near misses and accidents could be evaluated and added as a mediator in the relationship between experience and risk perception, or expert and novice farmers could be observed/interviewed when interacting with machinery to identify the ways in which they perform their complex and varied tasks and the different strategies adopted to reduce risks (as in Mann et al. [52]).

Furthermore, in future research, data collection on farm accidents and near misses could be extended over a longer period. This would allow researchers to investigate the possible mediation effects of previous exposure to such events on the relationship between work experience and risk perception [42]. Finally, a mediation model such as the one used in the present study could be adopted to investigate accidents related to livestock [55] and pesticides [56], which are other major causes of accidents and health issues in the agricultural sector.

358 Conclusions

The chain of events leading to an occupational accident deserves particular attention in agriculture, due to the high hazardousness of this sector. The results of the present study showed that different critical variables intervene at different levels in determining an agricultural machinery-related accident. Hours worked and work experience affected the probability of being involved in an

363 accident through the mediation of adverse work environment and risk perception and then of near 364 misses. These results suggest that different facets of the interaction between the operator and his/her work environment should be considered when designing preventive interventions, ranging from a 365 366 re-design of the actual work processes to the development of strategies to enhance workers' risk perception. Interventions should also focus on near misses, making the reporting and analysis of 367 368 these events a widespread and systematic practice among farmers and farm workers [12]. 369 Furthermore, interventions should support the protective role played by work experience by 370 adopting engaging training methods as behavioral modeling in the use of machinery to optimize the 371 learning of safety practices and safe behaviors. Finally, it must be noted that, as found by Kogler et 372 al. [31] with regard to near misses, any solution and intervention aimed at improving the quality of farmers' work life and reducing accidents must also be disseminated to the farming populations in 373 374 formats that are acceptable and understandable [21].

375

Disclosure statement

377 The authors have no competing interests to declare.

378 Funding sources

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, ornot-for-profit sectors.

381 References

382 [1] ILO. Agriculture; plantations; other rural sectors [Internet]. Geneva; International Labour

383 Organization; 2014 [cited 2016 Sept 02]. Available from:

- 384 http://www.ilo.org/global/industries-and-sectors/agriculture-plantations-other-rural-
- 385 sectors/lang--en/index.htm
- 386 [2] ILO. Safety and health in agriculture. Geneva, Switzerland; International Labour Office; 2011.

- 387 [3] ILO. World day for safety and health at work [Internet]. Geneva; International Labour
- 388 Organization; 2005 [cited 2016 Sept 02]. Available from:

389 http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/safework/index.htm

- 390 [4] NSC. Injury facts: 2004 ed. Itasca (IL): National Safety Council; 2004.
- 391 [5] Narasimhan GR, Peng Y, Crowe TG, et al. Operational safety practices as determinants of
- 392 machinery-related injury on Saskatchewan farms. Accident Anal Prev. 2010;42:1226-1231.
- 393 [6] Swanton AR, Young TL, Leinenkugel K, et al. Nonfatal tractor-related injuries presenting to a
 394 state trauma system. J Safety Res. 2015;53:97-102.
- [7] Carlson KF, Gerberich SG, Church TR, et al. Tractor-related injuries: a population-based study
 of a five-state region in the Midwest. Am J Ind Med. 2005;47:254-264.
- [8] European Commission. Causes and circumstances of accidents at work in the EU. Luxembourg:
 Office for Official Publications of the European Communities; 2009.
- 399 [9] INAIL. Relazione audizione Commissione Agricoltura e Produzione Agroalimentare [Report
- 400 from the Commission on Agriculture and Food Production]. Rome: Istituto Nazionale
- 401 Assicurazione Infortuni sul Lavoro; 2015.
- 402 [10] Reason J. Human error: models and management. Brit Med J. 2000;320;768-770.
- 403 [11] Glasscock DJ, Rasmussen K, Carstensen O, et al. Psychosocial factors and safety behaviour as
- 404 predictors of accidental work injuries in farming. Work Stress 2006;20:173-189.
- 405 [12] NSC. Near miss reporting systems. Itasca (IL): National Safety Council; 2013.
- 406 [13] Myers JR, Hendricks KJ. Agricultural tractor overturn deaths: assessment of trends and risk
 407 factors. Am J Ind Med. 2010;53:662-672.
- 408 [14] Hwang S, Gomez MI, Stark AD, et al. Severe farm injuries among New York farmers. Am J
 409 Ind Med. 2001;40:32–41.
- 410 [15] Elkind PD. Perceptions of risk, stressors, and locus of control influence intentions to practice
- 411 safety behaviors in agriculture. J Agromedicine 2008;12:7-25.

412	[16] McLaughlin AC, Fletcher LM, Sprufera JF. The aging farmer: human factors research needs in
413	agricultural work. Proc Hum Fact Ergon Soc Annu Meet. 2009;53:1230-1234.
414	[17] Görücü S, Cavallo E, Murphy JD. Perceptions of tilt angles of an agricultural tractor. J
415	Agromedicine 2014;19:5-14.
416	[18] Lizer SK, Petrea RE. Health and safety needs of older farmers part II. Agricultural injuries.

417 Workplace Health Saf. 2008;56:9-14.

- [19] Rogers WA, Lamson N, Rousseau GK. Warning research: an integrative perspective. Hum
 Factors 2000;42:102-139.
- [20] Cavallo E, Ferrari E, Bollani L, et al. Strategic management implications for the adoption of
 technological innovations in agricultural tractor: the role of scale factors and environmental
 attitude. Technol Anal Strateg. 2014;26:765-779.
- 423 [21] McLaughlin AC, Mayhorn CB. Avoiding harm on the farm: human factors. Gerontechnology
 424 2011;10:26-37.
- 425 [22] Reason JT. Managing the risks of organizational accidents. Aldershot (UK): Ashgate; 1997.

426 [23] Phimister JR, Oktem U, Kleindorfer PR, et al. Near-miss system analysis: phase I.

- 427 Philadelphia, (PA): Wharton School, Center for Risk Management and Decision Processes;
 428 2000.
- 429 [24] Wright L, Schaaf T. Accident versus near miss causation: a critical review of the literature, an
 430 empirical test in the UK railway domain, and their implications for other sectors. J Hazard
 431 Mater. 2004;111:105–110.
- 432 [25] Uth HJ, Wiese N. Central collecting and evaluating of major accidents and near-miss-events in
 433 the Federal Republic of Germany results, experiences, perspectives. J Hazard Mater.
- 434 2004;111:139-145.
- 435 [26] Wu W, Gibb AG, Li Q. Accident precursors and near misses on construction sites: an
- 436 investigative tool to derive information from accident databases. Safety Sci. 2010;48:845-858.

437 [27] Marsh P, Kendrick D. Near miss and minor injury information - can it be used to plan and
438 evaluate injury prevention programmes? Accident Anal Prev. 2000;32:345-354.

439 [28] Lyons PG, Arora VM, Farnan JM. Adverse events and near-misses relating to intensive care

- 440 unit–ward transfer: a qualitative analysis of resident perceptions. Ann Am Thorac Soc.
 441 2016;13:570-572.
- [29] Lilley R, Feyer AM, Kirk P, et al. A survey of forest workers in New Zealand: do hours of
 work, rest, and recovery play a role in accidents and injury? J Safety Res. 2002;33:53-71.
- [30] Lundqvist P, Gustafsson B. Accidents and accident prevention in agriculture a review of
 selected studies. Int J Ind Ergonom. 1992;10:311-319.
- [31] Kogler R, Quendler E, Boxberger J. Near accidents with agricultural vehicles, machinery and
 equipment in Austria in the year 2013. Agricultural Engineering International: CIGR Journal
 2015;17:141-157.
- [32] INEA. Italian agriculture in figures 2013. Rome: Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria;
 2014.
- 451 [33] ISTAT. 6° Censimento generale dell'agricoltura 2010. Caratteristiche strutturali delle aziende
 452 agricole [6th Agricultural Census 2010. Characteristics of farms]. Rome: Istituto Nazionale di
 453 Statistica; 2010.
- [34] Bassanino, M, Sacco D, Zavattaro L, et al. Nutrient balance as a sustainability indicator of
 different agro-environments in Italy. Ecol Indic. 2011;11:715-723.
- [35] Cavallo E, Ferrari E, Bollani L, et al. Attitudes and behaviour of adopters of technological
 innovations in agricultural tractors: a case study in Italian agricultural system. Agr Syst.
 2014;130:44–54.
- [36] Caffaro F, Lundqvist P, Micheletti Cremasco M, et al. Machinery-related perceived risks and
 safety attitudes in senior Swedish farmers. J Agromedicine. Forthcoming 2017.

- 461 [37] Whitman SD, Field WE. Assessing senior farmers' perceptions of tractor and machinery-
- 462 related hazards. J Agric Saf Health. 1995;1:199-214.
- 463 [38] Kirkhorn SR, Earle-Richardson G, Banks RJ. Ergonomic risks and musculoskeletal disorders
- 464 in production agriculture: recommendations for effective research to practice. J
- 465 Agromedicine, 2010;15:281-299.
- 466 [39] Wagstaff AS, Lie JAS. Shift and night work and long working hours-a systematic review of
 467 safety implications. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2011;37:173-185.
- 468 [40] Greubel J, Nachreiner F. The validity of the risk index for comparing the accident risk
- associated with different work schedules. Accident Anal Prev 2013;50:1090-1095.
- 470 [41] Baron S, Estill C, Steege A, et al. Simple solutions: ergonomics for farm workers. Cincinnati,
- 471 (OH): National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; 2001.
- [42] Lindberg AK, Hansson SO, Rollenhagen C. Learning from accidents–what more do we need to
 know? Safety Sci. 2010;48:714-721.
- [43] Burke MJ, Sarpy SA, Smith-Crowe K, et al. Relative effectiveness of worker safety and health
 training methods. Am J Public Health. 2006;96:315-324.
- 476 [44] Tebeaux E. Improving tractor safety warnings: readability is missing. J Agric Saf Health
 477 2010;16:181–205.
- [45] Caffaro F, Cavallo E. Comprehension of safety pictograms affixed to agricultural machinery: a
 survey of users. J Safety Res. 2015;55:151–158.
- [46] Caffaro F, Mirisola A, Cavallo E. Safety signs on agricultural machinery: pictorials do not
 always successfully convey their messages to target users. Appl Ergon. 2017;58:156-166.
- 482 [47] Smith-Jackson T, Wogalter MS, Quintela Y. Safety climate and pesticide risk communication
- 483 disparities in crop production by ethnicity. Hum Factor Ergon Man. 2010;20:511–525.
- 484 [48] Nilsson, K., Pinzke, S., Lundqvist, P. Occupational injuries to senior farmers in Sweden. J
- 485 Agric Saf Health 2010;16(1):19-29.

- [49] Burton S, Blair E. Task conditions, response formulation processes, and response accuracy for
 behavioral frequency questions in surveys. Public Opin Quart. 1991;55:50-79.
- [50] Chaplin WF. The next generation of moderator research in personality psychology. J Personal
 1991;59:143-178.
- 490 [51] Stave C, Pousette A, Törner M. A model of the relations between risk perception and self491 reported safety activity. J Occup Ergon. 2006;6:35-45.
- 492 [52] Mann DD, Hesketh A, Morrison JB. Comparison of forward-facing and backward-facing
 493 tractor egress. Canadian Biosystems Engineering 2016;58:2.1-2.8.
- 494 [53] Pyykkönen M. Aherin B. Occupational Health and Safety in Agriculture. In: Jakobsson C,
- 495 editor. Ecosystem Health and Sustainable Agriculture 1. Sustainable agriculture. Uppsala: The
- 496 Baltic University Programme, Uppsala University; 2012. p. 391-401.
- 497 [54] Suutarinen, J. Occupational accidents in Finnish agriculture: Causality and managerial aspects
 498 for prevention [doctoral dissertation]. Agrifood Research Reports 39. Helsinki: MTT
- 499 Agrifood Research Finland [cited 2017 29 Jul]. Available from:
- 500 http://jukuri.luke.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/440983/met39.pdf?sequence=1
- 501 [55] Lindahl C, Lundqvist P, Hagevoort GR, et al. Occupational health and safety aspects of animal
 502 handling in dairy production. J Agromedicine. 2013;18:274-283.
- 503 [56] Emery SB, Hart A, Butler-Ellis C, et al. A review of the use of pictograms for communicating
- 504 pesticide hazards and safety instructions: implications for EU policy. Hum Ecol Risk Assess.
- 505 2015;21:1062-1080.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Worked hours per week	39.67	23.76	-	15*	12*	.28***	19***	.24***	13*	07	03
2. Age	45.47	17.40		-	.82***	14*	.29***	18**	.23***	10	08
3. Years of experience in agriculture	26.45	18.00			-	10	.22***	11	.23***	12*	10
4. Farm size (ha)	33.83	53.40				-	18**	.15*	10	05	06
5. Sole farmer $(0 = no, 1 = yes)$.37	.48					-	04	.12*	03	.01
6. Adverse work environment	0.00	1.00						-	.01	.13*	.15**
7. Risk perception	0.00	1.00							-	13*	.09
8. Near misses	1.11	1.71								-	.97***
9. Accidents	0.99	1.52									-

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the variables we used and correlation among them

Note. The "mean" of being a sole farmer is the proportion, on a 0-1 scale, of the participants who reported to be a sole farmer. When being a sole farmer is involved, the point-biserial correlation coefficient is displayed. *** p < .001. ** p < .01. * p < .05.

1 Table 2. Indirect effects of the exogenous variables and of the mediato	1	Table 2.	Indirect effects	of the exogenous	variables and o	of the mediators
---	---	----------	------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

	Years of experience in agriculture	Worked hours per week	Risk perception	Adverse work environment
Risk perception				
Adverse work environment				
Near misses	00*	.01**		
Accidents	.00**	.00**	23**	.00**

Note. ** *p* < .01. * *p* < .05.

3 Figure caption

- 4 Figure 1. Workers' characteristics predict accidents through the mediation of adverse work
- 5 environment, risk perception, and near misses.
- 6
- 7
- 8

9 Figure 1

