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1.0 Executive Summary

This report details the findings from the evaluation of Site Safe’s Construction, Civil and Supervisor Gold Passport Training Courses.

Background

Site Safe is an organisation established with the support of ACC and the construction industry in May 1999. It was specifically established to assist in the reduction of injuries in construction, given that construction represents one of the leading costs to ACC in terms of work-related injury compensation.

In an effort to improve occupational health and safety outcomes in the construction industry, one of Site Safe’s first initiatives was to develop the Passport Training Programme – a health and safety system specifically targeting the commercial construction industry, and aimed at ensuring a minimum level of awareness of health and safety issues among people working on, or closely associated with work on, construction sites.

This training was subsequently extended to the civil and residential construction sectors. However, due to a low uptake of the residential Passport Training Programme, the ‘commercial’ passport course was adapted to also suit the residential sector. The current name of this course is “Building Construction Passport Course”. Since its inception in August 2000, more than 72,000 workers in the building and construction sector have completed Passport training, and 1,300 supervisors have competed the Supervisor Gold Card course since 2001.

Previously, Site Safe has been receiving funding estimated at approximately $3.5 million per annum from the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), via Unitec, to deliver the Passport training programme. The Tertiary Education Commission, however, withdrew its funding on December 31, 2007.

There have been discussions between Site Safe and ACC’s Chairman and Chief Executive on whether or not ACC can assist or advise the Site Safe Board on how to go forward following the withdrawal of this funding. In this regard, the ACC Board met in February 2008 to decide whether or not ACC will contribute towards funding Site Safe’s Passport training courses. In order to inform the Boards’ decision and address certain information gaps, ACC commissioned Research New Zealand to undertake an independent evaluation of the Passport and Supervisor Gold Card Training Programmes.

In commissioning this evaluation, ACC articulated three objectives for the research:

1. To understand how Site Safe is perceived within the construction industry.

2. To determine how effective the Passport Training Programmes have been in building worker capacity to ensure no one is endangering themselves or their workmates.
3. To determine, if there is a difference in claim rates and costs among those employers, and self-employed construction workers, who have attended Passport training and those who have not.

**Methodology**

In order to fulfil the information objectives detailed above, two surveys were conducted:

- A telephone survey of Passport training attendees was conducted with a randomly selected sample of n=451 construction industry Passport and Gold Supervisor Card holders (drawn from Site Safe’s database of those attending the training courses) who successfully completed their training between 1 April 2007 and 1 November 2007.

- A telephone survey of n=461 employers and self-employed construction workers, drawn from ACC’s levy payer database and Site Safe’s database of employers who have sent staff to a Passport or Supervisor Gold Card training course.

In addition to the two surveys, qualitative interviews were conducted with eight senior officials (as nominated by ACC from certain key industry sector stakeholder groups, including the Department of Labour, three national builders associations/organisations, and an ITO that provides health and safety training to the building/construction sector).

Feedback was sought from these particular officials because of their knowledge and experience, in relation to the health and safety issues facing the construction industry. As such it was expected that they would be in a good position to comment on the role of Site Safe and its Passport training programmes in relation to addressing those issues.

In order to address Objective 3 of the research (i.e. determine if there are differences in work related ACC claims rates and costs between employers whose staff participate in Passport training, and those who do not), the aggregated 2006 and 2007 work-related claims data of n=297 of the employers who participated in the survey employers was also analysed.

---

1 Several of the stakeholders that were interviewed had been involved in Site Safe’s set up.
Key findings

Passport Holders survey

Reasons for participation in Passport training

- Passport holders generally found out about the course through their current employer or contractor (73 percent).

- Most felt that it was important or very important to attend the Site Safe course so that they are able to work on construction sites (92 percent), because it is a requirement of their employer (89 percent), and/or because of their own concerns about workplace health and safety (89 percent).

- Wanting to learn about injury prevention in general (42 percent), and gaining safety knowledge, awareness of Health and Safety, and identification of hazards (30 percent) were most frequently mentioned as being what they expected from the course.

- The large majority of Passport holders felt that the Site Safe Passport training met or exceeded their expectations (94 percent).

Satisfaction levels with Passport training

- Passport holders are highly satisfied with the aspects of the Passport training, which is reflected in their high level of satisfaction with the Site Safe training course overall (64 percent very satisfied and 32 percent just satisfied).

- The large majority would definitely recommend Site Safe to other people in their industry (89 percent), and a further six percent would recommend but with reservations.

- Many felt there was no particular improvement they would like made if they were to participate in the Passport training again (38 percent), but those most frequently mentioned were:
  - To make it more relevant or tailored to their industry, field or work (14 percent).
  - To make the length more appropriate for the amount of content (seven percent).

Priority of health and safety in work practices

- Most Passport holders personally consider workplace health and safety to be a high priority (90 percent), however, they believe their employers and head contractors place slightly less of a priority on workplace health and safety (81 percent).

- Similarly, they consider the injury rate for people in their trade (and who are doing the same job as them) as being below or well below the building and construction industry’s average...
injury rate (61 percent), but believe their own injury rate to be below or well below the building and construction industry’s average injury rate to a much greater extent (81 percent).

Health and safety training, other than Passport training

- Just under half have undertaken other health and safety training for work in construction (48 percent), meaning that for many workers in the construction sector, Passport training is the only health and safety training they receive.

- The Passport training compared favourably to these, with 41 percent reporting that their Passport training was better or much better, whereas only three percent reported that it was poor or very poor in comparison to their other training.

- Those rating the Passport training worse in at least some areas most frequently reported this because the other training was more specific or more tailored to their industry or trade (41 percent), more detailed (29 percent) or more practical (17 percent).

Impact of Passport training on work practices

- Most Passport holders feel they act differently since the training in that they are more aware and identify workplace hazards (56 percent).

- Amongst those who act differently in some way since obtaining their passport, the majority believe this has made a difference in terms of reducing the risks to them personally when working on-site (90 percent). This is frequently because they feel it has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues (63 percent).

- A similarly large majority of those who have acted differently report that it is likely that they will continue to do things differently in the future as a result of the Passport training (89 percent).

- Passport holders for whom this was a refresher course felt it improved their awareness and knowledge of health and safety issues in the building and construction industry (78 percent).

Awareness and usage of other Site Safe products and services

- Around two-thirds or more of Passport holders are aware of Toolbox Safety Talks (77 percent), the Health and Safety Guidelines (67 percent), and the Safety Management Plan (65 percent).

- Amongst these, just under half report they had used Toolbox Safety Talks (47 percent), and around one-third had used the Safety Management Plan (33 percent), and the Health and Safety Guidelines (30 percent).

- Furthermore, the large majority of those that had used these health and safety products and services found them helpful in their work: Toolbox Safety Talks (92 percent), Health and Safety Guidelines (91 percent), and Safety Advisors (90 percent).
Employers survey

Awareness of Site Safe training and participation

- When asked what training courses they are aware of that deal with identifying hazards, and being safe and avoiding accidents on building and construction worksites, 58 percent of organisations have mentioned Site Safe without being prompted. Unprompted awareness of the three specific Site Safe courses was as follows: Site Safe Construction Passport (24 percent), Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (ten percent), Site Safe Civil Passport (four percent).

- After being prompted about the three specific Site Safe courses, total combined awareness of these courses discussed was as follows: Site Safe Construction Passport (78 percent), Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (53 percent), Site Safe Civil Passport (42 percent).

- In contrast, 16 percent of respondents are not aware of any of the three courses, while another two percent are uncertain.

- Most frequently respondents found out about Site Safe training through another employer/contractor in the construction industry (37 percent), their current employer/boss (20 percent), an advertising/notice in local newspaper/magazine (ten percent).

- Forty-eight percent of those respondents aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses have attended Site Safe Construction Passport training, distantly followed by Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (nine percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (six percent). Also, a further two percent of respondents are enrolled to attend a course.

- However, 42 percent of respondents who are aware of the Site Safe courses report they have not attended any of them.

- Of those respondents aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses and who work in organisations employing other permanent staff, 64 percent report that their business’ employees have attended Site Safe Construction Passport training, distantly followed by Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (ten percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (six percent). Also, a further one percent of respondents report their employees are enrolled to attend a course.

- However, 24 percent report their business’ employees have not attended any of the courses.

- Fifty-nine percent of respondents report that all of their permanent employees who work on construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport, while another 16 percent believe that over three quarters of such employees have a Site Safe Passport.

- On the other hand, 13 percent of respondents report that less than half of the permanent employees in their business who work on construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport.
Thirty-seven percent of respondents report that all of their sub-contractors carry a valid Site Safe Passport, while 50 percent say their business does not require independent sub-contractors to have Site Safe Passports.

Forty-four percent of respondents report that all of their supervisors have a current Supervisor Gold Card, while another 16 percent believe that over three quarters of their supervisors have Gold Cards.

On the other hand, 22 percent of respondents report that less than half of the supervisors in their business have a current Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card.

**Employers’ reasons for participation in Site Safe and satisfaction with training**

Among the reasons for companies to send their employees to Site Safe courses, most frequently employers mentioned to be able to work on certain building/construction sites (50 percent), followed by wanting to learn about injury prevention (in general) (32 percent), and in order to be considered for/win contracts, or Compliance (with the Health and Safety Act) (both 12 percent).

The majority of respondents report that their expectations were met (71 percent) or exceeded (12 percent), when they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course. In contrast, 13 percent of respondents report their expectations about Site Safe training courses have not been met.

Among the reasons why they believe the Site Safe courses met or exceeded their expectations, respondents most frequently either gave a general positive comment (25 percent), or specifically mentioned that courses have enhanced their company’s overall awareness of hazards (18 percent), everything was covered adequately/covers the basics very well (17 percent), and good delivery/presentation/clarity (seven percent).

Among those reporting the Site Safe courses did not meet their expectations, respondents most frequently mentioned this was because content was too broad/not specific enough (34 percent), they already knew it/already covered in other courses/no new ground covered (20 percent), and the content was not relevant to their area of business (20 percent).

Majority of those respondents saying they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, report they are either satisfied (51 percent) or very satisfied (34 percent) with the training. Only six percent say they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, with the average level of satisfaction at $\bar{x}=4.14$ on a 5-point scale, where ‘1’ is very dissatisfied and ‘5’ is very satisfied.

Moreover, 75 percent of these respondents report they would definitely recommend Site Safe to other employers in their industry, while a further 14 percent would recommend, but with reservations. In contrast, six percent report they would probably not recommend and another two percent say they would definitely not recommend Site Safe to other employers.
Impact of passport training and renewal rates

- Among the respondents who said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, 25 percent report their business has done nothing as a result of attending Site Safe courses and another five percent are uncertain about the impact. In contrast, the majority report their business has made changes or taken some actions, most frequently mentioning:
  - Being more aware/identifying workplace hazards (40 percent).
  - Discussing identifying hazards with workers (20 percent).
  - Developing a safety management plan (16 percent).

- Eighty-five percent of those respondents, whose business has done something as a result of employees attending Site Safe courses, believe these actions have made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries among their business employees and contractors, while ten percent of believe these actions have made no such difference.

- Among those who believe the actions taken by their business as a result of attending Site Safe courses have made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries, most frequently respondents mentioned the such reasons as:
  - It has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues (61 percent).
  - The information was used to create or improve hazard management procedures (ten percent), and there are less accidents/it is a safer work environment (both ten percent).

- Among the respondents who said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, 23 percent were uncertain how Site Safe could be improved, while 18 percent report they are happy with Site Safe as it is. Other most frequently mentioned suggestions included having broader information than just construction/being relevant to employers industry (14 percent), increasing awareness about the courses, their availability, better promotion (11 percent), and having the training at the workplace (nine percent).

- Seventy-five percent of respondents that said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, report that all employees who have a Passport card are required to attend a refresher course, while 14 percent say that no employees are required to do this.

Non-participants perceptions of Site Safe

- When those respondents who said that neither they nor any other employees have attended or enrolled in a Site Safe training course, they were then asked what types of things the courses cover or involve, based on what they have heard or read about the Site Safe training courses. Forty percent were uncertain about the course content. In contrast, most frequently respondents believe the Site Safe training courses cover:
  - Identification of the most common accident and injuries that occur on building and construction sites in general (34 percent).
◆ Common sense building and construction safety practices (20 percent).

◆ Practical training (such as use of tools, use of equipment, chemical use, etc.) (14 percent).

◆ When asked why they or their business decided not to enrol in a Site Safe course, these respondents most frequently mention such reasons as:

◆ Timing and/or location of the course was inconvenient (18 percent).

◆ Haven't heard of it/I wasn't aware of the training (14 percent).

◆ Cost involved (i.e. getting there, taking the time off work, etc.) (12 percent).

**Other products and services provided by Site Safe**

◆ When respondents were prompted on their awareness of four other health and safety products and services provided by Site Safe (excluding Passports and the Supervisor Gold Card), 20 percent were not aware of any. In contrast, most frequently respondents are aware of Toolbox Safety Talks (62 percent), followed by:

◆ The Health and Safety Guidelines (61 percent).

◆ The Safety Management Plan (58 percent).

◆ Site Safe Safety Advisors (45 percent).

◆ Among those respondents aware of a specific service, the following proportions report using the service compared with those who did not use it:

◆ Toolbox Safety Talks (28 percent used the service while 34 percent did not).

◆ The Health and Safety Guidelines (23 percent used the service and 38 percent did not).

◆ The Safety Management Plan (22 percent used the service and 37 percent did not).

◆ Site Safe Safety Advisors (12 percent used the service and 33 percent did not).

◆ It is worth noting that overall, of respondents who have heard of Site Safe, only 38 percent use at least one of the other services that were discussed. The other 62 percent are either not aware of any such services (20 percent) or aware but have not used any of them (42 percent).

◆ Most respondents (between 80 and 86 percent), whose workplaces have used these specific services, report they were helpful, while only few (one or two percent) say they were not helpful.
Industry ratings of Site Safe and its programmes

- When rating Site Safe and its training programmes impacts on health and safety in the construction and building industry, employers gave the highest rating to raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them ($\bar{x} = 7.29$ on a 10-point scale) and similar ratings among the following attributes:
  - Helping to reduce unsafe behaviour on construction and building sites ($\bar{x} = 6.94$).
  - Addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general ($\bar{x} = 6.89$).
  - Reducing the frequency of workplace accidents and injuries ($\bar{x} = 6.83$).

- When asked to give reasons for their rating of Site Safe and its training programmes in relation to addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general, those respondents who gave a positive rating most frequently explained this by giving a general positive comment, while other respondents were more specific reporting that it has enhanced their company’s overall awareness of hazards (11 percent), everything was covered adequately/covers the basics very well (nine percent), and it gave them what they need to create a safer work environment/accidents have reduced (six percent).

- When asked if sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, 24 percent of respondents report that it definitely does not cover, while another 15 percent say probably not. On the other hand, 15 percent report it definitely covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, and a further 28 percent say it partially does. Also, 17 percent are uncertain about the coverage of their legal obligations.

- Among those respondents who said that sending employees to a Passport training course does not fully cover employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, the most frequently mentioned reason was that the course is only a part of being safe (31 percent), followed by employers being legally required to provide a safe environment (29 percent).

- Among those respondents who said that sending employees to a Passport training course fully or partially covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, the most frequently mentioned reasons was that it is good for the employee to learn specific issues to the industry (17 percent), followed by increasing staff awareness of health and safety issues (14 percent).

- Thirty percent of respondents made general positive comments, when asked what they thought the building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe, while other respondents were more specific reporting that Site Safe is a positive thing/heading in the right direction (ten percent), or that safety is an issue that needs to be taken seriously/important issue (ten percent).
In contrast, five percent made a general negative comment, while a small number (four percent) believe that building and construction industry thinks Site Safe is a waste of time, followed by three percent saying fees are too high.

Also, eight percent believe building and construction industry has mixed views about Site Safe having both good and bad aspects to it.

**Health and safety practices in the construction and building sector**

- Seventy-nine percent of respondents report their business has a formal or written document on health and safety covering procedures for identifying and managing workplace hazards.

- Among the organisations with a formal or written health and safety document, respondents report that most often such formal documents cover using machinery (41 percent), tool use (39 percent), and tasks involving manual lifting and handling (e.g. lifting, carrying, shovelling, pushing/pulling, etc.) (36 percent).

- Among the specific steps taken for health and safety reasons in their business, most frequently respondents report:
  - Enforcing the wearing of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) (96 percent).
  - Keeping staff up to date with health and safety issues (95 percent).
  - Regularly checking safety aspects of the tools and equipment that workers use (95 percent).
  - However, some of the steps were reported less frequently in particular sending staff on health and safety courses (69 percent), and employees interests are represented by a health and safety representative (63 percent).

- When asked to compare their business’ health and safety record to that of the building and construction industry in general, 67 percent of all respondents report it is better, while another 26 believe it is about the same, and further seven percent were uncertain.

- Also, when commenting on the priority of health and safety in their business, 81 percent report it is of high priority, while 19 percent believe it is of medium or low priority to their business.

- Forty-nine percent of all businesses that were surveyed had no workplace accidents or injuries in the past 12 months. In contrast, 15 percent had one accident, 13 percent had two, while 19 percent had three or more workplace accidents.

- Among the organisations where there was an accident in the past 12 months:
  - Fifty-two percent report the injured person took time off work as a result of the accident.
  - Also, 52 percent report that a claim was made with ACC relating to this accident or injury.
Claims data analysis

◆ In relation to determining if there is a difference in claim rates and costs among those organisations whose employees have attended Site Safe courses and those who have not, our analysis was inconclusive.

Industry stakeholders’ perspectives

◆ For the most part, those stakeholders who were interviewed were unanimous that awareness, attitudes health and safety practices within the building and construction sector have improved vastly over the past five to ten years. Some of this is attributed to the influence of Site Safe, and its activities to raise awareness generally about Health and Safety among the sector (and in particular its influence on some of the larger Commercial organisations and their contractors).

◆ There is still considerable room for improvement in the sector’s health and safety practices, however, particularly in relation to the need to achieve a culture shift in some businesses where merely complying with the legislation is viewed as being sufficient.

◆ Some stakeholders feel that Site Safe has deviated somewhat from its original mandate (which included a strong focus on research and development to identify best practices to address issues facing the building and construction sector) towards being primarily a health and safety training provider.

◆ While the Passport training programme is viewed as being a good, basic induction to health and safety, in particular for the commercial/vertical sector of the industry, it is not perceived as being sufficiently targeted/tailored to the needs the civil and resident sectors.

◆ Site Safe as an organisation is perceived positively by the industry, and it has a relatively strong brand. There is also no desire to see Site Safe ‘disappear’.

◆ While all ACC is seen as a logical funder for some of Site Safe’s activities, ACC should not fund the Passport training programme directly, to avoid potential conflicts of interest and avoid being seen as a government endorsement of Site Safe over other providers of health and safety training in the sector, which do not receive any government funding.
2.0 Introduction

This report details the findings from the evaluation of Site Safe’s Building Construction, Civil and Supervisor Gold Passport Training Courses.

2.1 Background

Site Safe is an organisation established with the support of ACC and the construction industry in May 1999. It was specifically established to assist in the reduction of injuries in construction, given that construction represents one of the leading costs to ACC in terms of work-related injury compensation.

In an effort to improve occupational health and safety outcomes in the construction industry, one of Site Safe’s first initiatives was to develop the Passport training programme – a health and safety system specifically targeting the commercial construction industry, and aimed at ensuring a minimum level of awareness of health and safety issues among people working on, or closely associated with work on, construction sites.

A number of the major construction companies have signed a Heads of Agreement protocol with Site Safe to ensure that only those people who have received this minimum level of training would be allowed access to construction sites. Successful trainees receive a ‘passport’ (renewable every two years) enabling them to work at sites these companies control.

This training was subsequently extended to the civil and residential construction sectors. However, due to a low uptake of the residential Passport training programme, the ‘commercial’ passport course was adapted to also suit the residential sector. The current name of this course is “Building Construction Passport Course”. Since its inception in August 2000 more than 72,000 workers in the building and construction sector have completed Passport training.

Also introduced was the Supervisor Gold Card Course (renewable every two years); a two-day programme intended for supervisors and those who need more in-depth knowledge of construction health and safety. Trainees learn management techniques for developing a safety culture, how to establish procedures that will influence worker behaviour, and look at the supervisor’s role focussing on how to influence, train and instruct staff. Since its inception in September 2001 more than 1,300 supervisors in the building and construction sector have completed Gold Card training.

The primary goal of Site Safe and its Passport training programme is to reduce accidents, injuries and deaths in the construction sector: “It is one practicable step that can be taken to ensure that all workers coming onto a site gain a basic understanding of their health and safety responsibilities” (Site Safe website, “Building Construction Passport Course”, 2007).

2 The following construction firms have made Site Safe “passports” an entry standard to working on their sites as from February 2001: Argon Construction, Clearwater Construction, Downer Construction, Fletcher Construction, Hartner Construction, Hawkins Construction, Key Commercial Interiors, McConnell Dowell, Mainzeal Property & Construction, Multiplex, Pendleton Corporation and W. Stevenson & Son.
2001 evaluation

An evaluation of the Passport training programme (as it related to the commercial construction sector and while it was in a pilot phase) was completed by Research New Zealand (then BRC Marketing and Social Research) in 2001. The objective of this evaluation was to ensure that the programme had the potential, once established, to lower the incidence of injuries, and to identify what improvements could be made to deliver the programme more effectively.

Information gap

Previously, Site Safe has been receiving funding estimated at approximately $3.5 million per annum from the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), via Unitec, to deliver the Passport training programme. The Tertiary Education Commission, however, withdrew its funding on December 31, 2007.

There have been discussions between Site Safe and ACC’s Chairman and Chief Executive on whether or not ACC can assist or advise the Site Safe Board on how to go forward following the withdrawal of this funding. In this regard, the ACC Board will make a decision as to whether or not ACC will contribute to funding Site Safe in February 2008.

Other than the evaluation in 2001 (which was fundamentally a formative and process evaluation), there has been no evaluation of the impact of the Passport training programme on injury reduction, nor has there been any research done to get an understanding of the value that the sector places on this training or Site Safe in general. In order to address this information gap and provide ACC’s board with the information it requires to make its decision, ACC commissioned Research New Zealand to conduct an independent evaluation of the Passport and Supervisor Gold Card training courses.
2.2 Objectives

In commissioning this evaluation, ACC articulated three objectives for the research:

1. To understand how Site Safe is perceived within the construction industry.

2. To determine how effective the Passport training programmes have been in building worker capacity to ensure no one is endangering themselves or their workmates.

3. To determine, if there is a difference in claim rates and costs among those employers, and self-employed construction workers, who have attended Passport training and those who have not.

Information objectives

With regards to the first objective, i.e. to understand how Site Safe is perceived within the construction industry, the following information was sought from employers and stakeholders in the construction sector:

- To what extent is the construction industry, aware of Site Safe and its training programmes within the context of ensuring health and safety in the workplace?

- What attitudes, beliefs and perceptions do they have regarding the Passport training programme?

- To what extent, have individual construction businesses engaged with Site Safe?
  - What are the main reasons that businesses and their employees take-up Site Safe training?
  - What are the main reasons why businesses choose not to send their employees to Site Safe training?
  - Having engaged, to what extent do they remain engaged?
    - Have they and/or all their employees attended Passport training? What rates of renewal have there been?
  - To what extent have they used other Site Safe services and products, such as the Safety Advisors, Toolbox Talks, and the Safety Guidelines?
  - To what extent do individual construction businesses believe Site Safe and its training programmes have met their expectations?

---

3 The ‘construction industry’ is defined here as representing the commercial, residential, civil and related trades, and a mix of small to large employers, and “key informants” – e.g. Department of Labour, the major builders and contractors associations and federations, etc.
Overall, to what extent do individual construction businesses, and their employees believe Site Safe adds value, in terms of improving health and safety practices, to their business and the industry in general?

What, in general, are their workplace health and safety practices and policies, and do these differ between those who have an awareness and send their employees to Passport training, those who are not aware of Site Safe training, and those who are aware, but choose not to send their employees?

Do employers believe that the Passport training is enough to fulfil their health and safety legal obligations to their employees?

With regard to the second objective (i.e. to determine how effective the Passport training programmes have been in building worker capacity to ensure no-one is endangering themselves or their workmates), the following information was sought from recent Passport training participants.

What were their reasons for undertaking Site Safe Passport training?

Specifically what did they expect to learn in their training, did this training meet their expectations?

How satisfied are Passport trainees with various aspects of the training, and overall?

What impact has this had on their awareness and knowledge of health and safety procedures, and ways to reduce risk of accidents/injuries on construction sites?

What have they done as a result of their training (e.g. reporting hazards, participation in tool box meetings, ensuring the safety behaviour of their workmates as well as themselves, identifying to their employer further training is required, etc.)?

Do they believe these changes have made a difference in their workplaces?

How likely will they continue to engage in these new behaviours?

Have Passport holders renewed their Passports? If so, how have the ‘refresher courses’ improved their awareness and knowledge of health and safety?
2.3 Methodology

In order to fulfil the information objectives detailed above, two surveys were conducted:

- A survey of recent attendees of a Site Safe Passport training (Construction and/or Civil) and Supervisor Gold Card training.
- A survey of construction sector employers and self-employed persons.

Details of the survey methodologies are detailed below.

**Passport holders survey**

The survey of Passport training attendees was conducted with a randomly selected sample of n=451 construction industry Passport and Gold Supervisor Card holders. The sample was selected from Site Safe’s database of those attending the training courses who successfully completed their training between 1 April 2007 and 1 November 2007.

In order to provide robust sub-samples for the purposes of analysis and reporting, Civil Passport and Supervisor Gold Card training attendees were over-sampled beyond their relative proportions.

Prior to being contacted for an interview, potential respondents were sent a pre-notification letter on Site Safe letterhead advising them that they might be contacted to participate in the research, and that that their participation was voluntary. They were also told that the research would be completed in accordance with the Code of Practice of the Market Research Society of New Zealand (MRSNZ) and the Privacy Act 1993, and that all information provided by them would be handled in the strictest of confidence and reported on an anonymous basis.

The telephone interviews were conducted from Research New Zealand’s CATI-enabled call centre in Wellington between 28 November and 15 December 2007. The average interview length was 19 minutes and the survey achieved a response rate of 52.1 percent.

The maximum margin of error, at the 95 percent confidence estimate for the main sample of n=451 Passport and Supervisor Gold Card trainees is ± 5.9 percent, after adjusting for over-sampling of Civil Passport and Supervisor Gold Card training attendees.

As a matter of course, the final survey data was weighted to adjust for the over-sampling of Civil Passport and Supervisor Gold Card training attendees, so that the overall results reported for the total sample would be representative of the population of all training attendees who successfully completed their training between 1 April 2007 and 1 November 2007.

Copies of the pre-notification letter and survey questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

---

4 The maximum margin of error (at the 95 percent confidence level) provides the range around the reported percentage, which is likely to include the true percentage for the population of interest, assuming a normal sample distribution. In other words, one is 95 percent confident that the “true” percentage is within the plus/minus range quoted, given a survey sample of the size in question.”
Employers and self-employed construction workers survey

The employers and self-employed construction workers survey was conducted with a randomly selected sample of n=461 construction industry employers drawn from ACC’s levy payer database and Site Safe’s database of employers who have sent staff to a Passport or Supervisor Gold Card training course.

As with participants in the Passport holders survey, prior to being contacted for an interview, potential respondents were sent a pre-notification letter on ACC letterhead advising them that they might be contacted to participate in the research, and that that their participation was voluntary. They were also told that the research would be completed in accordance with the Code of Practice of the Market Research Society of New Zealand (MRSNZ) and the Privacy Act 1993, and that all information provided by them would be handled in the strictest of confidence and reported on an anonymous basis.

The interviews were conducted from Research New Zealand’s CATI-enabled call centre in Wellington between 21 November and 14 December 2007. The average interview length was 19 minutes and the survey achieved a response rate of 24.0 percent. The maximum margin of error, at the 95% confidence estimate for the main sample of n=461 is ± 4.5 percent.

The final achieved sample of employers and self-employed workers was comprised of n=104 Site Safe members (including seven heads of agreement employers5), and n=357 non-Site Safe members. A total of n=277 of the survey respondents were employers who had either attended Site Safe Passport training personally, or who had sent their employees to training, while n=184 respondents were from workplaces that have not sent staff to Passport or Supervisor Gold Card training.

Copies of the pre-notification letter and survey questionnaire can be found in Appendix A.

Industry stakeholder interviews

In addition to the two surveys, qualitative interviews were conducted with eight senior officials (as nominated by ACC from certain key industry sector stakeholder groups, including the Department of Labour, three national builders associations/organisations, and an ITO that provides health and safety training to the building/construction sector).

Feedback was sought from these particular officials because of their knowledge and experience, in relation to the health and safety issues facing the construction industry. As such it was expected that they would be in a good position to comment on the role of Site Safe and its Passport training programmes in relation to addressing those issues6.

A copy of the interview guide used for these interviews can be found in Appendix A.

---

5 Twenty-seven out of 73 head’s agreement employers were randomly selected to participate in the research, seven of whom completed the survey.

6 Several of the stakeholders that were interviewed had been involved in Site Safe’s set up.
Analysis of ACC claims data

As noted in a previous section, Objective 3 of the research was to determine if there are differences in work related ACC claims rates and costs between employers whose staff participate in Passport training, and those who do not.

Following ethics committee approval within ACC, Research New Zealand was able to match n=297 of the organisations that participated in the employers survey (64 percent of the sample) with an ACC levy payer number.

The aggregated 2006 and 2007 claims data for each of these employers (i.e. number of medical fee claims and their aggregated associate costs) and their liable earnings were provided to Research New Zealand for analysis purposes only.

Details of the findings from this analysis can be found in Chapter 18 of this report.

2.3.2 Constraints and Limitations of the Research

Because involvement in all of the research activities was conducted on a voluntary basis, potential research participants we able to opt-out of the research process for any reason.

Therefore, the findings do not necessarily represent the perceptions, attitudes or experiences of Passport training attendees (or their employers) who refused to participate in the telephone surveys. Nor do they necessarily represent the views of training participants who participated in courses prior to March 2007, or after the end of November 2007.

Also, as the relative proportions of New Zealand employers and self-employed construction workers who send employees/attend Site Safe training (and who do not do so) is not known, it was not possible to weight the employers survey data to compensate for any intentional or unintentional over-sampling of these different types of employers. Therefore some caution should be exercised in extrapolating the findings of the employers survey to the entire construction sector.

Similarly, the qualitative interviews were conducted with senior persons selected from a limited number stakeholder organisations. These individuals were nominated by ACC as likely being able to contribute to the research, based on their knowledge of issues facing the building and construction sectors, as well as Site Safe and its Passport and Gold Supervisor Card training courses). It is also not known to what degree some of these stakeholders may have been expressing their personal opinion, rather than the official policy position of their organisation.

Therefore the qualitative findings of this research should be construed as likely representing some, but not all, stakeholders’ views and opinions in relation to Site Safe, the Passport training courses, or how to best achieve improvements and positive health and safety outcomes for the building and construction industry.
3.0 Profile of Passport holders

This section provides a profile of Site Safe Passport holders.

At the time of completing their most recent Passport course, just over three-quarters (78 percent) of respondents were full-time salary or wage earners. In comparison, 11 percent were self-employed and six percent were part-time salary or wage earners.

In terms of the types of building and construction that respondents are personally involved with in their work, non-residential building construction (63 percent) and housing and residential building construction (45 percent) were most frequently mentioned. Graph 1 further details these results.

**Graph 1: Types of building and construction involved in (n=451)**

Q31. Which of the following types of building and construction are you personally involved with in your work?

- Building Construction: 75%
- Building Structure Services: 39%
- Building Completion Services: 34%
- Installation Trade Services: 33%
- Site Preparation Services: 25%
- Non-Building Construction: 20%
- Site Preparation Services: 17%
- Other Construction Services: 0%

[Graph showing the percentages of different types of building and construction involvement.]
The period of time that respondents had worked in the construction industry varied, with 38 percent reporting up to five years, 14 percent up to 10 years, 20 percent up to 20 years, and 26 percent for longer than 20 years (Graph 2).

As might be expected, Supervisor Gold Passport holders are significantly more likely to have worked in construction for more than 20 years (52 percent compared with 28 percent for Civil Passport holders and 24 percent for Construction Passport holders).

Graph 2: Time working in the construction industry (n=451)

Q30. How long have you worked in construction?
4.0 Passport holders’ perceptions of Passport training and reasons for participation

The following chapter presents the findings in relation to Passport holders’ reasons for participating in the training course, their expectations as to what they would get out of the course, and the extent that these expectations were met.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Passport holders generally found out about the course through their current employer or contractor (73 percent).
- Most felt that it was important or very important to attend the Site Safe course so that they are able to work on construction sites (92 percent), because it is a requirement of their employer (89 percent), and because of their own concerns about workplace health and safety (89 percent).
- Wanting to learn about injury prevention in general (42 percent), and gaining safety knowledge, awareness of Health and Safety, and identification of hazards (30 percent) were most frequently mentioned as being what they expected from the course.
- The large majority of Passport holders felt that the Site Safe Passport training met or exceeded their expectations (94 percent).

4.1 Reasons for participation

All respondents were asked how they found out about Site Safe’s Passport training. As detailed in Table 1, the majority of Passport holders report they found out about the training from their current employers or contractors (73 percent), while fewer found out about it through another employer or contractor in the construction industry (11 percent), and through polytechnic or apprenticeship training (seven percent).

Interestingly, Civil Passport holders are significantly more likely to find out about Passport training from their current employers or contractors (91 percent compared with 78 percent for Supervisor Gold Passport holders, and 69 percent for Construction Passport holders). On the other hand, Construction Passport holders are significantly more likely to find out from another employer or contractor in the industry, other than their current one (13 percent), or through polytechnic or apprenticeship training (nine percent).
Table 1: Finding out about Passport training

Q7. How did you find out about Passport training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employer/contractor</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another employer/contractor in construction industry</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic/apprenticeship training</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory / requirement</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues working in construction</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Construction Industry Training Organisation (BCITO)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous employer outside the construction industry</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through another organisation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Site Safe or advertising</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Builders Association</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Master Builders Federation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Officer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

In considering the importance of possible reasons for attending the Site Safe Passport course, respondents report the following reasons as being important or very important:

- To be able to work on certain building/construction sites (92 percent reported this as important or very important to them).
- A requirement of their immediate employer (89 percent).
- Their own concerns about workplace health and safety (89 percent).
- The major contractors’ requirement that all subcontractors have a Passport since 1 February 2001 (81 percent).
- High injury rates in building and construction generally (77 percent).
- To get business/win contracts/be considered for contracts (73 percent).
- Increasing employment opportunities in the construction industry (69 percent).
- High injury rates in their particular type of business (65 percent).
Graph 3 illustrates the perceived importance of all reasons that respondents were asked about.

**Graph 3: Reasons for attending the Passport course (Important and very important) (n=451)**

**Q8. Thinking about why you attended the Passport course, how important or unimportant were each of the following reasons for doing this…?**

![Graph showing reasons for attending Passport course](image)

- To be able to work on certain building/construction sites: 92%
- A requirement of your immediate employer: 89%
- Your own concerns about workplace health and safety: 77%
- The major contractors’ requirement that all subcontractors have a Passport since 1 February 2001: 69%
- High injury rates in building and construction generally: 65%
- To get business/win contracts/be considered for contracts: 47%
- Increasing employment opportunities in the construction industry: 36%
- High injury rates in your particular type of business: 19%
- An accident someone else had when you were at work: 19%
- An accident you had at work: 10%
- A requirement of your union: 10%

In addition to these reasons, respondents were asked if there were any other important factors that motivated them to attend a Passport course. Most (59 percent) felt there were no such other reasons, while nine percent mentioned they wanted to learn about injury prevention in general, eight percent mentioned they wanted to make their staff and/or site safer, seven percent mentioned raising the staff’s awareness of hazards, and seven percent mentioned the compulsory nature of the course.

Construction Passport holders are significantly more likely to report that there were not any other important factors that motivated them to attend a Passport course (63 percent compared with 46 percent for Civil Passport holders and 43 percent for Supervisor Gold Passport holders).
4.2 Expectations of the course

When asked what types of information or skills that they expected to gain from the course (Table 2), Passport holders most frequently mentioned wanting to learn about injury prevention in general (42 percent), gaining safety knowledge, awareness of Health and Safety, and/or identification of hazards (30 percent), checking if their current injury prevention activities are appropriate (11 percent) and compliance with the Health and Safety in Employment Act (eight percent).

In comparison, ten percent could not think of any particular types of information or skills that they expected to gain from the course.

There is little difference in the expectations of the course based on the different types of passports.

Table 2: Expected information or skills

Q10. And can you tell me what types of information or skills you expected to gain from the course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Information or Skills</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to learn about injury prevention (in general)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety knowledge / awareness of Health and Safety / identification of hazards</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To check if my current injury prevention activities are appropriate</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (with the Health and Safety Act)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of legislation / safety requirements / safety processes</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build communication skills (with colleagues / onsite)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out the best ways to handle machinery</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to work on certain building/construction sites</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out the best ways to handle tools</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On personal recommendation from friend/ neighbour/ colleague</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out the best ways to handle chemicals</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to help others</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally convinced by course representative</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find out the best ways to handle vehicles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be considered for/win contracts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular reason</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.
Most Passport holders report that the Site Safe Passport training met their expectations (70 percent), while another 24 percent say their expectations were exceeded. In comparison, five percent of Passport holders report that their expectations were not met (Graph 4).

Again, there were no significant differences between the results for holders of different types of passports.

**Graph 4: Whether expectations were met (n=451)**

*Q11. Overall, how much do you agree or disagree that your expectations about the Site Safe course have been met? Would you say your expectations have been…?*

- 70% Met
- 24% Exceeded
- 5% Not met
- 1% Don't know
- 1% Don't know
5.0 Passport holders’ satisfaction with Passport training

This section presents the results relating to Passport holders’ satisfaction and opinions of the Site Safe training course. In particular, their satisfaction with specific aspects of the course, their overall level of satisfaction, and any improvements they would suggest making.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Passport holders are highly satisfied with the aspects of the Passport training, which is reflected in their high level of satisfaction with the Site Safe training course overall (64 percent very satisfied and 32 percent just satisfied).

- The large majority would definitely recommend Site Safe to other people in their industry (89 percent), and a further six percent would recommend but with reservations.

- Many felt there was no particular improvement they would like made if they were to participate in the Passport training again (38 percent), but those most frequently mentioned were:
  - To make it more relevant or tailored to their industry, field or work (14 percent).
  - To make the length more appropriate for the amount of content (seven percent).

5.1 Satisfaction with specific aspects of the course

When asked their level of satisfaction with specific aspects of the Passport training, the majority of Passport holders were highly satisfied with each of the specific aspects of the training. In particular, the following aspects elicited the highest satisfaction levels:

- Trainers’ knowledge and awareness of areas covered (98 percent reported they are satisfied or very satisfied).

- Material presented in the course (97 percent).

- Course location (97 percent).

- Course timing (96 percent).

The one notable exception was that of the course fee, for which only 42 percent reported they are satisfied or very satisfied. However, 53 percent reported that the course fee was not applicable, whereas only two percent of respondents reported they were dissatisfied with it.
Viewing the results by the different types of Passport holders, Civil Passport holders are more likely to be satisfied with almost all of the aspects of the training. In particular, they are significantly more likely to be very satisfied with the course location, and to consider the course fee to be not applicable.

Graph 5 below shows the satisfaction levels for all aspects of the Passport training.

**Graph 5: Satisfaction with aspects of the Passport training (n=451)**

Q13. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with each of the following areas of Passport training…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainer’s knowledge and awareness</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material presented</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course location</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course timing</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course fee</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance Length</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance Course fee</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Overall satisfaction with the Site Safe course

With this high rating of the individual aspects of the training in mind, it is not surprising to find that Passport holders report they are satisfied with the Site Safe training course overall, with 64 percent reporting they are very satisfied and a further 32 percent just satisfied (Table 3). The average rating is $x = 4.6$ on a 5-point scale.

Relatedly, the large majority (89 percent) would definitely recommend Site Safe to other people in their industry, while a further six percent would recommend but with reservations (Table 4).

Consistent with the findings for the individual aspects, the findings suggest Civil Passport holders are also more likely to be satisfied with Site Safe overall, and more likely to definitely recommend it to others, but not significantly so.

Table 3: Satisfaction with the Site Safe training course attended

Q14. So based on your experience, how satisfied would you say you are with the “Site Safe” training course that you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base = 451</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Table 4: Recommending Site Safe to other people in the industry

Q15. And would you recommend the “Site Safe” to other people in your industry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base = 451</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but with reservations</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

When asked for one improvement they would like made if they were to participate in the Passport training again, nearly four-in-ten Passport holders (38 percent) felt that there was no particular improvement that should be made. However, the most frequently mentioned improvements were:
◆ To make it more relevant or tailored to their industry, field or work (14 percent).

I would try and put people from similar organisations together. There was a benefit from having a range of backgrounds, but everyone was looking for specific information for their own industry.

Course to be tailored to different groups that attend the training. At the moment there is only one for all types.

◆ To make the length more appropriate for the amount of content (seven percent).

Reduce the time of the presentation. Reduce it in half and you’d still get the same amount of knowledge.

There were no significant differences in relation to suggested improvements to Passport training when viewed by the different types of passports.
6.0 Priority of health and safety

The following chapter details the results relating to the level of priority that is placed on health and safety, and the perceived injury rates as compared to the industry average.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Most Passport holders personally consider workplace health and safety to be a high priority (90 percent), however, they believe their employers and head contractors place slightly less of a priority on workplace health and safety (81 percent).

- Similarly, they consider the injury rate for people in their trade (and who are doing the same job as them) as being below or well below the building and construction industry’s average injury rate (61 percent), but believe their own injury rate to be below or well below the building and construction industry’s average injury rate to a much greater extent (81 percent).

6.1 Prioritisation of health and safety

As might be expected, the large majority of Passport holders (90 percent) personally believe workplace health and safety is a high priority (Graph 6). However, ten percent report that it is a medium or low priority.

There are no significant differences in the level of priority according to the different types of passports.

Graph 6: Personal priority placed on health and safety (n=451)

Q17. Overall, thinking about all the day-to-day decisions and considerations you make when doing your job, do you think workplace health and safety is a…?

- Low priority
- Medium priority
- High priority
However, respondents believe their employers and head contractors place slightly less of a priority on workplace health and safety, with 81 percent reporting them as having a high priority and 17 percent a medium or low priority (Graph 7).

Interestingly, Civil Passport holders were significantly more likely than Construction Passport holders to rate their employers as placing a high priority on workplace health and safety (92 percent compared with 78 percent).

**Graph 7: Priority placed on health and safety by employer (n=451)**

*Q18. And what level of priority do you think your employer or head contractors place on workplace health and safety?*

- **High priority**: 81%
- **Medium priority**: 2%
- **Low priority**: 3%
- **Don't know**: 3%
6.2 Perceived injury rates

In considering the injury rate for people in their trade and who are doing the same job as them, 61 percent of respondents believe that this injury rate is below or well below the building and construction industry’s average injury rate. In comparison, 17 percent believe it is above or well above the average.

However, when thinking specifically about their own injury rate, 81 percent of respondents believe that their injury rate is below or well below the building and construction industry’s average injury rate, compared with only six percent believing it is above or well above the average.

Graph 8 below illustrates these injury rate results both for respondents themselves and their perceptions of others in their trade.

Graph 8: Perceived injury rates – those in the trade versus personal (n=451)

Q19. Do you consider the injury rate for people in your trade, or who are doing the same job as you, to be below or above the building and construction industry’s average?

Q20. And compared to the average injury rate in construction, do you consider your own injury rate to be below or above the building and construction industry average?
7.0 Passport holders’ other health and safety training

This section details the results regarding any other health and safety training that Passport holders have participated in, and comparisons between that health and safety training and their Passport training.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Just under half have undertaken other health and safety training for work in construction (48 percent).

- The Passport training compared favourably to these, with 41 percent reporting that their Passport training was better or much better, whereas only three percent reported that it was poor or very poor in comparison to their other training.

- Those rating the Passport training worse in at least some areas most frequently reported this because the other training was more specific or more tailored to their industry or trade (41 percent), more detailed (29 percent) or more practical (17 percent).
7.1 Participation in other health and safety training

Just less than one half of all Passport holders (48 percent) report to have undertaken health and safety training for work in construction other than the Passport training, as shown in Graph 9 below.

There are no significant differences in these results based on the type of passport.

Graph 9: Other health and safety training (n=451)

Q21. Other than your Passport training, had you previously undertaken any health and safety training for work in construction?
7.2 Comparisons to the Passport training

Those who have had other training were asked to compare it to their Passport training (Table 5). Four-in-ten (41 percent) of this sub-sample reported that their Passport training was better or much better, whereas only three percent reported that it was poor or very poor in comparison to their other training. A further 31 percent believe the training was about the same, while 22 percent believe the Passport training was better in some areas, but not in others.

Again, no significant differences are evident based on the type of passport.

Table 5: Passport training in comparison with other health and safety training

Q22. And how did your Passport training compare to this other training in relation to raising awareness of the health and safety hazards in the construction and building industry? Would you say the Passport training was…?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base = 235*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better overall</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better in some areas, but not in others</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
*Sub-sample based on those who had previously undertaken some health and safety training for work in construction.

Those who rate the Passport training as lower than their other health and safety training were asked to explain their reasons for this. Reflecting the improvements that were suggested to the Passport course in Section 4.2, these respondents most frequently felt that the other training was better than the Passport training because it was:

- More specific or more tailored to their industry or trade (41 percent).

  Just because it brought up a lot more safety factors that were more relevant to my industry.

  It was more specific to the activities, which we carry out on a day-to-day basis, which is definitely required for the job that I do.
More detailed (29 percent).

They were able to explain every aspect of safety in one day. All types of fires. Use of proper PPE. The use of the right equipment for gas canisters. The use of the right tools for the job.

It was over a two-day course - got more in depth and we had to do exercises.

More practical (17 percent).

It was practical. We were working on the practical environment not just theoretical. We had exercises outside.

We went in and did practical and theory, and you got [to] practice what you learnt.
8.0 Impact of Passport training

This section presents the findings relating to any change in behaviour that has resulted from the training, Passport holders’ perceptions as to whether this has reduced the risks in the workplace, and whether this change in behaviour will continue.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Most Passport holders feel they act differently since the training in that they are more aware and identify workplace hazards (56 percent).
- Amongst those who act differently in some way since obtaining their passport, the majority believe this has made a difference in terms of reducing the risks to them personally when working on-site (90 percent). This is frequently because they feel it has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues (63 percent).
- A similarly large majority of those who have acted differently report that it is likely that they will continue to do things differently in the future as a result of the Passport training (89 percent).
- Passport holders for whom this was a refresher course felt it improved their awareness and knowledge of health and safety issues in the building and construction industry (78 percent).

8.1 Change in behaviour due to the training

Passport holders were asked to describe any changes in their behaviour while working on construction or building sites since obtaining their Passport card.

The majority mentioned being more aware/identifying workplace hazards (56 percent), while mentioned to a lesser extent was discussing identifying hazards with other workers, supervising contractors or employers (ten percent) and developing a safety management plan (six percent).

On the other hand, one-quarter of Passport holders report they have done nothing differently since attending the Passport training (24 percent), as shown in Table 6.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given the nature of the passport type, Supervisor Gold Passport holders were significantly more likely than Construction and Civil Passport holders to discuss identifying hazards with other workers, supervising contractors or employers (30 percent compared with ten percent and nine percent respectively).

Correspondingly, Civil Passport holders were significantly more likely than Supervisor Gold Passport holders to feel that they do not do anything differently since attending the course (30 percent compared with 17 percent).
Table 6: Changes when working on a construction or building site since obtaining the Passport

Q23. Since obtaining your Passport, what, if anything, do you now do differently when working on a construction or building site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More aware/ identified workplace hazards</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed identifying hazards with workers/employers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a safety management plan</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing safety equipment</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More carefully used machinery</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More carefully used tools</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being more careful/ working slower</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task analysis/ paperwork / assessing requirements</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More carefully used chemicals</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More carefully used vehicles</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring safety of others and encouraging good practices</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended the Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card course</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended/or plan to attend other safety courses</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being tidy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have done nothing differently since attending</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.
8.2 Impact of any behaviour change

Of those Passport holders who have acted differently since obtaining their passport, the majority (90 percent) believe this has made a difference in terms of reducing the risks to them personally when working on a construction or building site. In comparison, seven percent think it has made no difference in reducing the risks (Graph 10).

Graph 10: Impact of change in behaviour due to training (n=349)

Q23a. And do you believe this has made a difference in relation to reducing risks to you personally when you are working on a construction or building site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-sample based on those that had acted differently since obtaining their Passport.

The reasons provided by those that believe it has made a difference in relation to reducing the risks to them personally include:

- It has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues (63 percent).

  *You're made more aware by Site Safe of what can go wrong with different things, especially when there's a lot going on in one particular site.*

  *It makes you more aware of what's going on so you know what to look out for and how to deal with situations.*

- Staff are sharing the responsibility of safety management / taking on more responsibilities (11 percent).

  *If you feel that the industry is keen on health and safety then it’s a normal thing to pick it up and be part of it.*

  *You assess the situation first, rather than rely on the foreman or manager on site.*
There are fewer accidents / it is a safer work environment (seven percent).

Generally, the culture has become ‘let’s get it done safely’. It exposes me to less accidents.

The general site is now kept tidier with fewer hazards. The housekeeping has improved - removing rubbish and hazards.

In contrast, the reasons provided by those that believe it has not made a difference in relation to reducing the risks to them personally include:

- We were already safe / there were no previous accidents (51 percent).

  Because I have always been safety conscious - with or without the paperwork.

  Because I haven’t had any accidents before the passport and I haven’t had any accidents since receiving the passport.

- The information was just common sense (19 percent).

  Because most of the stuff is common sense and I always use the right gear to do the right job.

- We were already practicing the suggested methods (ten percent).

  The Site Safe course was basically a refresher course.
8.3 Future behaviour

Not surprisingly, a similar proportion of Passport holders that feel their actions have reduced the risks to themselves report that it is likely that they will continue to do things differently in the future as a result of the Passport training (89 percent), while five percent say they will not likely continue to do so (Graph 11).

Graph 11: Likelihood of continued change in behaviour (n=349)

Q23b. And how likely will you continue to do things differently in the future, than you might have done prior to your Passport training?

The reasons provided by those that feel it is likely that they will continue to do things differently include:

- They have a greater knowledge/awareness of dangers/hazards/safety now (30 percent).
  
  Having received that information now, having that awareness and that pre-checking process, and having that spelled out and taking that on as a permanent procedural change.

  Because I’m more aware of the danger associated with my workplace.

- They have prioritised safety and keeping themselves and others free from injury (22 percent).
  
  I think everything we do on site now is done for safety. It’s just as simple as that.

  Anything can happen at any time and I don’t want to be hurt or hurt others in any way.
Because it is safer to do things this way / it's the new way things must be done now (17 percent).

*It's become a habit. It's part of the way we do things now. That Site Safe meant a lot to the boys. You're more aware of hazards and the results of a hazard - it's not only us it affects.*

*Forms part of our health and safety policy in our company - have to maintain those levels.*

In contrast, those that feel it is not likely that they will continue to do things differently following the Passport training tended to mention that they will have an ongoing awareness but that they don’t do much particularly different than they did prior to the training.
8.4 Effectiveness of a refresher course

Just under half of respondents (48 percent) report that this was their first Passport course, whereas 52 percent report that this was a refresher course.

Passport holders for whom this was a refresher course were asked whether they felt this most recent course improved their awareness and knowledge of health and safety issues in the building and construction industry. Just over three-quarters (78 percent) of these respondents reported that it did improve their awareness and knowledge, whereas 21 percent felt it did not (Graph 12).

Interestingly, those that had first passed a Passport training course longer ago were no more likely to feel that their refresher course improved their awareness and knowledge of health and safety issues (78 percent for those first passing in 1999-2002 compared with 78 percent for those whose first course was in the 2003-2006 period).

Graph 12: Effectiveness of refresher Passport course (n=230)

Q23c. Overall, do you believe the most recent course has improved your awareness and knowledge of health and safety issues in the building and construction industry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-sample based on those for whom this was a refresher course.
9.0 Passport holders’ levels of awareness of other products and services provided by Site Safe

This section contains the results relating to other products and services provided by Site Safe. In particular, the level of awareness of these products and services, and their use.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Around two-thirds or more of Passport holders are aware of Toolbox Safety Talks (77 percent), the Health and Safety Guidelines (67 percent), and the Safety Management Plan (65 percent).

- Amongst these, just under half report they had used Toolbox Safety Talks (47 percent), and around one-third had used the Safety Management Plan (33 percent), and the Health and Safety Guidelines (30 percent).

- Furthermore, the large majority of those that had used these health and safety products and services found them helpful in their work: Toolbox Safety Talks (92 percent), Health and Safety Guidelines (91 percent), and Safety Advisors (90 percent).

9.1 Awareness of other products and services

Besides Site Safe’s Construction Passport, Civil Passport and Supervisor Gold Card, the health and safety products and services provided by Site Safe that Passport holders are most aware of are Toolbox Safety Talks (77 percent), the Health and Safety Guidelines (67 percent), and the Safety Management Plan (65 percent).

In contrast, 12 percent of Passport holders are not aware of any of the other health and safety products or services when asked a specific list of those provided by Site Safe (Table 7).

Interestingly, Supervisor Gold Passport holders were significantly more likely than Construction and Civil Passport holders to be aware of each of the other products or services provided by Site Safe.
Table 7: Awareness of other health and safety products or services provided by Site Safe

Q24. Besides a Passport and Supervisor Gold Card, are you aware of any of the following health and safety products or services provided by Site Safe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolbox Safety Talks</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Guidelines</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Management Plan</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Advisors</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.
9.2 Use of other products and services

Passport holders that had heard of any of these other health and safety products and services provided by Site Safe were then asked whether they had used any of them. Just under half (47 percent) reported they had used Toolbox Safety Talks, and around one-third had used the Safety Management Plan (33 percent), and the Health and Safety Guidelines (30 percent).

However, despite being aware of these other products and services, 44 percent report they had not used any of them (Table 8).

Reflecting their higher awareness of these other products and services, Supervisor Gold Passport holders were significantly more likely to have used each of the list of other products or services provided by Site Safe.

Table 8: Use of other Site Safe services

Q25. And have you ever used any of these services provided by Site Safe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Civil</th>
<th>Supervisor Gold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toolbox Safety Talks</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Management Plan</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Guidelines</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Advisors</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.
*Sub-sample based on those aware of other Site Safe specific services.

Those Passport holders that had used any of the other health and safety products and services provided by Site Safe were then asked whether they found them useful in their work.

For each of the products/services, the large majority of respondents report that it was helpful in their work (Graph 13):

- Toolbox Safety Talks (92 percent).
- Health and Safety Guidelines (91 percent).
- Safety Advisors (90 percent).
- Safety Management Plan (86 percent).
Although the results suggest that Construction Passport holders tended to report a lower level of helpfulness for each product/service, the differences are not statistically significant.

**Graph 13: Helpfulness of other health and safety products and services (n=84)**

Q26. And were the services you used helpful, partly helpful, or not helpful to you in your work…?

- **Toolbox Safety Talks (n=217)**: 92%
- **Health and Safety Guidelines (n=144)**: 91%
- **Safety Advisors (n=84)**: 90%
- **Safety Management Plan (n=161)**: 86%
10.0 Overall perceptions of Site Safe in general

Passport holders were asked what they think other people who work in the same area of the building and construction industry think about Site Safe. Just over half (55 percent) supplied positive comments about Site Safe, whereas 15 percent were negative.

A variety of positive comments were made but the most commonly mentioned themes were:

- That Site Safe has enhanced their overall awareness of hazards and safety (12 percent).

  They think it’s worthwhile because the information it brings can give you a better knowledge of what you’re doing and how to stay safer.

  They are all aware from what I’ve seen on site and they are safety conscious, may not be in their habit, but they are conscious of it.

- That it’s relevant and/or a requirement for their area of business (ten percent).

  I think it’s very very well known - so highly regarded - and I’d think everybody respects it. Most of the big companies have it and it’s a requirement so most people would respect it.

  I’d like to think so. If they are serious about being in the industry they should think about doing the Site Safe course.

Whereas the negative comments mentioned were generally focused on the following:

- That if it wasn’t for the fact it was compulsory they would not do it (26 percent).

  The main reason we do it is because we are told we have to do it to go on site. So you go and do it to get on with the job. They enjoyed it and got a bit out if it.

  A lot of feedback is that it’s boring and people only do it because they have to stay on the site. The number of negative comments outweighs the number of positive ones.

- That they already knew it and/or that the ground had already been covered in other training or courses (21 percent).

  It’s a good course but other people think it’s going over stuff they already know and it’s all common sense.

  Most are quite negative about it because they are adults and hate being told what to do - they feel they are adults and know all about it already.
Reflecting their high ratings of the impacts on health and safety, Civil Passport holders are also most likely to report that others in their area of the industry are positive about Site Safe (69 percent compared with 54 percent for Supervisor Gold and 53 percent for Construction).
11.0 Respondents’ profile of employers

The chapter describes the profile of the respondents in the achieved sample.

Graph 14 shows the types of the construction industry services that respondents’ companies are involved in. As detailed, 58 percent report working in the building construction, followed by the building completion services (29 percent) and building structure services (16 percent).

Sole traders or self-employed are more likely to report being involved in building completion services (88 percent).

Graph 14: Construction industry sectors (n=461)
Q3. Can you tell me which of the following construction-related activities apply to the type of work your company is involved in?

Graph 15 below shows the size of respondents’ businesses in relation to permanent employees. As detailed, 19 percent are sole traders or self-employed, while 13 percent are working in organisations with 20 or more permanent staff.

Graph 15: Size of the organisations (n=461)
Q4 and Q5a. Which of the following best describes the ownership structure of the business?
The survey also asked all those who were not self-employed what position they held in their organisation. As detailed in Graph 16, most frequently respondents were owners (40 percent), general managers or managing directors (29 percent), and health and safety managers (12 percent).

Those working in organisations with 20 or more permanent staff are more likely to report they work as a health and safety managers (41 percent), and less likely as an owner (16 percent) or a general manager/managing director (14 percent).

**Graph 16: Respondent's position in the business (n=329)**

*Q5. Which of the following best describes your position in this business?*

- Owner: 40%
- General Manager/Managing Director: 29%
- Health and Safety Manager: 12%
- Operations Manager: 6%
- Finance/Accounts Manager: 3%
- Human Resource Manager: 1%
- Other: 8%

Sub-sample excludes sole traders/self-employed.

The survey also asked how many sub-contractors that work on construction or building sites are currently working full-time or part-time for the respondent’s business. As detailed in Graph 17 overleaf, while roughly a third said *none* (35 percent), another third reported employing five or more sub-contractors (34 percent), while 28 percent sub-contracted one to four people.

As might be expected, those working in organisations with 20 or more permanent staff are less likely to report they do not employ any sub-contractors (11 percent).
Graph 17: Number of sub-contractors that work on construction or building sites for the business (n=401)

Q5b. And to the best of your knowledge, how many sub-contractors that work on construction or building sites are currently working full-time or part-time for this business?

Almost half (48 percent) of respondents working in the organisation with employees (permanent or sub-contractors) report having some employees on an apprenticeship scheme. As might be expected, those working in organisations that employ one to four permanent staff are less likely to report this (31 percent), while those organisations with five or more permanent staff are more likely to report that there are apprentices in their workplace (61 to 64 percent).

Also, of those respondents working in the organisation with employees (permanent or sub-contractors), eight percent report having staff belonging to a union. As might be expected, those working in organisations employing 20 or more permanent staff report are more likely to report there is a union presence in their workplace (38 percent), than smaller organisations (two to three percent).
12.0 Employers’ awareness of Site Safe and participation

The following chapter looks at the awareness of Site Safe training courses among employers, as well as participation of companies’ employees in these courses.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- When asked what training courses they are aware of that deal with identifying hazards, and being safe and avoiding accidents on building and construction worksites, 58 percent of organisations have mentioned Site Safe without being prompted. Unprompted awareness of the three specific Site Safe courses was as follows: Site Safe Construction Passport (24 percent), Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (ten percent), Site Safe Civil Passport (four percent).

- After being prompted about the three specific Site Safe courses, total combined awareness of these courses discussed was as follows: Site Safe Construction Passport (78 percent), Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (53 percent), Site Safe Civil Passport (42 percent).

- In contrast, 16 percent of respondents are not aware of any of the three courses, while another two percent are uncertain.

- Most frequently respondents find out about Site Safe training through another employer/contractor in the construction industry (37 percent), their current employer/boss (20 percent), an advertising/notice in local newspaper/magazine (ten percent).

- Forty-eight percent of those respondents aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses have attended Site Safe Construction Passport training, distantly followed by Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (nine percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (six percent). Also, a further two percent of respondents are enrolled to attend a course.

- However, 42 percent of respondents who are aware of the Site Safe courses report they have not attended any of them.

- Of those respondents aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses and who work in organisations employing other permanent staff, 64 percent report that their business’ employees have attended Site Safe Construction Passport training, distantly followed by Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (ten percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (six percent). Also, a further one percent of respondents report their employees are enrolled to attend a course.

- However, 24 percent report their business’ employees have not attended any of the courses.
Fifty-nine percent of respondents report that all of their permanent employees who work on construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport, while another 16 percent believe that over three quarters of such employees have a Site Safe Passport.

On the other hand, 13 percent of respondents report that less than half of the permanent employees in their business who work on construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport.

Thirty-seven percent of respondents report that all of their sub-contactors carry a valid Site Safe Passport, while 50 percent say their business does not require independent sub-contactors to have Site Safe Passports.

Forty-four percent of respondents report that all of their supervisors have a current Supervisor Gold Card, while another 16 percent believe that over three quarters of their supervisors have such Gold Cards.

On the other hand, 22 percent of respondents report that less than half of the supervisors in their business have a current Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card.
12.1 Awareness of Site Safe courses

12.1.1 Unprompted awareness of Site Safe courses

All respondents were asked what training courses they are aware of that deal with identifying hazards, and being safe and avoiding accidents on building and construction worksites. As detailed in Graph 18, over half (58 percent) mentioned Site Safe without being prompted. Unprompted awareness of the three specific Site Safe courses was as follows:

- Site Safe Construction Passport (24 percent).
- Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (ten percent).
- Site Safe Civil Passport (four percent).

Sole traders or self-employed are less likely to mention the Site Safe Construction Passport course without being prompted (13 percent). In contrast, organisations with 20 or more employees are more likely to mention the Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (25 percent).

There were no significant differences in relation to unprompted awareness of Site Safe training courses when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent’s organisation.

Graph 18: Unprompted awareness of Site Safe courses (n=461)

Q16. Now I’d like to ask some questions about training courses that deal with identifying hazards, and being safe and avoiding accidents on building and construction worksites. Which courses, if any, are you aware of?
12.1.2 Total awareness of Site Safe courses

Those respondents, who did not mention the names of the three specific Site Safe courses without being prompted, were asked if they have heard about them. Once the unprompted and prompted awareness were combined, total awareness of the three specific Site Safe courses discussed (detailed in Graph 19) was as follows:

- Site Safe Construction Passport (78 percent).
- Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (53 percent).
- Site Safe Civil Passport (42 percent).

On the other hand, 16 percent of respondents were not aware of any of the three courses, while another two percent were uncertain.

As might be expected, the larger the size of the company, the more likely they were aware of the Site Safe courses. Sole traders or self-employed were more likely to be unaware of any of the three Site Safe courses (34 percent) and in particular, were less likely to be aware of Site Safe Construction Passport (64 percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (25 percent). In contrast, those working in an organisation with 20 or more permanent staff were more likely to be aware of Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (77 percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (66 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent’s organisation.

Graph 19: Total awareness of the Site Safe courses (n=461)

Q16. Now I’d like to ask some questions about training courses that deal with identifying hazards, and being safe and avoiding accidents on building and construction worksites. Which courses, if any, are you aware of?

Q17. And have you also heard about a course called…?
12.2 Sources of awareness of Site Safe training

Those respondents who were aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses (n=378) were asked how they first became aware of Site Safe Passport training. As shown in Graph 20, most frequently respondents found out about Site Safe training through:

- Another employer/contractor in the construction industry (37 percent).
- Their current employer/boss (20 percent).
- An advertising/notice in local newspaper/magazine (ten percent).
- Another employer/ contractor in the construction industry (37 percent).
- Their current employer/boss (20 percent).
- An advertising/notice in local newspaper/magazine (ten percent).

The survey found no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or industry sub-sector.

**Graph 20: Sources of awareness of Site Safe training (n=378)**

Q18. Thinking about 'Site Safe' Passport training, how did you first become aware of the course?

- Another employer/ contractor in the construction industry
- Employer/boss
- Advertising/ notice in local newspaper/ magazine
- Friends/ neighbours/ colleagues
- Phone call or personal visit from Site Safe representative
- Building & Construction Industry Training Organisation (BCITO)
- Letter in the mail
- Registered Master Builders Federation
- Polytechnic/ apprenticeship training
- Certified Builders Association
- Through another organisation
- It is compulsory
- Through Internet
- Joinery Industry Training Organisation (JITO)
- Other
- Don't know

Sub-sample excludes those unaware of the 3 Site Safe courses.
12.3 Attendance of Site Safe courses

12.3.1 Attendance of Site Safe courses by employers

Those respondents who were aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses (n=378) were asked which of the courses they have attended themselves. As shown in Graph 21, almost half (48 percent) of responding employers attended Site Safe Construction Passport training, distantly followed by Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (nine percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (six percent).

A further two percent of respondents were enrolled to attend a course. However, 42 percent of respondents who were aware of the Site Safe courses report they have not attended any of them.

As might be expected, those respondents working in an organisation with 20 or more permanent staff were more likely to report they have attended Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card course (31 percent).

There were no significant differences when these results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent's organisation.

Graph 21: Attendance of Site Safe courses by employers (n=378)

Q19. And have you ever attended a 'Site Safe' Passport or Supervisor Gold Card course yourself? Which ones?

Sub-sample excludes those unaware of the 3 Site Safe courses.
12.3.2 Attendance of Site Safe courses by permanent employees

Those respondents who were aware of at least one of the three Site Safe courses and who work in organisations employing other permanent staff (n=378) were also asked which of the courses the permanent employees of their business have attended. As detailed in Graph 22 below, about two-thirds (64 percent) report that their business' employees have attended Site Safe Construction Passport training, distantly followed by Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card (ten percent) and Site Safe Civil Passport (six percent).

A further one percent of respondents report their employees were enrolled to attend a course. However, 24 percent report their business' employees have not attended any of the courses.

Again, as expected, those respondents working in an organisation with 20 or more permanent staff are more likely to report their employees have attended Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card course (27 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent's organisation.

Graph 22: Attendance of Site Safe courses by permanent employees (n=320)

Q20. And what about any of this business's (other) permanent employees, including apprentices? Which courses have they attended?

Sub-sample excludes those unaware of the 3 Site Safe courses and those who are sole traders or self-employed.
12.4 Employees with current Site Safe cards

12.4.1 Permanent employees with current Site Safe Passports

Those respondents whose employees attended Site Safe Construction Passport or Civil Passport courses (n=216) were asked what proportion of their business’ permanent employees who work on building or construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport. As shown in Graph 23, 59 percent of respondents report that all of their permanent employees who work on construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport, while another 16 percent believe that over three quarters of such employees have a Site Safe Passport.

On the other hand, 13 percent of respondents reported that less than half of the permanent employees in their business who work on construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport.

The survey found no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 23: Permanent employees with current Site Safe Passports (n=216)

Q20a. What proportion of this business’ permanent employees who work on building or construction sites have a current Site Safe Passport? Is it…?

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended Site Safe Construction Passport or Civil Passport courses.
12.4.2 Independent sub-contractors with current Site Safe Passports

Those respondents whose businesses employ sub-contractors (n=209) were asked if their business requires all of its independent sub-contactors to also carry a valid Site Safe Passport. As detailed in Graph 24, 37 percent of respondents report that all of their sub-contactors carry a valid Site Safe Passport, while 50 percent say their business does not require independent sub-contactors to have Site Safe Passports.

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 24: Independent sub-contractors with current Site Safe Passports (n=209)

Q20c. And does your business require all of its independent sub-contactors to also carry a valid Site Safe Passport?

- Yes, all of them: 37%
- Some, but not all: 50%
- Does not require independent sub-contactors to have Site Safe Passports: 4%
- Don't know: 9%

Sub-sample based on those aware of the 3 Site Safe courses and whose businesses employ sub-contractors.
12.4.3 Supervisors with current Site Safe Gold Cards

Those respondents whose employees attended a Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card course (n=32) were also asked what proportion of their business’ supervisors have a current Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card. As shown in Graph 25, 44 percent of the sub-sample report that all of their supervisors have a current Supervisor Gold Card, while another 16 percent believe that over three quarters of their supervisors have such Gold Cards.

On the other hand, 22 percent of respondents report that less than half of the supervisors in their business have a current Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card.

Due to the small sub-sample (n=32) further analysis by the size of the organisation or its industry sector was not possible.

Graph 25: Supervisors with current Site Safe Gold Cards (n=32)

Q20b. What proportion of this business’ supervisors have a current Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card? Is it…?

- 16% All of them
- 44% Over 75 percent
- 19% Between 50 and 75 percent
- 22% Less than 50 percent

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended Site Safe Supervisor Gold Card course.
13.0 Employers’ reasons for participation in Site Safe and satisfaction with training

The following chapter examines employers’ reasons for participation in Site Safe training and their satisfaction with it, as well as the ability of the courses to meet employers’ expectations about the courses.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

✦ Among the reasons for companies to send their employees to Site Safe courses, most frequently employers mentioned to be able to work on certain building/construction sites (50 percent), followed by wanting to learn about injury prevention (in general) (32 percent), and in order to be considered for/win contracts, or Compliance (with the Health and Safety Act) (both 12 percent).

✦ The majority of respondents report that their expectations were met (71 percent) or exceeded (12 percent), when they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course. In contrast, 13 percent of respondents report their expectations about Site Safe training courses have not been met.

✦ Among the reasons why they believe the Site Safe courses met or exceeded their expectations, respondents most frequently either gave a general positive comment (25 percent), or specifically mentioned that courses have enhanced their company’s overall awareness of hazards (18 percent), everything was covered adequately/covers the basics very well (17 percent), and good delivery/presentation/clarity (seven percent).

✦ Among those reporting the Site Safe courses did not meet their expectations, respondents most frequently mentioned this was because content was too broad/not specific enough (34 percent), they already knew it/already covered in other courses/no new ground covered (20 percent), and the content was not relevant to their area of business (20 percent).

✦ Majority of those respondents saying they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, report they are either satisfied (51 percent) or very satisfied (34 percent) with the training. Only six percent say they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, with the average level of satisfaction at $\bar{x}=4.14$ on a 5-point scale, where ‘1’ is very dissatisfied and ‘5’ is very satisfied.

✦ Moreover, 75 percent of these respondents report they would definitely recommend Site Safe to other employers in their industry, while a further 14 percent would recommend, but with reservations. In contrast, six percent report they would probably not recommend and another two percent say they would definitely not recommend Site Safe to other employers.
13.1 Reasons for participation in Site Safe courses

Those respondents reporting they or other employees in their business have attended or enrolled in a Site Safe training course (n=277) were asked about their reasons for doing so. As detailed in Graph 26, most frequently respondents mentioned:

- To be able to work on certain building/construction sites (50 percent).
- Wanting to learn about injury prevention (in general) (32 percent).
- In order to be considered for/win contracts (12 percent).
- Compliance (with the Health and Safety Act) (12 percent).

The survey found no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 26: Reasons for participation in Site Safe courses (n=277)

Q21. For what reasons did you or other employees of this business attend/enrol a ‘Site Safe’ training course?

To be able to work on certain building/construction sites
- Wanted to learn about injury prevention (in general)
- In order to be considered for/win contracts
- Compliance (with the Health and Safety Act)
- To check if my current injury prevention activities are appropriate
- So our staff/ sites are safer
- To raise the staff’s awareness of hazards
- It was compulsory
- It’s our company policy/ we make it compulsory for our staff
- On personal recommendation from friend/ neighbour/ colleague
- Money incentive/ rebate offer
- To find out the best ways to handle machinery
- To find out the best ways to handle tools
- Personally convinced by course representative
- Other
- Don’t know

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended or enrolled in the Site Safe courses.
13.2 Meeting expectations about Site Safe training courses and reasons for this

13.2.1 Meeting expectations about Site Safe training courses

Those respondents reporting they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course (n=277) were asked whether their expectations about the course have been met. As shown in Graph 27, the majority of respondents reported that their expectations were met (71 percent) or exceeded (12 percent). In contrast, 13 percent of respondents reported their expectations about Site Safe training courses have not been met.

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 27: Meeting expectations about Site Safe training courses (n=277)

Q22. Overall, how much do you agree or disagree that your expectations about 'Site Safe' training courses have been met? Would you say your expectations have been…?

71% Met
12% Exceeded
4% Not met
13% Don't know

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended the Site Safe courses.

13.2.2 Reasons for meeting/not meeting expectations

Respondents also mentioned the reasons why they believe the Site Safe courses did or did not meet their expectations (Table 9 overleaf).

Reasons for meeting expectations

Among those reporting the Site Safe courses met or exceeded their expectations (n=231), respondents most frequently either gave a general positive comment (25 percent for the combined sub-sample of those whose expectations were met or exceeded), or specifically mentioned:

Courses have enhanced our company’s overall awareness of hazards (18 percent).
It gave us a rounded overall view of the need to be aware of safety in the building industry, which is a hazardous industry.

Reinforced the company’s attitude for safety.

◆ Everything was covered adequately/covers the basics very well (17 percent).

It covers all the requirement for general knowledge of health and safety in the workplace.

They gave a good basic understanding of health and safety requirements within the construction industry.

◆ Good delivery/presentation/clarity (seven percent).

The teaching techniques were very good and the use of AV material was quite outstanding.

The content, presentation and training was good – you could understand it.

Of note, despite reporting their expectations have been met, seven percent of these respondents still mentioned that the content was primarily common sense.

There were no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

**Reasons for not meeting expectations**

Among those reporting the Site Safe courses did not meet their expectations (n=35), respondents most frequently mentioned such reasons as:

◆ Content was too broad/not specific enough (34 percent).

They are not specific in different areas of the construction industry.

They should have made it more specialised instead of trying to blanket cover all health and safety.

◆ We already knew it/already covered in other courses/no new ground covered (20 percent).

It was pointless. It was things we were already doing>It was just a waste of a whole afternoon and costing a fortune.

◆ The content was not relevant to our area of business (20 percent).

Some training was not applicable to our business.
Other categories included such reasons as bad presentation/delivery/boring, Site Safe unfairly shifting blame and responsibility from the employers onto employees, not needing it/beings safe enough/not accident-prone.

Table 9: Reasons for meeting/not meeting expectations

Q23. In what ways did the course not meet/meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Positive Comment</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has enhanced our company’s overall awareness of hazards</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything was covered adequately/ covers the basics very well</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good delivery/presentation/ clarity</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It highlights things we’d usually take for granted or were unaware of</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave us what we need to create a safer work environment</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages you to be proactive and look for hazards</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was relevant to our area of business</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content was very detailed and thorough</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good resource for new or inexperienced staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content was too broad/ Not specific enough</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We already knew it/ Already covered in other courses/ No new ground covered</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content was not relevant to our area of business</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Negative Comment</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content was primarily common sense</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More suited to people at entry level, not the experienced</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

*Sub-sample based on those who reported if the Site Safe courses met or did not meet their expectations.
13.3 Satisfaction with Site Safe courses

Those respondents reporting they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course (n=277) were asked how satisfied they were with these Site Safe training courses. As shown in Graph 28 below, majority of respondents report they are either satisfied (51 percent) or very satisfied (34 percent). Only six percent say they were dissatisfied (four percent) or very dissatisfied (two percent).

There were no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector. The levels of satisfaction were similar among all the groups, with the average level of satisfaction at $\bar{x}=4.14$ on a 5-point scale, where ‘1’ is very dissatisfied and ‘5’ is very satisfied.

Graph 28: Satisfaction with Site Safe courses (n=277)

Q24. Based on your experience, how satisfied would you say you are with the 'Site Safe' training courses that you or other employees of your business have attended?

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended the Site Safe courses.

[Note throughout the report $\bar{x}$ denotes the arithmetic mean, or average, of a sample. In all times such samples exclude respondents whose reply was either Don’t know or Refused.]
13.4 Recommending Site Safe to other employers in the industry

When those respondents who reported they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course (n=277) were asked if they would recommend Site Safe to other employers in their industry, three in four people (75 percent) said they would definitely do so, while a further 14 percent would recommend, but with reservations. In contrast, six percent report they would probably not recommend and another two percent say they would definitely not recommend Site Safe to other employers.

The survey found no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 29: Recommending Site Safe to other employers in the industry (n=277)

Q25. And would you recommend the “Site Safe” to other employers in your industry?

- 75% Definitely yes
- 14% Yes, with reservations
- 6% Yes
- 2% Don’t know
- 1% Refused
- 2% Probably not
- 1% Definitely not

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended the Site Safe courses.
14.0 Impact of passport training and renewal rates

The following chapter explores the impact of passport training on the business, as well as the Site Safe Passport renewal requirements.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Among the respondents who said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, 25 percent report their business has done nothing as a result of attending Site Safe courses and another five percent are uncertain about the impact. In contrast, the majority report their business has made changes or taken some actions, most frequently mentioning:
  - Being more aware/identifying workplace hazards (40 percent).
  - Discussing identifying hazards with workers (20 percent).
  - Developing a safety management plan (16 percent).

- Eighty-five percent of those respondents, whose business has done something as a result of employees attending Site Safe courses, believe these actions have made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries among their business employees and contractors, while ten percent of believe these actions have made no such difference.

- Among those who believe the actions taken by their business as a result of attending Site Safe courses have made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries, most frequently respondents mentioned the such reasons as:
  - It has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues (61 percent).
  - The information was used to create or improve hazard management procedures (ten percent), and there are less accidents/it is a safer work environment (both ten percent).

- Among the respondents who said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, 23 percent were uncertain how Site Safe could be improved, while 18 percent report they are happy with Site Safe as it is. Other most frequently mentioned suggestions included having broader information than just construction/being relevant to employers industry (14 percent), increasing awareness about the courses, their availability, better promotion (11 percent), and having the training at the workplace (nine percent).

- Seventy-five percent of respondents that said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course, report that all employees who have a Passport card are required to attend a refresher course, while 14 percent say that no employees are required to do this.
14.1 Impact from receiving Site Safe training

14.1.1 Outcomes resulting from Site Safe training

Those respondents that said they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course (n=277) were asked what, if anything, their business has done as a result of employees attending Site Safe training. While a quarter (25 percent) of respondents report their business has done nothing as a result of attending Site Safe courses and another five percent are uncertain about the impact (Graph 30), the majority reported they had made changes or taken some actions.

Most frequently respondents report being more aware/identifying workplace hazards (40 percent) distantly followed by:

- Discussing identifying hazards with workers (20 percent).
- Developing a safety management plan (16 percent).
- Improving/updating/altering our safety procedures (seven percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 30: Outcomes in businesses as a result of Site Safe training (n=277)

Q26. And what, if anything, has your business done as a result of yourself or other employees attending ‘Site Safe’ training courses?

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended the Site Safe courses.
14.1.2 Impact on reducing the risk of accidents

Eighty-five percent of those respondents, whose business has done something as a result of employees attending Site Safe courses, believe these actions have made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries among their business employees and contractors (Graph 31). In contrast, ten percent of the sub-sample believe the actions have made no such difference.

The survey found no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 31: Impact on reducing the risk of accidents (n=200)

Q26a. And do you believe this has made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries among your business’s employees and contractors?

Sub-sample based on businesses that have done something as a result of its employees attending Site Safe courses.

Reasons for believing organisations’ actions have reduced the risk of accidents

Among those who believe the actions taken by their business as a result of attending Site Safe courses have made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries (n=170), most frequently these respondents mentioned the following reasons (Table 10 overleaf):

- It has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues (61 percent).

  Because we do have heightened awareness on hazards in building sites.

  Made us more aware, brought it to our attention.

- The information was used to create or improve hazard management procedures (ten percent).
Because they point out health and safety issues which we review and then we try to reduce the risk of that hazard.

We’ve taken a step back and look at the site before we actually do anything on it.

- There are less accidents/it is a safer work environment (ten percent).

Sites are getting safer, scaffolding, things marked and cleaner sites, no one is taking stupid chances.

There were no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Reasone for believing organisations’ actions have not reduced the risk of accidents

Table 10 also shows the reasons mentioned by respondents who believe the actions of their business resulting from attending Site Safe courses have not made any difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents. However, due to a very small sub-sample (n=19) these results are indicative only and should be viewed with caution.

Table 10: Reasons for believing organisations’ actions have/have not reduced the risk of accidents

Q26a. And do you believe this has made a difference in relation to reducing the risks of accidents and injuries among your business’s employees and contractors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes, has made a difference</th>
<th>No, has not make a difference</th>
<th>Don't know/ not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has increased staff awareness of health and safety issues</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was used to create or improve hazard management procedures</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are less accidents/ it is a safer work environment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, it has made a difference</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff are sharing the responsibility of safety management/ taking on more responsibilities</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is now an emphasis on the use of protective gear</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were already safe/no previous accidents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was purely common sense/ we rely on common sense</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, there have been no significant changes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were already practicing the suggested methods</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other courses and training already covered the content</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content was too broad or not specific enough</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was irrelevant to our area of trade</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General negative comment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ Not sure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

*Sub-sample based on businesses that have done something as a result of its employees attending 'Site Safe' training courses.

**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.
14.2 Suggestions for improving Site Safe

Those respondents reporting they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course (n=277) were also asked what suggestions they have for improving ‘Site Safe’. While 23 percent were uncertain how Site Safe could be improved (Table 11), 18 percent report they are happy with Site Safe as it is. Other most frequently mentioned suggestions made by employers in the businesses whose employees attended a Passport course included:

- Have broader information than just construction. Relevant to employers industry (14 percent).
- Increase awareness about the courses, their availability, better promotion (11 percent).
- Have the training at the workplace (nine percent).

The survey found no significant differences when these findings were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

**Table 11: Suggestions for improving Site Safe**

Q27. And what suggestions, if any, do you have for improving ‘Site Safe’? Please consider factors such as how the courses are promoted, when and where the courses are held, who runs the course, whether the content is appropriate, the time commitment, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sole trader/ self-employed</th>
<th>Less than 5 permanent staff</th>
<th>Between 5 and 19 permanent staff</th>
<th>More than 19 permanent staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy with “Site Safe”: no suggestions</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have broader information than just construction/ Relevant to employers industry</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness about the courses, their availability, better promotion</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the training at the workplace</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more practical information and less theory (general knowledge)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the training closer to our workplace/locally</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run courses regularly/ have refresher courses more frequently</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce fees</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have courses in the evening/ outside of working hours for attendance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly update content</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have refresher courses less often than two years</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it compulsory/a prerequisite for getting on work site</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course not difficult enough/too easy to obtain the certificate</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have different level courses (e.g. employer, employees, contractors, etc.)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have it in other languages/ cater for English as second language employees</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamate employer industry safety process with Site Safe</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover the costs for doing “Site Safe”</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

*Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended the Site Safe courses.
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14.3 Site Safe Passport renewal rates

Those respondents reporting they or other employees have attended a Site Safe training course (n=277) were also asked if their business requires its employees to attend a Site Safe refresher course every two years so they can renew their Passport card. In relation to this, 75 percent said that all employees who have a Passport card are required to attend a refresher course (Graph 32). In contrast, 14 percent of respondents report that no employees are required to do this.

Sole traders or self-employed respondents are less likely to report that they or all of their business’ sub-contractors who have a Passport card are required to attend a refresher course (47 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent’s organisation.

Graph 32: Site Safe Passport renewal rates (n=277)

Q28. Does your business require its employees to attend a Site Safe refresher course every two years so they can renew their Passport card?

- Yes, all employees who have a Passport card are required to attend a refresher course: 75%
- Only some employees are required to attend a refresher course: 14%
- No employees are required: 2%
- Employees are encouraged to attend a refresher course, but it is not required: 4%
- Don’t know: 5%

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees attended the Site Safe courses.
15.0 Non-participants perceptions of Site Safe

The following chapter examined the perceptions of Site Safe among those who have not attended the training.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

✦ When those respondents who said that neither they nor any other employees have attended or enrolled in a Site Safe training course were asked what types of things the courses cover or involve, based on what they have heard or read about the Site Safe training courses, 40 percent were uncertain about the course content. In contrast, most frequently respondents believe the Site Safe training courses cover:

✦ Identification of the most common accident and injuries that occur on building and construction sites generally (34 percent).

✦ Common sense building and construction safety practices (20 percent).

✦ Practical training (such as use of tools, use of equipment, chemical use, etc.) (14 percent).

✦ When asked why they or their business decided not to enrol in a Site Safe course, these respondents most frequently respondents mention such reasons as:

✦ Timing and/or location of the course inconvenient (18 percent).

✦ Haven't heard of it/I wasn't aware of the training (14 percent).

✦ Cost involved (i.e. getting there, taking the time off work, etc.) (12 percent).
15.1 Perceptions about the content of Site Safe courses among non-participants

Some respondents said that neither they nor any other employees have attended or enrolled in a Site Safe training course (n=184). These people were more likely to be from Building Construction sub-sector (71 percent compared with 49 percent of those who attended a course), and work as sole traders or in small businesses with four or less permanent staff (71 percent compared with 43 percent), as well as less likely to be union members (two percent compared with 11 percent).

These respondents were asked what types of things the courses cover or involve, based on what they have heard or read about the Site Safe training courses. As detailed in Graph 33, while 40 percent were uncertain about the course content, most frequently respondents believe the Site Safe training courses cover:

- Identification of the most common accident and injuries that occur on building and construction sites generally (34 percent).
- Common sense building and construction safety practices (20 percent).
- Practical training (such as use of tools, use of equipment, chemical use, etc.) (14 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 33: Perceptions about the content of Site Safe courses among non-participants (n=184)

Q29. Based on what you have heard or read about the Site Safe training courses, what types of things do you believe the courses cover or involve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the most common accident and injuries that occur on building and construction sites generally</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense building and construction safety practices</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical training (such as use of tools, use of equipment, chemical use, etc.)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing hazard and safety plans</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of theory/ paper work</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/ have not heard about Site Safe</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees did not attend nor enrolled to attended the Site Safe courses.
15.2 Reasons for not enrolling into Site Safe courses

Those respondents who said that neither they nor any other employees have attended or enrolled in a Site Safe training course (n=175) were also asked why they or their business decided not to enrol in a Site Safe course. As shown in Graph 34 overleaf, most frequently respondents mentioned such reasons as:

- Timing and/or location of the course inconvenient (18 percent).
  
  *Because there isn’t any locally at the moment.*
  
  *Need to get it done but just haven’t had the time yet.*

- Haven’t heard of it/I wasn't aware of the training (14 percent).
  
  *No one ever told me the course existed.*
  
  *Not enough information on where and when the course was.*

- Cost involved (i.e. getting there, taking the time off work, etc.) (12 percent).
  
  *Because I have to take a day off work and pay for it.*
  
  *It is not always easy to get away from work when it's only a one or two man team.*

Again, the survey found no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.
Q30. And can you tell me why you or your business decided not to enrol in a Site Safe course?

Graph 34: Reasons for not enrolling into Site Safe courses (n=175)

- **Timing and/or location of the course inconvenient** 18%
- **Haven't heard of it/I wasn't aware of it** 14%
- **Cost involved (i.e. getting there, taking the time off work, etc.)** 12%
- **Safety is common sense** 10%
- **Don't believe I'm at risk of injury/not accident prone** 10%
- **Have already attended similar courses, know it all already** 7%
- **In the process of enrolling/ have enrolled** 7%
- **No-one directly approached me to attend** 7%
- **I am on my own/we are a small company** 7%
- **I don't like course content** 7%
- **Do not like course content** 7%
- **Thought it was for younger/more inexperienced builders, etc.** 5%
- **Other** 5%
- **Does not apply to my business** 3%
- **Inexperienced builders, etc.** 3%
- **No** 3%
- **Don't know** 1%
- **Other** 1%

Sub-sample based on businesses whose employees did not attend nor enrolled to attend the Site Safe courses and excludes those who have not heard about Site Safe.
16.0 Other products and services provided by Site Safe

The following chapter examines the awareness of other products and services provided by Site Safe, their usage and helpfulness to the businesses.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

◆ When respondents were prompted on their awareness of four other health and safety products and services provided by Site Safe (excluding Passports and the Supervisor Gold Card), 20 percent were not aware of any. In contrast, most frequently respondents are aware of Toolbox Safety Talks (62 percent), followed by:

◆ The Health and Safety Guidelines (61 percent).

◆ The Safety Management Plan (58 percent).

◆ Site Safe Safety Advisors (45 percent).

◆ Among those respondents aware of a specific service, the following proportions report using the service compared with those who did not use it:

◆ Toolbox Safety Talks (28 percent used the service while 34 percent did not use it).

◆ The Health and Safety Guidelines (23 percent used the service and 38 percent did not use it).

◆ The Safety Management Plan (22 percent used the service and 37 percent did not use it).

◆ Site Safe Safety Advisors (12 percent used the service and 33 percent did not use it).

◆ It is worth noting that overall, of respondents who have heard of Site Safe, only 38 percent use at least one of the other services that were discussed. The other 62 percent are either not aware of any such services (20 percent) or aware but have not used any of them (42 percent).

◆ Most respondents (between 80 and 86 percent), whose workplaces have used these specific services, report they were helpful, while only few (one or two percent) say they were not helpful.
16.1 Awareness of other products and services provided by Site Safe

When respondents were prompted on their awareness of four other health and safety products and services provided by Site Safe (excluding Passports and the Supervisor Gold Card), 20 percent were not aware of any (Graph 35). In contrast, most frequently respondents are aware of Toolbox Safety Talks (62 percent), followed by:

- The Health and Safety Guidelines (61 percent).
- The Safety Management Plan (58 percent).
- Site Safe Safety Advisors (45 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent's organisation or the size of the organisation, with the exception that respondents working in an organisation with 20 or more permanent staff are more likely to report being aware of Toolbox Safety Talks (80 percent).

Graph 35: Awareness of other products and services provided by Site Safe (n=452)

Q31. Besides a Passport and Supervisor Gold Card, are you aware of any of the following health and safety products or services provided by Site Safe? Yes or No?

Sub-sample excludes those who have not heard about Site Safe.
16.2 Usage of other services provided by Site Safe

Those respondents who were aware of a specific service were asked if their workplace had ever used it. Graph 36 shows what proportion of respondents report using the service compared with those who did not use it in relation to total awareness levels.

It is worth noting that overall, of respondents who have heard of Site Safe, only 38 percent use at least one of the other services that were discussed. The other 62 percent are either not aware of any such services (20 percent, as was shown in Graph 35 above) or aware but have not used any of them (42 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 36: Usage of other services provided by Site Safe (n=452)

Q31. Besides a Passport and Supervisor Gold Card, are you aware of any of the following health and safety products or services provided by Site Safe? Yes or No?

Q32. And has your workplace ever used any of these services provided by Site Safe? Yes or No?

Sub-sample excludes those who have not heard about Site Safe.
16.3 Helpfulness of used services provided by Site Safe

Those respondents reporting their business has used a specific service were also asked if the service/product was helpful to their workplace. As detailed in Table 12, most respondents (between 80 and 86 percent), whose workplaces have used these services said they were helpful, while only few (one or two percent) saying they were not helpful.

The survey found no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector, mainly due to small sub-samples.

Table 12: Helpfulness of used services provided by Site Safe

Q33. And were the services you used helpful, partly helpful, or not helpful to your workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safety Advisors</th>
<th>Health and Safety Guidelines</th>
<th>Toolbox Safety Talks</th>
<th>Safety Management Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly helpful</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/ Refused</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

*Sub-sample based on businesses that used the service.
17.0 Industry ratings of Site Safe and its programmes

The following chapter looks at industry ratings of Site Safe and its programmes, employers’ perceptions of coverage of legal obligations, as well as what building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- When rating Site Safe and its training programmes impacts on health and safety in the construction and building industry, employers gave the highest rating to raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them ($\bar{x}$ =7.29 on a 10-point scale) and similar ratings among the following attributes:
  - Helping to reduce unsafe behaviour on construction and building sites ($\bar{x}$=6.94).
  - Addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general ($\bar{x}$=6.89).
  - Reducing the frequency of workplace accidents and injuries ($\bar{x}$=6.83).

- When asked to give reasons for their rating of Site Safe and its training programmes in relation to addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general, those respondents who gave a positive rating most frequently explained this by giving a general positive comment, while other respondents were more specific reporting that it has enhanced their company’s overall awareness of hazards (11 percent), everything was covered adequately/covers the basics very well (nine percent), and it gave them what they need to create a safer work environment/accidents have reduced (six percent).

- When asked if sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, 24 percent of respondents report that it definitely does not cover, while another 15 percent say probably not. On the other hand, 15 percent report it definitely covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, and a further 28 percent say it partially does. Also, 17 percent are uncertain about the coverage of their legal obligations.

- Among those respondents who said that sending employees to a Passport training course does not fully cover employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, the most frequently mentioned reason was that the course is only a part of being safe (31 percent), followed by employers being legally required to provide a safe environment (29 percent).

- Among those respondents who said that sending employees to a Passport training course fully or partially covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety
obligations, the most frequently mentioned reason was that it is good for the employee to learn specific issues to the industry (17 percent), followed by increasing staff awareness of health and safety issues (14 percent).

- Thirty percent of respondents made general positive comments, when asked what they thought the building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe, while other respondents were more specific reporting that Site Safe is a positive thing/heading in the right direction (ten percent), or that safety is an issue that needs to be taken seriously/important issue (ten percent).

- In contrast, five percent made a general negative comment, while a small number (four percent) believe that building and construction industry thinks Site Safe is a waste of time, followed by three percent saying fees are too high.

- Also, eight percent believe building and construction industry has mixed views about Site Safe having both good and bad aspects to it.
17.1 Rating Site Safe and its training programmes

As shown in Table 13, when rating Site Safe and its training programmes impacts on health and safety in the construction and building industry, employers gave the highest rating to raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them ($\bar{x}=7.29$ on a 10-point scale) and similar ratings among the following attributes:

- Helping to reduce unsafe behaviour on construction and building sites ($\bar{x}=6.94$).
- Addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general ($\bar{x}=6.89$).
- Reducing the frequency of workplace accidents and injuries ($\bar{x}=6.83$).

However, as noted in the table, a sizeable minority of employers (between 15 and 19 percent) are uncertain if Site Safe and its training courses were having an impact in the areas discussed.

Table 13: Rating Site Safe and its training programmes

Q34. How would you rate Site Safe and its training programmes in relation to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general</th>
<th>Helping to reduce unsafe behaviour on construction and building sites</th>
<th>Raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them</th>
<th>Reducing the frequency of workplace accidents and injuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base =</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean =</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 out of 10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 out of 10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 out of 10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 out of 10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 out of 10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 out of 10</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 out of 10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 out of 10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Sub-sample excludes those who have not heard about Site Safe.
Table 14 details the average responses (means) when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation. As shown, there were no significant differences.

Table 14: Rating Site Safe and its training programmes (Means)

Q34. How would you rate Site Safe and its training programmes in relation to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sole trader/ self-employed</th>
<th>Less than 5 permanent staff</th>
<th>Between 5 and 19 permanent staff</th>
<th>More than 19 permanent staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to reduce unsafe behaviour on construction and building sites</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the frequency of workplace accidents and injuries</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As detailed in Table 15, those respondents working in the installation trade services gave a significantly higher rating to raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them ($\bar{x}=7.78$).

Table 15: Rating Site Safe and its training programmes (Means)

Q34. How would you rate Site Safe and its training programmes in relation to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Construction</th>
<th>Non-Building Construction</th>
<th>Site Preparation Services</th>
<th>Building Structure Services</th>
<th>Installation Trade Services</th>
<th>Building Completion Services</th>
<th>Other Construction Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to reduce unsafe behaviour on construction and building sites</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising worker awareness of safety hazards on construction and building sites and how to manage them</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$=7.78</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the frequency of workplace accidents and injuries</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for rating Site Safe on addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general

Respondents were asked to explain their rating of Site Safe and its training programmes in relation to addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general (Table 16). Those who gave particularly high rating (scores 9-10) were separated out.

Note that the table also shows the reasons mentioned by respondents who gave a low rating (scores 0-4) below mid-point. However, due to a very small sub-sample (n=25) these results are indicative only and should be viewed with caution.

Table 16: Reasons for rating Site Safe on addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Total 367*</th>
<th>Scores 0-4</th>
<th>Scores 5</th>
<th>Scores 6-8</th>
<th>Scores 9-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Positive Comment</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has enhanced our company’s overall awareness of hazards</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything was covered adequately/ covers the basics very well</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave us what we need to create a safer work environment/ Accidents have reduced</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good delivery/ presentation/ clarity</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content was very detailed and thorough</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It highlights things we’d usually take for granted or were unaware of</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a good resource for new or inexperienced staff</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages you to be proactive and look for hazards</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was relevant to our area of business</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Negative Comment</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content was too broad/ Not specific enough</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t do the course/ don’t know enough about Site Safe to comment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It comes down to the individual’s attitude/ some people will be careless regardless of training</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content was not relevant to our area of business</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content was primarily common sense</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We already knew it/ Already covered in other courses/ No new ground covered</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only sat it because we had to</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad presentation/ delivery/ Boring/ Needs improvement</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More suited to people at entry level, not the experienced</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course not difficult enough/ too easy to obtain the certificate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough publicity/ needs to pay more attention to smaller areas, towns and business</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up and refresher courses needs to be more frequent</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t need it/ Are safe enough/ Are not accident prone</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site safe unfairly shifts blame and responsibility from the employers onto employees</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sub-sample based on those who rated Site Safe training on addressing the health and safety training needs of the building and construction sector in general.
**Caution: low base number of respondents - results are indicative only.

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.
17.2 Perceptions of coverage of legal obligations

As detailed in Graph 37, when respondents were asked if sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, a quarter (24 percent) report that it definitely does not cover, while another 15 percent say probably not. On the other hand, 15 percent report it definitely covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations, and a further 28 percent say it partially does. Also, 17 percent are uncertain about the coverage of their legal obligations.

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent’s organisation or the size of the organisation, with the exception that those working in an organisation with 20 or more permanent staff are more likely to report that sending employees to a Passport training course definitely does not cover employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations (43 percent).

Graph 37: Perceptions of coverage of legal obligations (n=452)

Q36. And to the best of your knowledge, does sending employees to a Passport training course fully cover employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations? Would you say…?

- 24% Definitely not
- 17% Probably not
- 15% Yes, partially
- 15% Yes, definitely
- 1% Don’t know
- 28% Refused

Sub-sample excludes those who have not heard about Site Safe.
Reasons for believing/not believing whether sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations

Respondents were asked to explain why they believe whether sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers or does not cover employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations (Table 17).

Among those respondents who said that sending employees to a Passport training course does not fully cover employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations (n=174), most frequently mentioned reason was that the course is only a part of being safe (31 percent), followed by employers being legally required to provide a safe environment (29 percent).

Among those respondents who said that sending employees to a Passport training course fully or partially covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations (n=196), the most frequently mentioned reason was that it is good for the employee to learn specific issues to the industry (17 percent), followed by increasing staff awareness of health and safety issues (14 percent).

The survey found no significant differences when each of the two sub-groups’ results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Table 17: Reasons for believing/not believing whether sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations

Q37. And why do you say that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Base = 370*</th>
<th>No, does not cover 174</th>
<th>Yes, it covers 196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course is only a part of being safe</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers are legally required to provide a safe environment</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer is still liable for the employee/ does not stop employer from being sued</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It comes down to the individuals attitude/ some people will become careless regardless of training</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other legislative requirements</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have our own in house training courses/other provider courses</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content was too broad or not specific enough</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an ongoing process</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is compulsory</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for the employee to learn specific issues to the industry</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase staff awareness of health and safety issues</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an important issue</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very informative/ covers a wide range of safety processes</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is specific to our industry type</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a requirement for being onsite</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

*Sub-sample based on those reporting if sending employees to a Passport training course fully covers employers in relation to their legal health and safety obligations.
17.3 What building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe

Those respondents aware of Site Safe were asked what they thought the building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe, in general. As detailed in Table 18, while 30 percent just made a general positive comment, some respondents were more specific reporting that Site Safe is a positive thing/heading in the right direction (ten percent), or that safety is an issue that needs to be taken seriously/important issue (ten percent).

In contrast, five percent made a general negative comment, while a small number (four percent) believe that building and construction industry thinks Site Safe is a waste of time, followed by three percent saying fees are too high.

Also, eight percent believe building and construction industry has mixed views about Site Safe having both good and bad aspects to it.

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Table 18: What building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe

Q38. Finally, what do you think the building and construction industry thinks about Site Safe, in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sole trader/ self-employed</th>
<th>Less than 5 permanent staff</th>
<th>Between 5 and 19 permanent staff</th>
<th>More than 19 permanent staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>452*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good (general)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive thing/ heading in the right direction</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An issue that needs to be taken seriously/ important issue</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has enhanced our company's overall awareness of hazards</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A useful tool/ good resource/ gave us what we needed to create a safe work environment</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to look after the employees' safety</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (general)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of time</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees are too high</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one is aware of it/ don't know enough to comment on it</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to do it because it is compulsory</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have a good reputation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed view on it: good and bad aspects to it</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may exceed 100% because of multiple response.

*Sub-sample excludes those who have not heard about Site Safe.
18.0 Health and safety in organisations

The following chapter explores the health and safety record in the organisations, as well as their practices and policies in relation to safety.

The main findings covered in this chapter include:

- Seventy-nine percent of respondents report their business has a formal or written document on health and safety covering procedures for identifying and managing workplace hazards.

- Among the organisations with a formal or written health and safety document, respondents report that most often such formal documents cover *using machinery* (41 percent), *tool use* (39 percent), and *tasks involving manual lifting and handling* (e.g. lifting, carrying, shovelling, pushing/pulling, etc.) (36 percent).

- Among the specific steps taken for health and safety reasons in their business, most frequently respondents reported:
  - Enforcing the wearing of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) (96 percent).
  - Keeping staff up to date with health and safety issues (95 percent).
  - Regularly checking safety aspects of the tools and equipment that workers use (95 percent).
  - However, some of the steps were reported less frequently in particular *sending staff on health and safety courses* (69 percent), and *employees interests are represented by a health and safety representative* (63 percent).

- When asked to compare their business’ health and safety record to that of the building and construction industry in general, 67 percent of all respondents report it is *better*, while another 26 believe it is *about the same*, and further seven percent were uncertain.

- Also, when commenting on the priority of health and safety in their business, 81 percent report it is of *high priority*, while 19 percent believe it is of *medium or low priority* to their business.

- Forty-nine percent of all businesses that were surveyed had no workplace accidents or injuries had occurred in the past 12 months. In contrast, 15 percent had one accident, 13 percent had two, while 19 percent had three or more workplace accidents.

- Among the organisations where there was an accident in the past 12 months:
  - Fifty-two percent report the injured person took time off work as a result of the accident.
  - Also, 52 percent report that a claim was made with ACC relating to this accident or injury.
18.1 Health and safety practices and policies

18.1.1 Formal documents on health and safety

**Businesses that have formal documents on health and safety**

As shown in Graph 38, 79 percent of respondents report that their business has a formal or written document on health and safety covering procedures for identifying and managing workplace hazards.

Sole traders or self-employed are less likely to report they have such documents (50 percent), while those working in an organisation with five to 19 permanent staff are more likely to report this (95 percent). Also, all organisations employing 20 or more permanent staff report having such written or formal documents on health and safety.

Also, respondents working in organisations whose employees attended Site Safe courses are more likely to report having a formal or written document on health and safety covering procedures for identifying and managing workplace hazards (91 percent), particularly when compared with those not aware of Site Safe (51 percent).

Those respondents working in Building Construction Sector are less likely to report having such documents (69 percent), while those from Installation Trade Services are more likely (91 percent).

**Graph 38: Businesses that have formal documents on health and safety (n=461)**

Q7. Can you tell me does this business have a formal or written document on health and safety covering procedures for identifying and managing workplace hazards?

- Yes: 79%
- No: 20%
- Don't know: 1%
Hazard coverage of formal documents on health and safety

Those respondents who reported their business has a formal or written health and safety document (n=365) were asked to identify what particular hazard areas this document covered. As shown in Graph 39, most often such formal documents cover:

- Using machinery (41 percent).
- Tool use (39 percent).
- Tasks involving manual lifting and handling (e.g. lifting, carrying, shovelling, pushing/pulling, etc.) (36 percent).

Sole traders or self-employed are less likely to report their formal document covers tool use (20 percent). There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the awareness or attendance of Site Safe training courses, or by the respondents’ industry sector.

Graph 39: Hazard coverage of formal documents on health and safety (n=365)

Q8. And what particular hazards does the document cover?

Sub-sample based on those whose business has a formal or written document on health and safety covering procedures for identifying and managing workplace hazards.
18.1.2 Steps taken for health and safety reasons

Respondents were asked which of the specific steps are taken for health and safety reasons in their business (Table 19). Most frequently respondents reported:

- Enforcing the wearing of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) (96 percent).
- Keeping staff up to date with health and safety issues (95 percent).
- Regularly checking safety aspects of the tools and equipment that workers use (95 percent).

However, some of the steps were reported less frequently in particular:

- We send staff on health and safety courses (69 percent).
- Employees interests are represented by a health and safety representative (63 percent).

As detailed in Table 19, larger organisations are more likely to report taking several steps for health and safety reasons, particularly when compared with sole traders or self-employed.

**Table 19: Steps taken for health and safety reasons**

*Q9. And which of the following steps are taken for health and safety reasons in your business?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sole trader/ self-employed</th>
<th>Less than 5 permanent staff</th>
<th>Between 5 and 19 permanent staff</th>
<th>More than 19 permanent staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing the wearing of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We keep staff up to date with health and safety issues*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly check safety aspects of the tools and equipment that workers use</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety issues are discussed with new employees when they first start*</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have regular checks on the effectiveness of hazard controls such as employees using Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) appropriately*</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of the site accidents are investigated and appropriate action to eliminate these in the future are taken</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly do health and safety checks</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We record the type and severity of injuries that occur on building and construction sites</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing health and safety training is provided for new and existing employees*</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We meet regularly with employees to discuss hazards and safe work methods</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We record the number of accidents that occur on building and construction sites</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We record hazards and review these regularly</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We send staff on health and safety courses*</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees interests are represented by a health and safety representative*</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
*These statements were only asked of respondents who have employees (n=311).
Of note, those respondents who are not aware of Site Safe courses (n=83) are less likely to report their organisation has taken the following steps for health and safety reasons:

- Recording the type and severity of injuries that occur on building and construction sites (70 percent).
- Regularly doing health and safety checks (67 percent).
- Recording the number of accidents that occur on building and construction sites (66 percent).
- Ongoing health and safety training is provided for new and existing employees (66 percent).
- Meeting regularly with employees to discuss hazards and safe work methods (65 percent).
- Recording hazards and review these regularly (64 percent).
- Employees interests are represented by a health and safety representative (40 percent).
- Sending staff on health and safety courses (34 percent).

However, it is not known if there is a causal relationship between awareness of Site Safe in general and better health and safety practices, or vice versa.

Due to small sub-sample, there were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent’s organisation.
18.2 Health and safety record

18.2.1 Businesses’ health and safety record

When asked to compare their business’ health and safety record to that of the building and construction industry in general, 67 percent of all respondents report it is better, while another 26 believe it is about the same, and further seven percent were uncertain (Graph 40). The survey found no significant differences when these results were viewed by the size of the organisation, its industry sector or by the awareness or attendance of Site Safe courses.

Graph 40: Businesses’ health and safety record (n=461)

Q14. Overall, would you say your business’s health and safety record is better than that of the building and construction industry in general, worse, or about the same?

7% Better
26% Worse
67% About the same
7% Don’t know
0% Refused

18.2.2 Priority of health and safety

All respondents were also asked to comment on the priority of health and safety in their business, with 81 percent reporting it is of high priority (Graph 41). On the other hand, 19 percent believe it is of medium or low priority to their business. There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation, its industry sector or by the awareness or attendance of Site Safe courses.

Graph 41: Priority of health and safety (n=461)

Q15. And would you say that health and safety is of low, medium or high priority to your business?

81% High
18% Medium
2% Low
18.2.3 Accidents in the past 12 months

Number of accidents businesses have had in the past 12 months

As detailed in Graph 42 below, about half (49 percent) of all businesses that were surveyed had no workplace accidents or injuries had occurred in the past 12 months. In contrast, 15 percent had one accident, 13 percent had two, while 19 percent had three or more workplace accidents.

Graph 42: Number of accidents businesses have had in the past 12 months (n=461)

Q10. To the best of your knowledge, how many workplace accidents or injuries have you or other people working for this business had within the past 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Accidents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None/no accidents/ injuries</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 accidents</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more accidents</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 overleaf shows the results when viewed by the size of the company. As might be expected, the larger the size of the company, the more likely it has had some workplace accidents in the past 12 months.

In particular, sole traders or self-employed are more likely to report they have not had any accidents or injuries in the past 12 months (72 percent), while those working in an organisation with 20 or more permanent staff are less likely to report this (13 percent). The latter group is more likely to report they had six to ten such accidents (20 percent) or 20 or more accidents (20 percent).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the industry sector of the respondent’s organisation or by the awareness or attendance of Site Safe courses.
Table 20: Number of accidents businesses have had in the past 12 months

Q10. To the best of your knowledge, how many workplace accidents or injuries have you or other people working for this business had within the past 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sole trader/ self-employed</th>
<th>Less than 5 permanent staff</th>
<th>Between 5 and 19 permanent staff</th>
<th>More than 19 permanent staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base = 461</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 accidents</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more accidents</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/no accidents/ injuries</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Taking time off work as a result of the accident

Those respondents who reported there was an accident in their workplace in the past 12 months (n=218) were also asked if the injured person took time off work as a result of the accident, with 52 percent reporting this has been the case (Graph 43).

The survey found no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 43: Taking time off work as a result of the accident (n=218)

Q12. And did this person take one or more days off work as a result of the accident?

Sub-sample excludes those whose business did not have any accidents in the past 12 months.
Claim made with Accident Compensation Corporation

Those respondents reporting there was an accident in their workplace in the past 12 months (n=218) were also asked if a claim was made with ACC relating to this accident or injury, with 52 percent reporting a claim had been made (Graph 44).

There were no significant differences when the results were viewed by the size of the organisation or its industry sector.

Graph 44: Claim made with Accident Compensation Corporation (n=218)

Q13. And was a claim made with ACC relating to this accident or injury?

- Yes: 50%
- No: 45%
- Don't know: 5%

Sub-sample excludes those whose business did not have any accidents in the past 12 months.
19.0 Claimants data analysis

Of the n=461 respondents who participated in the survey, it was possible to match n=297 organisations with an ACC levy payer number and anonymous claims data provided by ACC.

Liable earnings have been used to calculate an estimate of FTEs, based on the average salary of $31,720 for 2006 and $34,684 for 2007. Frequency and cost of medical claims were then analysed.

Our analysis confirms that those organisations whose employees attended the course tend to be larger in size with the average FTEs around 27 people compared with just four or five FTEs among those organisations whose employees did not attend a course or were not aware of them. Because of this strong correlation, it is not surprising that the average number of claims was also higher among the businesses whose employees attended the course. However, these differences become very minor once the average number of claims per FTE is calculated, which is similar across all sub-groups.

The average cost of claims has also been calculated showing that those businesses not aware of Site Safe courses are likely to have lower costs claims. It may be hypothesised that the group consisting mainly of sole traders or smaller companies with four or less permanent staff are more likely to have minor injuries compared with employees of larger companies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21: Claimants data analysis (Means)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated FTEs from liable earnings in 2006 (assumes salary of $31,720)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of medical claims in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of claims in 2006(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of medical claims per FTE in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Base =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated FTEs from liable earnings in 2007 (assumes salary of $34,684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of medical claims in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of claims in 2007(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of medical claims per FTE in 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Average cost of claims was calculated only among those organisations who have launched a claim and excludes those who did not have any medical claims.

In relation to determining if there is a difference in claim rates and costs among those organisations, whose employees have attended Site Safe courses and those who have not, our analysis was inconclusive.

\(^a\) The data sent by ACC was made anonymous and did not show the number of claimants for a company where such number was three people or less. In all such cases the number of claimant was estimated using the average claim cost, which is around $130 per claim.
20.0 Industry stakeholders perceptions of Site Safe and Passport training

This section of the report details the findings from the interviews with some key construction industry stakeholders, including the Department of Labour, three national builders associations/organisations, and an ITO that provides health and safety training to the sector.

Specifically examined are stakeholders’ perceptions of the current state of health and safety in the building and construction sector; given this context their perceptions of the effectiveness of Site Safe as an organisation, its Passport (and Gold Supervisor Card) training courses and perceptions of how Site Safe could increase its impact on health and safety practices within the building and construction sector. Also included in this section or stakeholders’ opinions in relation to appropriate sources of future funding for Site Safe’s Passport training.

Key findings

◆ For the most part, those stakeholders who were interviewed were unanimous that awareness, attitudes health and safety practices within the building and construction sector have improved vastly over the past five to ten years. Some of this is attributed to the influence of Site Safe, and its activities to raise awareness generally about Health and Safety among the sector (and in particular its influence on some of the larger Commercial organisations and their contractors).

◆ There is still considerable room for improvement in the sector’s health and safety practices, however, particularly in relation to the need to achieve a culture shift in some businesses where merely complying with the legislation is viewed as being sufficient.

◆ Some stakeholders feel that Site Safe has deviated somewhat from its original mandate (which included a strong focus on research and development to identify best practices to address issues facing the building and construction sector) towards being primarily a health and safety training provider.

◆ While the Passport training programme is viewed as being a good, basic induction to health and safety, in particular for the commercial/vertical sector of the industry, it is not perceived as being sufficient targeted/tailored to the needs the civil and resident sectors.

◆ Site Safe as an organisation is perceived positively by the industry, and it has a relatively strong brand. There is also no desire to see Site Safe ‘disappear’.

◆ While ACC is seen as a logical funder for some of Site Safe’s activities, ACC should not fund the Passport training programme directly, to avoid potential conflicts of interest and avoid being seen as a government endorsement of Site Safe over other providers of health and safety training in the sector, which do not receive any government funding.
20.1 Perceptions of the current state of health and safety in the construction/building industry

For the most part, those stakeholders who were interviewed were unanimous that awareness, attitudes health and safety practices within the building and construction sector have improved vastly over the past five to ten years. These improvements were attributed to a number of different factors:

- The introduction of the Health and Safety in Employment Act (first passed in 1992, and amended substantially in 2002), which requires employers and others to maintain safe working environments, and implement sound practice, including the setting out of the mutual responsibilities and rights of employers and employees.

- ACC injury prevention initiatives such as the Partnership Programme, the Workplace Safety Management Partnership Programme WSMP), and the Workplace Safety Discount (WPSD) Scheme.

- The influence of Site Safe in raising awareness generally about Health and Safety among the sector and in particular its influence on some of the larger Commercial organisations and their contractors (i.e. the requirement that only those with valid Passports can work on these companies' construction sites)

The stakeholders also commented that credit for some of the changes seen in awareness, attitudes and behaviour in the sector should also recognise the efforts of many building and construction employers and their businesses to improve health and safety management systems and practices.

In spite of this perceived progress, all of the stakeholders were in agreement that there was still considerable room for improvement in the sector’s health and safety practices, particularly in relation to the need to achieve a culture shift in some businesses where merely complying with the legislation is viewed as being sufficient.

For the most part, the stakeholders also felt that achieving further improvements for the sector will need to take into account some key differences and disparities between different sub-groups within the building and construction industry.

Their perceptions of the commercial building/construction sector was that, for the most part, the major players in the industry such as Mainzeal Property and Construction, Fletcher Construction, Hawkins Construction, and Multiplex, to name a few, have established relatively sound practices in administering and practicing health and safety.
This is believed to be due in part to a combination of:

- Recognition that sound health and safety practices are good for business profitability.
- Incentives and pressures from third parties (such as ACC with its WSMP and WPSD incentive programmes).
- The strong penetration of Site Safe memberships among these large employers (particularly within the vertical construction sector).
- Pressure from public sector clients, such as the Defence Force, which requires that all contractors on its building sites have a valid “Passport”.

Given their size, larger businesses are also seen as having the advantage that they can have dedicated health and safety officers, and the financial resources to facilitate staff training.

In contrast, smaller businesses, and in particular, the residential building sector (which is comprised primarily of smaller businesses) will always be at a greater risk. This is due in part to:

- The economic realities of running a small business in an ever-increasing competitive environment.
- Small business owners being time-poor.
- Small businesses not have the financial resources to put into place the types of practices that large commercial builders are able to (despite the fact that the viability of a small business is more vulnerable to the impacts of staff/business owners being off work due to injury).

On the plus side, a significant number of small businesses in the sector are members of either Master Builders, or Certified Builders. This creates an opportunity for ACC, and organisations like Site Safe to work collaboratively with these industry bodies to achieve positive health and safety outcomes for small building and construction businesses.

Like small businesses, self-employed contractors are also time and finance poor, and are probably even less likely to have formal health and safety practices in place. Therefore, as a significant number of self-employed contractors work on the sites controlled by the larger commercial and civil construction companies, they will continue to be reliant upon these larger organisations to have appropriate third party audit systems in place and to dictate health and safety requirements for working on their building/construction sites (e.g. not being allowed on site without a Site Safe passport and having to abide by the employers’ health and safety rules and regulations).
20.2 Effectiveness of Site Safe in address health and safety issues in the construction/building industry

20.2.1 Perceptions of Site Safe’s mandate

Several of the stakeholders (and/or their organisations) had an involvement in the set-up and initial stages of Site Safe. Based on their understanding, the original mandate of Site Safe was to raise awareness of health and safety issues in the industry. As part of this original mandate, it was envisaged that a large part of Site Safe’s activities would have a research and development focus on identifying current and evolving health and safety issues facing the building and construction sector and developing best practice methods to deal with this.

This is highlighted by Site Safe being originally developed as a result of identification of the need for the building and construction industry to address health and safety issues and unacceptably high injury rates.

*We were part of setting up Site Safe about 10 years ago. Back then there were quite a lot of things not going well safety-wise across the sector. That research was in conjunction with ACC at the time, and was showing that there was more the sector could do for itself.*

*The original mandate around Site Safe was initially more about strategic analysis than anything else, in other words: What are the issues? What are the trends? What are the standards that should be in place? How do we influence providers in the area both government and non-government, and act as an advocate for safety-related issues across the sector. That strategic role was the early genesis for Site Safe.*

Implicit in this mandate was that Site Safe would identify issues and develop and provide health and safety training to employees in the sector, this resulted in the development of the main Passport courses (the original Building Construction Passport course was launched in 2000) and the Supervisor Gold Card course (conceived in 2001).


The stakeholders that Research New Zealand spoke with felt that Site Safe has deviated somewhat from its original mandate (which included a strong focus on research and development to identify best practices to address issues facing the building and construction sector) towards being primarily a health and safety training provider.
I constantly hear people refer to Site Safe as a training provider, but if you read its constitution, it is clearly not that. In part, yes, but not as its main focus.

While some stakeholders felt that this shift away from research and development, towards being primarily a training provider, was a result of economic drivers and based on a pragmatic decision to secure the financial viability of the organisation, others feel that Site Safe has ‘taken the road of least resistance’ by tapping into the TEC funding stream, and this has resulted in Site Safe ignoring the research and development aspects of its original mandate.

I think that Site Safe have done some good stuff. It has raised awareness at a fairly general level, and it has introduced some good training initiatives. But my sense of Site Safe is that it has put a lot of its focus into its training programmes. That is what generates revenue for them.

They used to produce right across the range quite a lot of detailed information about processes and various information to deal with specific risks and issues. That slowly started to fade away. If you look at their website, it has lots of documents that were last updated in the 90’s and have never been looked at again. Some of this information is so out-of-date it’s not funny.

In relation to its accomplishments to date, Site Safe is considered to have been extremely successful in providing basic health and safety training to workers in the commercial (vertical) construction sector; is seen as having a very prominent brand within that sector; and is likely having positive impacts on attitudes and behaviours on the sites controlled by its members.

On the other hand, the organisation is not seen to be as successful in targeting the residential building sector, for various reasons.

In the residential market it has not had the success that it could have, and even Site Safe will admit that and there are a number of reasons for that. The seven founding members or founding partners of Site Safe were the big construction companies, so their whole initial ethos was all around the commercial side of things.

If you look at the building industry, it is actually dominated by small contractors and residential buildings. So you may have done a really good job in the large commercial sector, but until you do a really good job with the small contractors and residential [builders], the job is well and truly not done.
20.2.2 Perceptions of Site Safe training (Passport and Supervisor Gold Card)

In relation to its role as a training provider, most of the stakeholders felt that Passport training’s primary strength is that it is a sound induction course in relation to building awareness of the types of health and safety risks that are frequently encountered on building sites, particularly for the vertical construction/building sector.

*I think they have done fantastic work in the commercial area. In some cases you cannot get onto the site because there is one or to of the big companies, like Mainzeals and Co, who say “All of our sites are Site Safe sites, therefore no contractors are allowed on site unless you have got a Site Safe Passport.*

In relation to its weaknesses, some stakeholders felt that the courses were too general and not focussed enough, and several had criticisms that the Civil and Residential Passport courses, have not been sufficiently tailored to address the risks inherent in ‘horizontal’ and residential construction.

*The key players who were with Site Safe in the beginning were all big vertical construction companies, so they have put a lot of effort in that area. I don’t think they have got the depth of experience with the civil sector and there has been a fair bit of criticism of the Civil Passport Course. I think it is a bit ‘once over lightly’.*

There were also concerns that Site Safe training is not achieving good penetration among smaller businesses and the residential construction sector, and that marketing of the courses has been primarily targeted towards medium and large sized construction businesses. Some of the stakeholders also said that there was anecdotal evidence that that many smaller businesses and sole contractors take up Passport training, solely so they can have access to the construction sites controlled by large Site Safe members, rather than out of a desire to be safe.

*For the residential and smaller contractors, I think in many cases they are doing it because they work with larger companies that expect that compliance from them. In some cases they are doing it because they have got all the right reasons and they think it is a good idea. But I think another big chunk are doing it quite cynically with the thought that it would be useful to have this because they can show people they have “got their ticket”.*

Several of the stakeholders also raised concerns that Passports are handed out, rather than achieved, as there is currently no assessment component to the training, as such there is no clear evidence that the course content is achieving a good knowledge transfer. Another issue that was raised was that the refresher courses are repetitive, rather than progressive, and geared towards building specific health and safety management skills from a basic foundation of awareness.

On a positive note, however, this is where the Gold Card diploma programme is perceived has having particular strengths, because it is progressive, and builds upon the basics covered by Passport training.
20.3 Increasing Site Safe’s effectiveness in addressing health and safety issues

Despite some of their mixed impressions of Site Safe, in relation to it straying from what was perceived as its original mandate, and the content and focus of the Passport training programme, the stakeholders agree that Site Safe is perceived positively by the industry, and it has a relatively strong brand. There is also no desire to see Site Safe ‘disappear’ as currently no other organisation in New Zealand is in a position to step up and take its place.

All but one of the stakeholders felt that Site Safe has the opportunity to significantly impact health and safety practices in the construction and building trades. Some of their thoughts of how this could happen include:

◆ Taking more of a strategic position in injury prevention, by returning to its original mandate to provide research and development, and being seen as an information provider and industry expert on best practice.

◆ Operating in a more consultative manner with the industry, and redeveloping relationships with key industry stakeholders, such as Registered Master Builders and Certified Builders Association representatives, thus extending its reach and impact into areas that it currently may not be targeting.

◆ Coordinating a national framework for health and safety training across the industry:
  ◆ Working with other official training bodies (e.g. ITOs), and licensing these to incorporate Passport training into their curriculum.
  ◆ Incorporating Site Safe training (Passports and Gold Cards) as NZQA unit credits, so that those undertaking trade qualifications are more motivated to take the courses, thereby gaining greater penetration across the industry.

◆ Tailoring the Passport training to better meet the needs of the civil and residential construction/building sectors.

◆ Targeting and promoting the value of training to the small business sector.

◆ Tailoring training to address trends identified in the latest industry injury statistics – i.e. running specific courses focussed on addressing identified risk areas.

◆ Increasing the penetration of Site Safe Advisors, and facilitating access to these consultants to ensure Health and Safety advice is provided effectively across the industry.
20.4 Opinions regarding future funding of Passport and Supervisor Gold Card training courses

The fact that Site Safe’s funding for Passport training from the TEC, would end in December 2007, was also discussed with the stakeholders and their input was sought as to how this training could be funded in the future.

While all of the stakeholders conceded that ACC is a logical funder for some of Site Safe’s activities, particularly given ACC’s vested interest in supporting injury prevention initiatives, only one felt that ACC should fund the Passport training programme directly. This was due to a number of reasons including:

- Some felt that direct funding of Site Safe’s Passport courses by ACC might potentially be a conflict of interest for the two organisations.

- As a government entity, direct funding of the course by ACC could be seen as a government endorsement of Site Safe over other providers of health and safety training in the sector, which do not receive any government funding (e.g. Hazard Co.).

- Any government funding provided specifically for a health and safety training course, itself should hold the training accountable for its performance as assessed against injury statistics (in terms of reducing these)

However, the stakeholders were generally in agreement that ACC should be providing Site Safe with support to:

- Undertake research and development to target the whole of the industry and specific health and safety problem areas and disseminate this information to the industry.

- Develop industry tailored injury prevention initiatives.

Importantly, most of the stakeholders also believe that the industry itself should share the costs of funding the Passport courses, and Site Safe’s other services, either on a user pays basis, or alternatively, a specific ‘training levy’ if such training were made mandatory through legislative change.
Appendix A Questionnaires and interview guide