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Abstract

BACKGROUND: The hospital environment has many occupational health risks that predispose healthcare workers to various kinds of work accidents.

OBJECTIVE: This study aims to compare different methods for work accidents investigation and to verify their suitability in hospital environment.

METHODS: For this purpose, we selected three types of accidents related with needle stick, worker fall and inadequate effort/movement during the mobilization of patients. A total of thirty accidents were analysed with six different work accidents investigation methods.

RESULTS: The results showed that organizational factors were the group of causes which had the greatest impact in the three types of work accidents.

CONCLUSIONS: The methods selected to be compared in this paper are applicable and appropriate for the work accidents investigation in hospitals. However, the Registration, Research and Analysis of Work Accidents method (RIAAT) showed to be an optimal technique to use in this context.

Keywords: Hospital, risk assessment, occupational accidents analysis

1. Introduction

Currently it is estimated that 1.7 million people die each year as a result of their occupation [1]. The International Labour Organization (ILO) found that, in addition to deaths, there are about 268 million non-fatal injuries which result in an average of three days of work lost by accident, as well as 160 million new cases of work-related diseases [1]. In many countries, and in particular in the European Union (EU), the risk assessment is a legal requirement as well as the notification of occupational accidents [2,3]. According to the Occupational Health and Safety Advisory Services (OHSAS) 18001:2007 on the requirements of the management of safety and occupational health, work accident (WA) is a “work-related event resulting in injury,
health condition or death” [4]. According to the Portuguese legislation (article 8º in Lei nº 98/2009 de 4 de setembro), a WA is “one that takes place during working time and produces direct or indirect injury, functional disorder or sickness resulting in reduced ability to work or death” [5]. The accidents analysis and investigation not only represents a legal obligation (article 98º in Lei nº 102/2009 de 10 de setembro), but also aims to make improvements, both in terms of procedures, work practices and in assessment systems and risk control [6].

1.1. Accidents investigation methods

WA has negative impacts on workers’ health and performance of the organization. Nevertheless WA can be understood as a source of information to process improvement and self-protection system as well as a way to provide an opportunity for correction and development [7,8]. The main objective of the accident investigation consists in the description of the course of events, however, is also essential to understand how the safety system failed and why the accident occurred. It is also important to provide feedback to decision makers about the causes of negative events since most organizations have implemented measures to prevent accidents [9,10].

The WA investigation methods might be direct or indirect, or also referred to as inductive or deductive, respectively. The direct methods are those that establish risk factors prior to the accident (Risk Assessment Methodology), while the indirect methods analyze accidents, providing information of the causal factors associated (Accident Analysis Methodologies) [11,12]. It should be noted that the causes are all factors that directly or indirectly have contributed to the accident. The WA does not result from one single cause but by multiple causes, which may be provided from all levels of an organization, such as equipment failures; action of hazardous substances; improper actions of the employee; insufficient supervision, among others [2].

Most accident models and theories applied in the field of occupational accidents are still based on the ideas in Heinrich’s domino model, which is based on linear progression of events leading to the accident [13].

After that, several tools with different purposes, practices and conclusions have emerged, but all aimed to improve the occupational conditions [14]. The author Laflamme [15] ranked the models into four different approaches: decision, sequential, energy and organizational. On the other hand, Lehto and Salvendy [16] distinguished models of causality in three groups: general models of the accidents process, human error models and risk behaviours and models of mechanical damage. Kjellén [17] described five categories of models: the causal sequence, process, energy, logical tree and Safety, Health and Environment (SHE) management.

According to Hollnagel [18], the models are divided into sequential, epidemiological and systematic. In the sequential model, the accident is understood as the outcome from a series of individual steps organised according to their order of occurrence. Regarding the epidemiological model, accidents result from a sequence of events due to latent failures and active barriers in the system. These barriers, according to their position along the chain of events, delineate the presence of different work areas (safe, unsafe, and loss of control) [18]. On the other hand, the systematic model describes the accident as the result of a variability of multiple factors that are part of the production system [18].

The advanced version of Human Factors Analysis and Classification Systems (HFACS) based on Reason’s model of latent and active failures has provided an applicable system for investigating human error in accidents and it is one of the most powerful tools for reconstructing human contributions to various types of accidents [19]. During the last decades, a number of methods for accident investigation has been developed and well described in the literature [8]. In this section a brief description of some selected methods are presented.

1.1.1. Fault tree (FT)

The fault tree analysis (FT) was developed in the early 60’s by H. A. Watson Bell Telephone Laboratories [11]. This method represents a graph (logical tree) that displays various combinations of events through the use of logic gates, equipment failures, human errors and environmental factors that can result in accidents [8]. During the analysis procedure all the factors that may give a valid contribute are selected, in order to show the relationships (dependence or independence) and possible causes of the accident [12].

1.1.2. Causal Tree Method (CTM)

In the 70’s the Institut National de Recherche et de Sécurité (INRS), developed the Causal Tree Method (CTM). Accidents analysis by the CTM can be associated with the sequential model [18]. The CTM assumes that accidents result from variations or deviations from the usual process, which can be related to individuals,
tasks, equipment and environment. The starting point of the tree is the final event, after that the investigator has to identify various causes for the accident, relating their causal links [14].

1.1.3. Swiss-cheese method (SCM)

The theory of “Swiss-cheese” focuses on the epidemiological model and describes the undesirable event through an analogy as an appearance of a disease or a Swiss-cheese [20]. Therefore it is understood that there are barriers along the layers of the system and that can be corrupted by active faults (committed by professionals with immediate consequences) and latent (structural conditions reflect the organization and do not have immediate consequences) of the system. Barriers that are degraded by latent conditions and active failures are classified into physical, functional, symbolic and immaterial and can be used in the analysis of pre-existing systems [21]. This classification differs from author to author, so the barriers can be also classified as administrative, management, preconditions, productive activities and defences [7].

1.1.4. Failure matrix (FM)

Failure matrix method (FM) can be applied to any system, or can be adapted to workplace accidents or other cases. The technique identifies the situation, explains the causes, consequential effects, the estimated frequency and severity. On the other hand, this procedure allows the ranking of accidents by level of risk and it might be a way to align priorities of preventive or corrective actions [22].

1.1.5. Work Accidents Investigation Technique (WAIT)

Work Accidents Investigation Technique (WAIT) was developed by Jacinto and Aspinwall [23], which integrated two approaches developed by Reason [20] and Hollnagel [18]. The method provides a complete set for their application in research and accidents analysis, comprising nine steps grouped into two sequential phases. The first consists in a simplified investigation, during which the causes and immediate circumstances and legal support are identified. In the second phase – frequently called a full investigation – other possible weaknesses and conditions within the organisation are also identified and analysed [23].

1.1.6. Registration, Research and Analysis of Work Accidents (RIAAT)

The Registration, Research and Analysis of Work Accidents method, developed in the project Coding, Analysis and Prevention of Accidents at Work (CAPTAR – “Learning to prevent”) was tested with the collaboration of the Portuguese Authority for the Working Conditions (ACT) to investigate accidents and to promote good practice in matters related to accidents at work. The objective of the project was to increase the efficiency of the process and how the accident information is obtained, handled and used to improve safety [24]. The data is processed in a hierarchical cycle with different activities such as gathering initial information about the accident, their codification and interpretation (sometimes using pre-defined classification systems); research into the causes and underlying factors, and finally, how the information is used to learn and to develop prevention strategies. It is a tool that covers the entire cycle of the accident data [24].

1.2. Work accidents investigation in hospitals

Most WA investigation methods are targeted towards the industrial sector, particularly for high-risk industry [25]. However, other complex jobs with high levels of responsibility, such as hospital work where it is essential to implement measures that prevent accidents. The work performed in hospital environments is physically and psychologically intense, with the potential for burnout, stress and fatigue, which can result in errors [26]. There is also the risk of WA with serious consequences for healthcare workers and sometimes for patients.

The hospital organizations are among the most complex structures, given their diversity of services, facilities, equipment and their hierarchical system of several departments and professions (such as doctors, nurses, diagnostic and therapeutic health technicians, administrative personnel and general services). The hospital environment has many occupational health risks due to the variety of clinical and non-clinical tasks performed by healthcare workers. The exposures to psychosocial, chemical, physical, mechanical and biological hazards are common in hospital units [27] and predispose healthcare workers to different types of accidents.

In 2007, a total of 4593 accidents have occurred in Portuguese hospitals [28]. The professional category that presented more WA was the nurses, with 1991 cases, representing approximately 39.3% of total workers. However, the professional groups with a higher incidence rate of WA were the operational and auxiliary workers, with 93 and 90 accidents per 1000 professionals, respectively. Taking into account
the complexity of hospital organizations and the unacceptable consequences of such major WA in this environment, it is necessary to apply a suitable investigation method to obtain relevant information about accidents causes and also to prevent their occurrence. It is important to know more about the investigation methods and the performance of each one when applied to different types of accidents.

In order to take corrective and/or preventive actions to eliminate or minimize occupational hazards in these institutions, it is necessary to verify the applicability of effective models in the search of possible sources of occupational accidents in hospitals. This study aimed to compare WA investigation methods and verify their suitability in hospital environment. The study was conducted based on HFACS, a generic model that investigates the active failures by the operators combined with latent conditions upstream in the organization.

2. Methods

2.1. Characterisation of the hospital unit under study

This work was carried out between January and September of 2011. The hospital under study belongs to Portuguese public service and it is constituted by eleven stores building, two of them are located underground. It has a capacity of more than 1000 beds and various medical and surgical specialties as well as a variety of supplementary diagnostic and therapeutic support.

2.2. Definition of WA and investigation methods

The types of WA analysed were selected according to the national prevalence of WA in Portuguese hospitals [28]. Considering the numbers presented in this report the occurrence of occupational accidents, taking into account the action of an injury (an event that leads to injury), were mostly the “needle stick” with 1630 cases and “worker fall” with 1016 accidents. The agents that cause most injuries were tools/instruments with a prevalence of 43.6%, followed by floors, with 12.5%. The most common types of injuries were wounds, with 2025 occurrences, followed by sprains, with 714 cases.

A total of thirty accidents were analysed (n = 30). For each type of accident (needle stick, falls and inadequate effort/movement) were selected two different tasks for the application of investigation methods, as can be seen in Table 1. Different six WA investigation methods were studied: Fault Tree (FT), Causal Tree Method (CTM), Swiss-Cheese Method (SCM), Failure Matrix (FM), Work Accidents Investigation Technique (WAIT) and Registration, Research, Analysis of Work Accidents (RIAAT). These methods were applied based on the four following criteria:

1) WA investigation method used in the studied hospital – CTM
2) The method tested by ACT – RIAAT
3) The investigation methods proposed by Hollnagel [18] – FT, SCM, WAIT
4) A simple method that allows the prioritization of corrective actions quickly – FM.

2.3. Support instruments for WA analysis

A checklist and a previously validated questionnaire were applied in order to characterise the work conditions and describe the accident situation. The checklist included six analysis topics: (I) General Conditions; (II) Working practices; (III) Materials and equipment; (IV) Other work-related factors; (V) Individual factors and (VI) Training, information, communication and awareness. The questionnaire has two main fields: (I) Professional identification; (II) Accident or incident characterisation.

The investigator was just an observer that was recording the data without intervening actively in the variables under study and analysing the cause-effect (causes of WA) [29].

2.4. Causes classification

The cause’s classification was based on the Human Factors Analysis and Classification Systems (HFACS), which uses the same levels presented by Reason [19] in his model: organizational influences, unsafe supervision, preconditions for unsafe acts and unsafe acts [30]. The HFACS framework was developed by Wiegmann and Shappell [31] and it is present in Fig. 1.
2.5. Analysis of selected methods for accident investigation

The advantages and disadvantages of WA investigation methods were analysed according to seven variables: 1) the degree of complexity, 2) time spent in the analysis, 3) number of variables to analyse, 4) accident complexity, 5) action plan, 6) Eurostat uniformity [32] and 7) hierarchy of action.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Needle stick

Table 2 presents the “needle stick” WA analysed and the main causes responsible for its occurrence. The group of causes that had the greatest impact in this type of WA was organizational influences (39.5%) and it was related mainly to the lack of instructions and/or work procedures and material resources (for example, absence of containers for biological waste). However, in the accidents occurred during surgical procedures, it was observed that the causes identified were related to preconditions for unsafe acts (31.2%). In the case of accidents during medicines administration, the main cause was unsafe acts (13.3%). The WA occurred during the surgical procedures were generally associated with the lack of space and inadequate layout of the operating rooms. On the other hand, during medicines administration, inadequate elimination of perforate cutting material by healthcare workers was the most important cause for this type of WA. In fact, unsafe behaviours are involved in the increasing of the risk or probability of accidents [33]. As a matter of fact, one of the factors related to the accidents with perforate cutting material in hospitals is the negligence of healthcare workers [34].

3.2. Falls

The main causes of WA involving “falls” are presented in Table 3. For this type of WA, the results show
that organizational influences were further the main group of causes, accounted 43.4% during cleaning tasks and 46.7% on access to different areas essentially associated with inadequate maintenance of infrastructure and lack of instructions and/or of work procedures. The second most important group of causes was preconditions for unsafe acts, representing 32.5% during cleaning tasks and 32.6% on access to different areas. These causes were related to low-light level conditions and disorganised workplaces. The unsafe acts had more influence in accident occurrence during cleaning tasks (19.3%) than during access to different areas (9.8%).

3.3. Inadequate effort/movement

Table 4 presents the main causes associated to WA involving “inadequate effort/movement” during patients handling and during manual handling, respec-
Table 4
Number and type of causes identified with different investigation methods in “inadequate effort/movement” accident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods(b)</th>
<th>Causes(a)</th>
<th>Accident – Inadequate effort/movement (n = 10)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAAT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 (28.7%)</td>
<td>18 (16.7%)</td>
<td>17 (15.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual handling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAAT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 (31.7%)</td>
<td>15 (14.8%)</td>
<td>4 (4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 (30.1%)</td>
<td>33 (15.8%)</td>
<td>21 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) A – Unsafe acts; B – Preconditions for unsafe acts; C – Unsafe supervision; D – Organizational Influences; \(b\) CTM – Causal Tree Method; FT – Fault Tree; SCM – Swiss-Cheese Method; FM – Failure Matrix; WAIT – Work Accidents Investigation Technique; RIAAT – Registration, Research and Analysis of Work Accidents.


tively. In this type of accident, the organizational influences had also more influence in the WA occurrence, ranged between 38.9% and 49.5%. These results suggest that it is crucial to develop procedures and work instructions and create training programs focused on the manual handling activities. It is known that injuries occur most often while the patient is being transported and rarely associated to lifting operation [35]. Hence, the training programs should focus more in transporting activities than on that method of lifting. The unsafe acts had similar influence in WA occurrence on the two tasks analysed (ranged between 28.7% and 31.7%). For each group of causes, adoption of inadequate postures was the main factor identified. The influence of preconditions for unsafe acts was also similar in the different tasks, accounted for 16.7% during patients handling and 14.8% during manual handling. In fact, for both tasks, the lack of adequate equipment (for example, adjustable equipment) and the inadequate conception of workplaces were the main factors identified in this group of causes. Also note that for all accident type analysed, results showed that unsafe supervision had less influence in accidents occurrence.

3.4. Comparison of WA investigation methods

The results obtained in this study show that independently of the WA investigation method applied and the task analysed, the organizational influences was the main cause responsible for WA occurrence, highlighting the influence of top management on safety in the organizations [36]. As a result, the WA investigation methods should include variables capable to analyse factors associated with top management and their influences.

Table 5 presents the results relative to the perspective of the investigator according to seven variables defined on Section 2.5.

Even though the causes obtained after the application of the WA investigation methods were common, more complex methods (WAIT and RIAAT) were able to find new causes (of different levels of organization)
that complement the analysis of the simple methods. This can be seen Tables 2, 3 and 4. Many of the accident investigation methods are complementary and not mutually exclusive, such as CTM and FM methods [7]. The application of these methods depends on the experience and technical knowledge of WA because there are no predefined variables, but only an idea that causes can be related to the individual, task, equipment and environment. The main advantage of CTM and FM methods is that it requires little time to process information. Nevertheless, most hospital accidents are quite complex and depend heavily on administrative policies and management, which causes problems in interpreting the possible causal factors [14].

The theory of Swiss Cheese depends on the investigator (experience, qualifications, etc.) but it has already guidelines for analysis, called barriers. Their absence or outdated originates a failure, allowing the occurrence of WA. These barriers can cause difficulties, due to the inexistence of uniform literature for its analysis. In order to overcome this disadvantage, CTM or FT methods can be used not with the purpose of classifying the barriers but to provide information that can support this analysis [7]. These methods can be used as a complement of other techniques, such as FM. This method ranks the priority intervention in accidents depending on the frequency, severity and/or probability of occurrence.

The application of WA investigation methods selected in hospitals are feasible, however, the WAIT and RIAAT methods have pre-defined variables that contribute for WA analysis, unlike the rest which depend on the investigators practice in relation to knowledge of the infrastructure, the functioning of the workplace and activities carried out by workers. The WAIT method is easy and practical to use in work accidents and incidents analysis on industries [2]. This application in hospital context is practicable because it takes into account the Eurostat pre-defined variables [32], contributing to the harmonization of European statistical analysis by integrating these variables [2,3,24]. Other advantage of this method is the ability to be compared and associated with the OSH Management System – OHSAS 18001:2007, as well as the prioritization of recommendation in terms of time and cost [2].

The RIAAT method is also considered a practical and structured tool, applied to learn and develop new prevention strategies, such as WAIT. These methods have several variables that simplify the interpretation of WA and should be applied in more serious and complex accidents. The correct application of WAIT and RIAAT methods implies that the investigators know every step of the method and have enough time for its application. The RIAAT allows, through a decision tree, to select more basic or detailed causes depending of the WA type. This makes the RIAAT method an adequate tool for use in hospitals.

4. Conclusion

Accident investigations are an integral part of any good safety and health initiative. It also, should be a formalized part of a company’s safety and health commitment [37]. In many European Union countries, including Portugal, the existing legislation requires the occupational risk assessment and notification of occupational accidents and the investigation of its causes. These legislative measures provide improvements, according to the practices/procedures and the risk control systems, as a way to minimize the impact of work on workers’ health.

This study showed that “organizational influences” are the most relevant cause of WA in hospitals, independently of the method applied. The methods used are not mutually exclusive. They can complement each other and be adaptable to the hospital environment.

The most complex methods have the disadvantage of being more time consuming. However, the RIAAT method in the implementation phase of the decision tree analysis allows the distinction between simple accidents (e.g. entrapment between objects) and more complex/frequent/severe accidents (e.g. needle stick). This method includes pre-defined variables of the WAIT method, making it a complete and proper technique. Besides that, experience from accidents shows that major accidents almost never result from one single cause, but usually involves multiple and interrelated causal factors.

This study pretends to be a contribution for the selection of methods for the analysis of occupational accidents in hospitals and a helpful contribute to improve the investigation system of WA in these institutions and in similar sectors such as Health Centre’s and laboratories. Furthermore, this study can be expanded with further developments, such applying other investigation methods and by the analysis of more complex WA.
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