

Existing Terminology Used for Classifying and Discussing Laboratory* Safety Cultures among EHS Professionals

(“Things could be otherwise”- Quote by unknown STS scholar)

Alphabetic List:

Absent PI – A setting where the most responsible person (i.e., the Principal Investigator or PI) is seldom present in the lab as a negative term.

Accountable – Indicates that one or more persons is or are responsible for the safety function.

Advanced – Typically positive, an environment that has progressed.

Apathetic – An uncaring attitude typified by behaviors that don’t (seem to) address safety needs.

Bad – Obviously negative but vague.

Blaming – Sometimes adding “victim” to it, an obviously negative connotation of an environment where fault is found as opposed to an objective process.

Calculative – A systematic albeit perfunctory approach, it may also typify obedience without a belief in any value basis.

Change – Usually considered positive and representing an approach focused on the ability for an organization to adapt to conditions and needs different from those it faces presently or in the past.

Committed – Reflects an ongoing approach of usually prioritizing safety and/or one of persistence.

Complacent – Typically negative indicating somewhat of a laissez faire approach or overly sure of doing the right things.

Compliance-focused – Indicates an approach of stressing conformance to rules, regulations, and/or requirements (as opposed to going beyond or encouraging thinking about the hazard, not the rule). This can be OSHA, the institution, and/or the EHS department.

Consulting – An approach focused more on providing advice or guidance as opposed to stipulating compliance and enforcement.

Dangerous – Similar to hazardous, often a negative connotation reflecting an environment with (undue) dangers present.

Desirable – Obviously positive but very subjective, undefined, and meaning different qualities for different people.

Effective – Typically a positive indication of a setting or group which is able to accomplish safe approaches and processes.

Enforced – The focus and driver is that of policies and rules being policed as opposed to behaviors on a voluntary basis or a value-based approach.

Engaged – Typically positive indicating some level of active participation by the people in the lab.

Ethical – Obviously a positive term indicating an approach considering the needs of others and decisions based on what a social group would consider acceptable behaviors or norms.

Example-setting – A demonstrated approach where the lead person(s) (e.g., the PI) shows desired behaviors by doing so her or himself.

Fast and Loose – A negative connotation for an approach that tends to skip or ignore safe practices.

Flexible – Generally positive reflecting the ability to adapt to change.

Generative – Safe behaviors are embedded into processes with a high degree of value in the benefits.

Good – Obviously positive yet vague.

Hands-on – Positive, indicating active engagement by the PI.

Hazardous – Generally indicates an environment with certain riskier conditions or processes (which may have a negative connotation but may also merely indicate existence of more dangerous work that still could be well-assessed, managed, and/or controlled).

Involved – Similar to hands-on indicating active participation by the PI.

Just – A positive context similar to “trust” in that it encourages open dialogue and reciprocal value of safety reflections. It can also reflect to the justice system in a process for evaluating “safety infractions” and fair process.

Lagging Indicators – Often as a negative, focusing on metrics occurring after incidents (e.g., accidents, injuries, exposures, OSHA “recordables”, etc.).

Leadership – Typically positive, indicating the PI taking an active role in setting the proper example, following through, etc.

Leading Indicators – Often as a positive, focusing on metrics occurring before incidents (e.g., training, meetings with a safety element, use of checklists, etc.).

Learning – Often combined with “environment” or “focused” indicating an approach that supports learning from mistakes or missteps without overt or subtle penalties or other negatives.

Mature vs. Immature – A dichotomy reflecting one that has grown (in a positive way) as opposed to one still at its nascent stage.

Mindful vs. Mindless – A dichotomy representing a conscious process of consideration of safety

Negligent – Obviously a negative context indicating not doing what a “prudent and reasonable” person would do to prevent harm to come to another person.

Norm, Normal, or Normative – Expressing a co-existence of similar values between all members.

Old-fashioned – Indicates an out-of-date approach (usually in a negative context) that minimizes supposed overstatement of risk.

Open vs. Closed – A dichotomy reflecting communication and environment between freedom to speak and be heard to a reluctance to “speak up”.

Paternalistic and Maternalistic – In both cases, representing an authoritative figure providing some type and level of guidance and leadership. Whereas maternalistic is usually thought of as one of care and compassion, paternalistic is usually thought of as more protective in a controlling manner.

Pathological – Extremely negative, focus is on avoiding detection for violations (of policies, rules, reg’s).

Plateau(ed) – Reached a point effectively of improvement stagnation. Neither positive nor negative as the state of the safety program isn’t reflected, only its tapering of improvement.

Positive vs. Negative – A dichotomy of good vs. bad.

Proactive vs. Reactive – Proactive typically demonstrates habits anticipating safety concerns whereas reactive focusses more on responding to incidents post hoc.

Production-focused – Typically used to indicate an approach that puts “getting the work done” over safety.

Progressive (or progressing) – Positive indicating a forward looking and/or advancing status.

Proper vs. Improper – Proper would indicate correctness, following rules, standards of care, etc. Improper would indicate a lack thereof.

Protective – Indicating an emphasis on ensuring that various hazard control measures are available and implemented.

Regulatory-driven – Reflects an attitude or approach of focusing solely on compliance as opposed to going beyond the minimum legal requirements.

Responsible – Typically positive indicating an environment where the organization, lab leadership, and/or lab members take on roles supporting safe practices and/or conditions. Also, used to describe an approach of prudence toward hazards.

Risk-averse – An approach that tends away from tolerating undue risks (a combination of hazards and their likelihood).

Risk-tolerant – An approach that tends to allow certain risks (either through evaluation or absent of risk assessment).

Risky – Typically a negative connotation though similarly to “risk-tolerant” possibly indicative of hazards merely being present in the lab.

Rules-based – An approach characterized by a dogmatic set of rules that dictate how people work. This can be positive (that all follow these rules) and/or negative (that people don’t actively think about what they’re doing but instead tend to perform somewhat “robotically”).

Safe vs. Unsafe – An obvious and intuitive dichotomy reflecting attitudes, behaviors, and/or conditions on dangers, hazards, and or risks.

Safety-Aware – The state of having a basic knowledge of and general thought on safety.

Safety-Conscious – Typically expressing a mindfulness of safety.

Safety-first – Keeping safety at the fore of one’s thinking prior to considerations for other priorities (e.g., over production).

Short-Sighted – Typically negative, indicating overly focused on short term gains at the expense of long term needs and benefits (e.g., safety).

Strong vs. Weak – A dichotomy similar to positive vs. weak as good vs. bad. In this case it obviously reflects a qualitative measure of the relative “strength” of the program.

Supportive – Typically indicates behaviors that emphasize safety practices.

Trust(ing), of – Atmosphere where people feel able to question practices without fear of reprisal, possibly even rewarded for doing so.

Value-based – A positive term for an approach where safety is a priority integrated throughout lab processes and systems.

** Many of these terms are general to all safety applications (or even to organizations in general) and aren’t specifically or solely applicable to or reflective of laboratory safety.*

Positive vs. Neutral vs. Ambiguous vs. Negative:

Positive:

Accountable – Indicates that one or more persons is or are responsible for the safety function.

Advanced – Typically positive, an environment that has progressed.

Change – Usually considered positive and representing an approach focused on the ability for an organization to adapt to conditions and needs different from those it faces presently or in the past.

Committed – Reflects an ongoing approach of usually prioritizing safety and/or one of persistence.

Committed - Positive, indicating an approach of focusing on safety over the long term.

Desirable – Obviously positive but very subjective, undefined, and meaning different qualities for different people.

Effective – Typically a positive indication of a setting or group which is able to accomplish safe approaches and processes.

Engaged – Typically positive indicating some level of active participation by the people in the lab.

Ethical – Obviously a positive term indicating an approach considering the needs of others and decisions based on what a social group would consider acceptable behaviors or norms.

Example-setting – A demonstrated approach where the lead person(s) (e.g., the PI) shows desired behaviors by doing so her or himself.

Flexible – Generally positive reflecting the ability to adapt to change.

Generative – Safe behaviors are embedded into processes with a high degree of value in the benefits.

Good – Obviously positive yet vague.

Hands-on – Positive, indicating active engagement by the PI.

Involved – Similar to hands-on indicating active participation by the PI.

Just – A positive context similar to “trust” in that it encourages open dialogue and reciprocal value of safety reflections. It can also reflect to the justice system in a process for evaluating “safety infractions” and fair process.

Leadership – Typically positive, indicating the PI taking an active role in setting the proper example, following through, etc.

Leading Indicators – Often as a positive, focusing on metrics occurring before incidents (e.g., training, meetings with a safety element, use of checklists, etc.).

Learning – Often combined with “environment” or “focused” indicating an approach that supports learning from mistakes or missteps without overt or subtle penalties or other negatives.

Mature (vs. Immature) – A dichotomy reflecting one that has grown (in a positive way) as opposed to one still at its nascent stage.

Mindful (vs. Mindless) – A dichotomy representing a conscious process of consideration of safety

Open (vs. Closed) – A dichotomy reflecting communication and environment between freedom to speak and be heard to a reluctance to “speak up”.

Positive (vs. Negative) – A dichotomy of good vs. bad.

Proactive (vs. Reactive) – Proactive typically demonstrates habits anticipating safety concerns whereas reactive focusses more on responding to incidents post hoc.

Progressive (or progressing) – Positive indicating a forward looking and/or advancing status.

Proper – Proper would indicate correctness, following rules, standards of care, etc.

Responsible – Typically positive indicating an environment where the organization, lab leadership, and/or lab members take on roles supporting safe practices and/or conditions. Also, used to describe an approach of prudence toward hazards.

Safe vs. Unsafe – An obvious and intuitive dichotomy reflecting attitudes, behaviors, and/or conditions on dangers, hazards, and or risks.

Safety-Aware – The state of having a basic knowledge of and general thought on safety.

Safety-Conscious – Typically expressing a mindfulness of safety.

Safety-first – Keeping safety at the fore of one's thinking prior to considerations for other priorities (e.g., over production).

Strong (vs. Weak) – A dichotomy similar to positive vs. weak as good vs. bad. In this case it obviously reflects a qualitative measure of the relative “strength” of the program.

Trust(ing), of – Atmosphere where people feel able to question practices without fear of reprisal, possibly even rewarded for doing so.

Value-based – A positive term for an approach where safety is a priority integrated throughout lab processes and systems.

Neutral:

Calculative – A systematic albeit perfunctory approach, it may also typify obedience without a belief in any value basis.

Compliance-focused – Indicates an approach of stressing conformance to rules, regulations, and/or requirements (as opposed to going beyond or encouraging thinking about the hazard, not the rule). This can be OSHA, the institution, and/or the EHS department.

Enforced – The focus and driver is that of policies and rules being policed as opposed to behaviors on a voluntary basis or a value-based approach.

Protective – Indicating an emphasis on ensuring that various hazard control measures are available and implemented.

Regulatory-driven – Reflects an attitude or approach of focusing solely on compliance as opposed to going beyond the minimum legal requirements.

Rules-based – An approach characterized by a dogmatic set of rules that dictate how people work. This can be positive (that all follow these rules) and/or negative (that people don't actively think about what they're doing but instead tend to perform somewhat "robotically").

Ambiguous:

Consulting – An approach focused more on providing advice or guidance as opposed to stipulating compliance and enforcement.

Norm, Normal, or Normative – Expressing a co-existence of similar values between all members.

Paternalistic and Maternalistic – In both cases, representing an authoritative figure providing some type and level of guidance and leadership. Whereas maternalistic is usually thought of as one of care and compassion, paternalistic is usually thought of as more protective in a controlling manner.

Plateau(ed) – Reached a point effectively of improvement stagnation. Neither positive nor negative as the state of the safety program isn't reflected, only its tapering of improvement.

Risk-averse – An approach that tends away from tolerating undue risks (a combination of hazards and their likelihood).

Risk-tolerant – An approach that tends to allow certain risks (either through evaluation or absent of risk assessment).

Supportive – Typically indicates behaviors that emphasize safety practices.

Negative:

Absent PI – A setting where the most responsible person (i.e., the Principal Investigator or PI) is seldom present in the lab as a negative term.

Apathetic – An uncaring attitude typified by behaviors that don't (seem to) address safety needs.

Bad – Obviously negative but vague.

Blaming – Sometimes adding "victim" to it, an obviously negative connotation of an environment where fault is found as opposed to an objective process.

Closed (vs. Open) – A dichotomy reflecting communication and environment between freedom to speak and be heard to a reluctance to "speak up".

Complacent – Typically negative indicating somewhat of a laissez faire approach or overly sure of doing the right things.

Dangerous – Similar to hazardous, often a negative connotation reflecting an environment with (undue) dangers present.

Fast and Loose – A negative connotation for an approach that tends to skip or ignore safe practices.

Hazardous – Generally indicates an environment with certain riskier conditions or processes (which may have a negative connotation but may also merely indicate existence of more dangerous work that still could be well-assessed, managed, and/or controlled).

Immature (vs. mature) – A dichotomy reflecting one that has grown (in a positive way) as opposed to one still at its nascent stage.

Proper vs. Improper – Improper would indicate a lack of correctness, following rules, standards of care, etc.

Lagging Indicators – Often as a negative, focusing on metrics occurring after incidents (e.g., accidents, injuries, exposures, OSHA “recordables”, etc.).

Mindless (vs. Mindful) – A dichotomy representing a conscious process of consideration of safety

Negligent – Obviously a negative context indicating not doing what a “prudent and reasonable” person would do to prevent harm to come to another person.

Old-fashioned – Indicates an out-of-date approach (usually in a negative context) that minimizes supposed overstatement of risk.

Negative (vs. Positive) – A dichotomy of good vs. bad.

Pathological – Extremely negative, focus is on avoiding detection for violations (of policies, rules, reg’s).

Reactive (vs. Proactive) – Proactive typically demonstrates habits anticipating safety concerns whereas reactive focusses more on responding to incidents post hoc.

Production-focused – Typically used to indicate an approach that puts “getting the work done” over safety.

Risky – Typically a negative connotation though similarly to “risk-tolerant” possibly indicative of hazards merely being present in the lab.

Unsafe (vs. Safe) – An obvious and intuitive dichotomy reflecting attitudes, behaviors, and/or conditions on dangers, hazards, and or risks.

Short-Sighted – Typically negative, indicating overly focused on short term gains at the expense of long term needs and benefits (e.g., safety).

Weak (vs. Strong) – A dichotomy similar to positive vs. weak as good vs. bad. In this case it obviously reflects a qualitative measure of the relative “strength” of the program.

Clustered Synonyms:

Positive:

Accountable – Indicates that one or more persons is or are responsible for the safety function.

Committed – Reflects an ongoing approach of usually prioritizing safety and/or one of persistence.

Responsible – Typically positive indicating an environment where the organization, lab leadership, and/or lab members take on roles supporting safe practices and/or conditions. Also, used to describe an approach of prudence toward hazards.

Advanced – Typically positive, an environment that has progressed.

Generative – Safe behaviors are embedded into processes with a high degree of value in the benefits.

Leading Indicators – Often as a positive, focusing on metrics occurring before incidents (e.g., training, meetings with a safety element, use of checklists, etc.).

Proactive (vs. Reactive) – Proactive typically demonstrates habits anticipating safety concerns whereas reactive focusses more on responding to incidents post hoc.

Value-based – A positive term for an approach where safety is a priority integrated throughout lab processes and systems.

Change – Usually considered positive and representing an approach focused on the ability for an organization to adapt to conditions and needs different from those it faces presently or in the past.

Desirable – Obviously positive but very subjective, undefined, and meaning different qualities for different people.

Flexible – Generally positive reflecting the ability to adapt to change.

Learning – Often combined with “environment” or “focused” indicating an approach that supports learning from mistakes or missteps without overt or subtle penalties or other negatives.

Mindful (vs. Mindless) – A dichotomy representing a conscious process of consideration of safety

Progressive (or progressing) – Positive indicating a forward looking and/or advancing status.

Effective – Typically a positive indication of a setting or group which is able to accomplish safe approaches and processes.

Mature (vs. Immature) – A dichotomy reflecting one that has grown (in a positive way) as opposed to one still at its nascent stage.

Strong (vs. Weak) – A dichotomy similar to positive vs. weak as good vs. bad. In this case it obviously reflects a qualitative measure of the relative “strength” of the program.

Engaged – Typically positive indicating some level of active participation by the people in the lab.

Example-setting – A demonstrated approach where the lead person(s) (e.g., the PI) shows desired behaviors by doing so her or himself.

Involved – Similar to hands-on indicating active participation by the PI.

Hands-on – Positive, indicating active engagement by the PI.

Leadership – Typically positive, indicating the PI taking an active role in setting the proper example, following through, etc.

Ethical – Obviously a positive term indicating an approach considering the needs of others and decisions based on what a social group would consider acceptable behaviors or norms.

Just – A positive context similar to “trust” in that it encourages open dialogue and reciprocal value of safety reflections. It can also reflect to the justice system in a process for evaluating “safety infractions” and fair process.

Open (vs. Closed) – A dichotomy reflecting communication and environment between freedom to speak and be heard to a reluctance to “speak up”.

Trust(ing), of – Atmosphere where people feel able to question practices without fear of reprisal, possibly even rewarded for doing so.

Good – Obviously positive yet vague.

Positive (vs. Negative) – A dichotomy of good vs. bad.

Safe (vs. Unsafe) – An obvious and intuitive dichotomy reflecting attitudes, behaviors, and/or conditions on dangers, hazards, and or risks.

Safety-Aware – The state of having a basic knowledge of and general thought on safety.

Safety-Conscious – Typically expressing a mindfulness of safety.

Safety-first – Keeping safety at the fore of one’s thinking prior to considerations for other priorities (e.g., over production).

Neutral:

Calculative – A systematic albeit perfunctory approach, it may also typify obedience without a belief in any value basis.

Compliance-focused – Indicates an approach of stressing conformance to rules, regulations, and/or requirements (as opposed to going beyond or encouraging thinking about the hazard, not the rule). This can be OSHA, the institution, and/or the EHS department.

Enforced – The focus and driver is that of policies and rules being policed as opposed to behaviors on a voluntary basis or a value-based approach.

Protective – Indicating an emphasis on ensuring that various hazard control measures are available and implemented.

Regulatory-driven – Reflects an attitude or approach of focusing solely on compliance as opposed to going beyond the minimum legal requirements.

Rules-based – An approach characterized by a dogmatic set of rules that dictate how people work. This can be positive (that all follow these rules) and/or negative (that people don't actively think about what they're doing but instead tend to perform somewhat "robotically").

Ambiguous:

Consulting – An approach focused more on providing advice or guidance as opposed to stipulating compliance and enforcement.

Norm, Normal, or Normative – Expressing a co-existence of similar values between all members.

Paternalistic and Maternalistic – In both cases, representing an authoritative figure providing some type and level of guidance and leadership. Whereas maternalistic is usually thought of as one of care and compassion, paternalistic is usually thought of as more protective in a controlling manner.

Plateau(ed) – Reached a point effectively of improvement stagnation. Neither positive nor negative as the state of the safety program isn't reflected, only its tapering of improvement.

Risk-averse – An approach that tends away from tolerating undue risks (a combination of hazards and their likelihood).

Risk-tolerant – An approach that tends to allow certain risks (either through evaluation or absent of risk assessment).

Supportive – Typically indicates behaviors that emphasize safety practices.

Negative:

Absent PI – A setting where the most responsible person (i.e., the Principal Investigator or PI) is seldom present in the lab as a negative term.

Apathetic – An uncaring attitude typified by behaviors that don't (seem to) address safety needs.

Mindless (vs. Mindful) – A dichotomy representing a conscious process of consideration of safety

Bad – Obviously a negative though vague.

Negative (vs. Positive) – A dichotomy of good vs. bad.

Blaming – Sometimes adding “victim” to it, an obviously negative connotation of an environment where fault is found as opposed to an objective process.

Closed (vs. Open) – A dichotomy reflecting communication and environment between freedom to speak and be heard to a reluctance to “speak up”.

Complacent – Typically negative indicating somewhat of a laissez faire approach or overly sure of doing the right things.

Dangerous – Similar to hazardous, often a negative connotation reflecting an environment with (undue) dangers present.

Fast and Loose – A negative connotation for an approach that tends to skip or ignore safe practices.

Hazardous – Generally indicates an environment with certain riskier conditions or processes (which may have a negative connotation but may also merely indicate existence of more dangerous work that still could be well-assessed, managed, and/or controlled).

Risky – Typically a negative connotation though similarly to “risk-tolerant” possibly indicative of hazards merely being present in the lab.

Unsafe (vs. Safe) – An obvious and intuitive dichotomy reflecting attitudes, behaviors, and/or conditions on dangers, hazards, and or risks.

Immature (vs. mature) – A dichotomy reflecting one that has grown (in a positive way) as opposed to one still at its nascent stage.

Lagging Indicators – Often as a negative, focusing on metrics occurring after incidents (e.g., accidents, injuries, exposures, OSHA “recordables”, etc.).

Reactive (vs. Proactive) – Proactive typically demonstrates habits anticipating safety concerns whereas reactive focusses more on responding to incidents post hoc.

Negligent – Obviously a negative context indicating not doing what a “prudent and reasonable” person would do to prevent harm to come to another person.

Pathological – Extremely negative, focus is on avoiding detection for violations (of policies, rules, reg’s).

Old-fashioned – Indicates an out-of-date approach (usually in a negative context) that minimizes supposed overstatement of risk.

Production-focused – Typically used to indicate an approach that puts “getting the work done” over safety.

Short-Sighted – Typically negative, indicating overly focused on short term gains at the expense of long term needs and benefits (e.g., safety).

Weak (vs. Strong) – A dichotomy similar to positive vs. weak as good vs. bad. In this case it obviously reflects a qualitative measure of the relative “strength” of the program.

Sources:

Advancing Safety Culture in the University Laboratory by the Task Force for Advancing the Culture of Laboratory Safety at Stanford University, 2014, at http://web.stanford.edu/dept/EHS/cgi-bin/lscf/sites/default/files/Stanford_Task_Force_Report.pdf

A framework for understanding the development of organisational safety culture by Dianne Parker, Matthew Lawrie, and Patrick Hudson, 2005. Published Safety Science 44 (2006) 551–562.

Building a Culture of Safety by Beryl Lieff Benderly, Science Magazine, June 5, 2009 at <http://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2009/06/building-culture-safety>

Creating Safety Cultures in Academic Institutions: A Report of the Safety Culture Task Force of the ACS Committee on Chemical Safety, (ISBN 978-0-8412-2817-7) American Chemical Society, Wash., DC 2012

Danger culture of industrial society, The, Chapter 15. ARIE RIP.

Just Culture: Balancing Safety and Accountability by Sidney Dekker, Agate Publishing, 2012.

Laboratory Safety Culture Survey 2012 – Draft Report A collaboration by the UC Center for Laboratory Safety, BioRAFT and Nature Publishing Group Overview of initial findings September 2012 Laura Harper and Fiona Watt, Nature Publishing Group at <http://www.bioraft.com/lab-safety-culture-survey-draft-report>

Prudent Practices in the Laboratory: Handling and Management of Chemical Hazards: Updated Version at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK55882/>

Safe Science: Promoting a Culture of Safety in Academic Chemical Research (2014) by the Board on Chemical Sciences and Technology of the National Academy of Science (NAS)

Safety2 Listserv of ASU’s Fulton Schools of Engineering, poll of members by the list Moderator (Jonathan Klane), February 2016.

Safety culture maturity model by Dr Mark Fleming Chartered Psychologist Prepared by The Keil Centre for the Health and Safety Executive, 2000. ISBN 0 7176 1919 2.

Safety Survey Reveals Lab Risks: Questionnaire suggests researchers not as safe as they feel by Richard Van Noorden, Nature – International Journal of Science, Volume 493, Issue 7430, January 2, 2013 at

http://pl8cg5fc8w.search.serialssolutions.com/?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info%3Aofi%2Fenc%3AUTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/summon.serialssolutions.com&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=Safety+survey+reveals+lab+risks&rft.jtitle=Nature&rft.au=Richard+Van+Noorden&rft.date=2013-01-03&rft.pub=Nature+Publishing+Group&rft.issn=0028-0836&rft.eissn=1476-4687&rft.volume=493&rft.issue=7430&rft.spage=9&rft.externalDocID=2887067991¶mdict=en-US

Taming Prometheus: Talk About Safety and Culture by Susan S. Silbey, MIT, *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 2009. 35:341–69.

Towards a model of safety culture by M.D. Cooper, Ph.D., *Safety Science* 36 (2000) 111±136

Towards an occupational safety and health culture by Gerard Zwetsloot and Niek Steijger, Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research, published on OSHwiki on 24 April 2013 at https://oshwiki.eu/wiki/Towards_an_occupational_safety_and_health_culture