

issue 15 - September 2015
Philippe Balzer
Icsi, Consultancy team

Philippe Balzer

He has run businesses in the fields of structural analysis and public sector construction, organisations and change management, and innovation and technology transfer. He worked for the French national health insurance agency as a risk prevention advisor. He provides initial and ongoing training for many French universities. He is also involved in the preparation of standards and international recommendations.



Is it possible to go climbing in the Alps or replace the tiles on your roof whereas you have to use a lifting platform for all tasks carried out at height over 3 metres at your workplace?

How will I explain that I set the cruise control in my car at 140km/h, when I advocate strict compliance with important safety rules at work?

Can Dr Jekyll get the better of Mr Hyde?

Many of us think that good working practices should extend to our private life. Some argue that *"It's a sign that Safety Culture has finally got through to everyone"*.

Meanwhile, others question the boundary between working life and private life. *"Once I'm out of the office I don't look back"*.

The tip is part of the iceberg!

We can hope that all employees hold the same safety 'values'. We want their beliefs to naturally push them towards the desired behaviours: carefulness, shared vigilance, compliance, proactivity, etc.

Companies often create conditions for success that are not found in private life

Consider these two extreme cases:

Case 1: The employees we recruit already apply safety values in their private lives. Their behaviour at work is generally in line with our expectations.

Case 2: The employees we recruit perform well overall, but their attitude is different in private.

Safety at work must be consistent with safety at home

- Good news! This means that when they are at work the technical resources, methods, supervision, organization and mutual assistance within teams fosters the adoption of safe behaviours.
- It also means that this favourable context does not exist at home: lack of good equipment, little or no preparation or training, lack of teamwork, non-existent supervision, etc.
- Bad news: If we are not able to offer a good environment, our employees will behave as they do at home, and adopt risky behaviours.

Living dangerously!

Even after beliefs and prevention practices have been aligned, one has to deal with another crucial topic: exposure to hazards!



A company consciously chooses the hazards to which it is exposed: chemicals, radioactive materials, electricity, flammable or explosive products, etc. They are the company's speciality, its domain of expertise, and they form the framework for its business model.

Can we prevent an individual or a family from doing likewise, and choosing the hazards to which they are exposed? Is it possible to ban our employees from taking part in dangerous sports, doing DIY, or travelling to sensitive areas?

Right now, the answer is far from obvious.

