



Research First

Canterbury Rebuild Safety Charter 2015 Members Research

Friday, 4 December 2015



Table of Contents

1	Key Messages.....	3
1.1	Project Context.....	3
1.2	Key Findings.....	3
2	Research Method.....	5
3	Perceptions of the Safety Charter	6
3.1	Recall of the Charter Commitments.....	6
3.2	Perceptions of the Charter.....	6
3.3	Supporters, Passives and the Less Satisfied.....	9
4	Engagement with the Charter.....	10
4.1	The Charter Update	11
4.2	The Charter Website.....	12
4.3	Charter Events.....	13
5	The Charter Project Officer.....	14
6	About the Sample.....	16

1 Key Messages

1.1 Project Context

The Canterbury Rebuild Safety Charter (the Charter) is a health and safety agreement between the leaders of various government agencies and organisations involved in the rebuild of Canterbury. The Charter has over 200 member organisations. The Charter wished to understand their perceptions of, and level of engagement with, the Charter.

To answer these questions for the Charter, Research First conducted a telephone survey of Charter members. This involved a census of the first 200 Charter member organisations. In total, 141 surveys were completed.

This document provides the results from that research.

1.2 Key Findings

Perceptions of the Safety Charter

- Awareness of the Charter Commitments was high with almost all Charter members indicating awareness of all or most of the Commitments.
- Half of the respondents rated the Charter as being useful for improving health and safety of worksites.
- Slightly more than half (56%) of the respondents agreed the Charter membership is good value for money.
- While essentially positive, the results also suggest there are pockets of disengaged or dissatisfied members:
 - 30% rated the Charter's usefulness and value for money as 'neutral'; and
 - 17% and 14% rated the Charter as not useful and not value for money respectively.
- Using these results of perceptions of the Charter, members were able to be clustered into three groups:

Supporters

- Thought the Charter was useful and good value for money
- Charter advocates
- 36% of total sample

Passives

- Tend to be either neutral or somewhat positive in regard to usefulness of the Charter and value for money
- Passive in terms of likelihood to recommend the Charter
- 58% of total sample

Less Satisfied

- Perceptions of Charter as not useful and poor value for money
- Small group of less satisfied members: 6% of total sample

Engagement with the Charter

- Most Charter members were aware of the Charter resources.
- Most of the resources were considered useful to half or more of these members, with Charter events being seen as the most useful resource (74%).
- In contrast, posters were considered the least useful of the resources the Charter provides.

The Charter Project Officer

- Few members noted that the Charter Project Officer had visited their worksite. Of those 23 who did, 16 found the visit useful.
- Half of the members thought a Charter representative talking to workers about health and safety and supporting member organisations with their Charter performance would be useful.

2 Research Method

The Canterbury Rebuild Safety Charter (the Charter) is a health and safety agreement between the leaders of various government agencies and organisations involved in the rebuild of Canterbury. The Charter has over 200 member organisations. The Charter wished to understand their perceptions of, and level of engagement with, the Charter.

To answer these questions for the Charter, Research First conducted a telephone survey of Charter members. This involved a census of the first 200 Charter member organisations. In total, 141 surveys were completed.

A sample of this size (141 surveys out of a population of 200) provides the Charter with results with a margin of error of approximately +/- 4.5%¹. This means the Charter can have confidence in these results as a measure of Charter members' perceptions.

2.1 Analysis

The results have been analysed by cluster (Supporters, Passives, and those Less Satisfied) and organisation size. Note that the margins of error associated with subsets in the sample will be larger than +/-4.5% because the maximum sampling error is a function of the total size of the sample, irrespective of the size of the population. It is important to keep this in mind and to remember that the results become less precise as the sample size shrinks. Thus, the results by cluster and organisation size should be read with caution. Few differences in these results were discovered but those that were have been outlined in the body of the report.

The analysis by organisation size is based on the following groups:

Table 2.1: Size of Organisation

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Small (<10 FTEs)	32	23%
Medium (11-49 FTEs)	48	34%
Large (50+ FTEs)	61 ²	43%
Total	141	100%

¹ At the 95% confidence interval.

² One organisation, which does not technically employ anyone but manages over 100 workers, has been included in this group of 'large' employees for the purposes of the analysis.

3 Perceptions of the Safety Charter

3.1 Recall of the Charter Commitments

Almost all Charter members were aware of all or most of the Charter Commitments. Charter members were most aware of the Leadership commitment and least aware of the Engagement and Consultation; and Reporting and Impairment commitments.

When analysed by organisation size, the results show that small organisations were slightly less likely to be aware of the Engagement and Consultation and Site Induction Commitments.

Table 3.1: Awareness of the Charter Commitments

	Unprompted Recall	Prompted Recall	Total Recall
Leadership	21%	77%	98%
Site Safety Risks	15%	82%	96%
Health and Wellbeing	14%	82%	96%
Critical Risks	18%	78%	96%
Site	9%	87%	96%
Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)	17%	79%	96%
Training	13%	81%	94%
Impairment	15%	77%	92%
Reporting	7%	84%	91%
Engagement and Consultation	9%	81%	90%

3.2 Perceptions of the Charter

Charter members were asked how likely they would be to recommend the Charter to other organisations involved in the Canterbury rebuild. Data were collected using a variation of the loyalty metric developed by the Harvard Business School - the Net Promoter Score³.

In this design, members were asked to rate their likelihood to recommend the Charter using a scale from 0 to 10 (where 0 meant they would 'never recommend' and 10 meant they would 'always recommend' the Charter). Those who provided ratings of 9 or 10 were identified as promoters; while those who provided ratings between 0 and 6 were identified as detractors. Scores of 7 or 8 were identified as passive. The Net Promoter Score is calculated by the percentage of detractors from that of promoters. The score ranges from -100 to +100 and any result above zero is considered a positive outcome.

³ Net Promoter Score and System: <http://www.netpromoter.com/why-net-promoter/know>



The Charter’s Net Promoter Score is +6. To put this into context, Net Promoter Scores around the midpoint (i.e. 0) are common. However, a closer look at the distribution of scores shows that the results are relatively evenly split between ‘promoters’, ‘passives’ and ‘detractors’. The easiest way for the Charter to improve is to work on converting the ‘passives’ to ‘promoters’.

Large companies (NPS of +28) were more likely to be promoters of the Charter than both medium (-15) and small (-6) companies.

Table 3.2: Likelihood to Recommend the Charter

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Promoters	50	35%
Passives	50	35%
Detractors	41	29%
Net Promoter Score		+6

Members were also asked to rate the usefulness of the Charter for improving health and safety in their organisation. Responses were recorded using a simple five point Likert scale, with the following options:

1	2	3	4	5
Not useful at all	Not useful	Neutral	Useful	Very useful

Half of the members rated the Charter as either ‘useful’ or ‘very useful’ for improving health and safety on their worksites. This is a relatively good result and shows that the Charter is having a positive effect for half of the member organisations.

However, a closer look at the results reveals a pocket of dissatisfaction. This is represented by the 17% of members who indicated the Charter is not useful for improving health and safety practices.

Table 3.3: Perceptions of Usefulness for Improving Health and Safety

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More than useful (MTU)	75	53%
Very useful	23	16%
Useful	52	37%
Neutral	42	30%
Not useful	15	11%
Not useful at all	9	6%
Total Respondents	141	100%

Members were asked to rate how much they agreed or disagreed that Charter membership is good value for money. This was asked on a five point Likert scale with the following options:

1	2	3	4	5
Not useful at all	Not useful	Neutral	Useful	Very useful

The results show that 56% of the respondents agreed that Charter membership is good value for money. This echoes the finding (above) that half of the members think the Charter helps to improve health and safety on their worksites.

However, these results reiterate the earlier less positive finding indicating a pocket of dissatisfaction with the Charter. Here, 14% of members did not think the Charter is good value for money.

Table 3.4: Perceptions of Value for Money

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More than agree (MTA)	79	56%
Strongly agree	32	23%
Agree	47	33%
Neutral	43	30%
Disagree	15	11%
Strongly disagree	4	3%
Total Respondents	141	100%

3.3 Supporters, Passives and the Less Satisfied

Using the results concerning perceptions of the Charter, the members are able to be clustered into three groups:

Supporters	Passives	Less Satisfied
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Thought the Charter was useful and good value for money•Charter advocates•36% of total sample	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Tend to be either neutral or somewhat positive in regard to Charter usefulness and value for money•Passive in terms of likelihood to recommend the Charter•58% of total sample	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Perceptions of Charter as not useful and poor value for money•Small group of less satisfied members: 6% of total sample

These results show that:

- One third (36%) of the members surveyed are enthusiastic '**Supporters**' of the Charter. These members consider the Charter to be useful and good value for money, and, as such, are likely to promote the Charter to their friends and colleagues.
- The bulk of the surveyed members (58%) fit into the '**Passives**' group. These respondents are neutral or somewhat positive about the usefulness and value for money of the Charter. The Passives are less likely than the Supporters to promote the Charter.
- A small group of respondents exhibited signs of being less engaged with and less satisfied with the Charter. This group of the '**Less Satisfied**' members included those 6% who indicated the Charter was not useful or value for money.

The results presented throughout the rest of the document have been analysed by these clusters and any notable differences in the results have been outlined.

4 Engagement with the Charter

Charter members were asked a range of questions about their engagement with the Charter resources. Most respondents had heard of the resources.

Table 4.1: Awareness of Charter Resources

	Heard of this resource
Events	99%
Website	99%
Newsletter	99%
Posters	96%
Charter assessment tool	95%
Toolbox talks about critical risks	94%
Toolbox talks about fatigue	94%

Respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of those resources they had heard about. Responses were recorded on a five point scale with the following options:

1	2	3	4	5
Not useful at all	Not useful	Neutral	Useful	Very useful

To make the results easier to understand, a 'more than useful' (MTU) score was calculated. This simply combines the percentage of respondents who rated the resource as 'useful' or 'very useful'.

Charter members attributed varying levels of usefulness to the resources the Charter provides. Charter events were seen as the most useful of the resources, with three-quarters rating events as 'more than useful'. Most resources (except posters) were seen as being useful to at least half of the members. Large companies were the most likely to see posters as being useful (48%).

Supporters were more likely to rate the various resources provided by the Charter as useful. While those members in the Less Satisfied cluster were the least likely to rate the resources as useful.

Table 4.2: Usefulness of the Charter Resources

	More than Useful	Very useful	Useful	Neutral	Not useful	Not useful at all	Total respondents
Events	74%	30%	44%	13%	9%	5%	140
Newsletter	62%	16%	46%	26%	7%	5%	139
Toolbox talks about critical risks	62%	21%	41%	24%	9%	5%	133
Website	61%	16%	45%	27%	6%	6%	139
Charter assessment tool	51%	17%	34%	33%	7%	9%	134
Toolbox talks about fatigue	50%	20%	30%	24%	19%	7%	133
Posters	36%	15%	21%	30%	18%	16%	136

4.1 The Charter Update

Of those who were aware of the Charter Update newsletter (139 members), most receive the newsletter and read it (in varying degrees of depth).

Smaller organisations were less likely to read it in detail and (possibly consequently) less likely to rate the Charter newsletter as useful (47%).

Table 4.3: Receipt of Charter Update

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Receive Charter Update newsletter	133	96%
Don't receive Charter Update newsletter	4	3%
Don't know	2	1%
Total Respondents	139	100%

Table 4.4: Engagement with Charter Update

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Read it in detail	34	26%
Scan the newsletter	58	44%
Read some issues but not all	35	26%
Don't read it	6	5%
Total (those who receive the newsletter)	133	100%

4.2 The Charter Website

Of the members who were aware of the Charter website (139), almost all had visited the website. Most members visit the website relatively infrequently (i.e. once per month or less often).

Table 4.5: Engagement with the Charter Website

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Have visited the website	130	94%
Have not visited the website	9	6%
Total	139	100%

Table 4.6: Frequency of Visiting the Charter Website

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
I visit the website more often than once a week	1	1%
I visit the website once a week	5	4%
I visit the website two to three times a month	23	18%
I visit the website once a month	48	37%
I visit the website less often than once per month	46	35%
I visited the website when we first signed up but have not visited since then	7	5%
Total	130	100%

4.3 Charter Events

Of those members who were aware that the Charter runs events (140), 85% had been to at least one event. Representatives of large organisations were more likely (than those from medium or small organisations) to have attended all events run since they joined the Charter.

Those who had not attended an event themselves noted a range of reasons for this (including that someone else from their organisation attended instead).

Table 4.7: Attendance of Charter Events

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
I have been to all of the Charter events (since signing the Charter)	35	25%
I have been to one or some events (since signing the Charter)	84	60%
I have not been to any events	21	15%
Total	140	100%

Table 4.8: Reasons for Not Attending a Charter Event

	Number of Respondents
Designated staff member attends ⁴	10
The event was at a bad time for me	6
The location of the event/s was inconvenient	5
I didn't think the event/s would be useful	1
Other (please specify):	3
There has not been an event since we signed the Charter	1
Total	21

⁴ The designated staff members included managers, owners and health and safety representatives. Six respondents did not specify the job title of the designated staff member.

5 The Charter Project Officer

Interestingly, just 16% (N=23) of the members surveyed indicated that the Charter Project Officer had visited their worksite. Of these 23 respondents, 16 found the Charter Project Officer's visit to be 'useful' or 'very useful'.

Table 5.1: Has the Charter Project Officer Been to the Worksite?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Charter Project Officer has been to worksite	23	16%
Charter Project Officer has not been to worksite	107	76%
Don't know	11	8%
Total	141	100%

Table 5.2: Usefulness of the Charter Project Officer's Visit

	Number of Respondents
Very useful	8
Useful	8
Neutral	5
Not useful	2
Not useful at all	0
Total	23

Charter members were asked to rate the usefulness of two possible functions of a Charter representative:

1. Meeting workers on site to talk about health and safety; and
2. Supporting member organisations with their Charter performance.

There is some indication that these functions would be useful to Charter members with half of the respondents indicating this. Large organisations were the most likely to rate 'meeting workers on site' as useful, while small organisations were less likely to rate this as being useful. Medium sized organisations were the most likely to think support with Charter performance would be a useful function of a Charter representative.

Those members in the Supporters cluster were more likely to want (and see the value in) both of these suggested functions of a Charter representative than the Passives and Less Satisfied members.

Table 5.3: Perceptions of Usefulness of a Charter Representative

	More than Useful	Very useful	Useful	Neutral	Not useful	Not useful at all	Total respondents
A Charter representative meeting with workers on site to talk about health and safety	50%	21%	29%	23%	16%	11%	141
A Charter representative supporting your organisation (and other Charter signatories) with its Charter performance	51%	21%	30%	21%	19%	9%	141

6 About the Sample

Table 6.1: Number of FTEs in Organisation

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
0	2	1%
1-5	20	14%
6-9	11	8%
10-19	17	12%
20-49	31	22%
50-99	20	14%
100+	40	28%
Total	141	100%

Table 6.2: Use of the Charter

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
My organisation only	95	67%
My contractors and/ or subcontractors	1	1%
Both	45	32%
Total	141	100%

Table 6.3: Encouraging Use of the Charter

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Encourage contractors/ subcontractors to become Charter members	33	72%
Don't encourage contractors/ subcontractors to become Charter members	13	28%
Total	46	100%