



Agricultural Injuries among Farmers and Ranchers in the Central United States during 2011-2015

Anthony Johnson, Lorena Baccaglini, Gleb R Haynatzki, Chandran Achutan, Dana Loomis & Risto H Rautiainen

To cite this article: Anthony Johnson, Lorena Baccaglini, Gleb R Haynatzki, Chandran Achutan, Dana Loomis & Risto H Rautiainen (2021) Agricultural Injuries among Farmers and Ranchers in the Central United States during 2011-2015, Journal of Agromedicine, 26:1, 62-72, DOI: [10.1080/1059924X.2020.1845268](https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2020.1845268)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2020.1845268>



Published online: 18 Jan 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 101



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)



Agricultural Injuries among Farmers and Ranchers in the Central United States during 2011-2015

Anthony Johnson^a, Lorena Baccaglini^b, Gleb R Haynatzki^c, Chandran Achutan^a, Dana Loomis^d, and Risto H Rautiainen^a

^aDepartment of Environmental, Agricultural and Occupational Health, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, USA; ^bDepartment of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, USA; ^cDepartment of Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, USA; ^dSchool of Community Health Sciences, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA

ABSTRACT

The high risk of occupational fatalities in agriculture is well documented, but information on non-fatal injuries is lacking due to challenges in injury surveillance. This surveillance study explored the frequency, characteristics, and risk factors for non-fatal injuries among farmers and ranchers in the central United States. The Central States Center for Agricultural Safety and Health (CS-CASH), in collaboration with the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), conducted annual surveys ($n = 34,777$ sent) during 2011–2015 covering a seven-state region (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, and South Dakota). The average response rate was 32% in the five consecutive annual surveys. The average injury incidence rate was 7.0 injuries/100 operators per year. Most injuries (89%) occurred during agricultural work. The most frequent sources of injury were livestock (22%), machinery (13%), and hand tools (12%). Risk factors for injury included: male gender, younger age (vs. 65+ years), farming as the primary occupation, greater work time, greater land area, ranch (vs. farm), organic farming, internet access, and production of several types of crops and animals. Most injuries (56%) required a doctor visit, and 12% required hospitalization. The average medical costs were \$1,936 out of pocket and \$8,043 paid by insurance. The combined average costs for most serious injuries were \$7,858. Most injuries (66%) resulted in some lost time from agricultural work, and 13% were serious, resulting in more than 30 days of lost work time. The non-fatal injury rate for self-employed farmers and ranchers was higher than that of hired agricultural workers reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This result reaffirms farming/ranching as a dangerous occupation and emphasizes the need for efforts to prevent agricultural injuries, especially those associated with identified injury sources and risk factors.

KEYWORDS

Agriculture; injury; accident; risk factor; disability; cost

Introduction

Agriculture ranks among the most hazardous industries worldwide, and high rates of occupational fatalities, injuries, and illnesses have been observed in many studies.^{1–4} The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) has reported the highest rates of both fatal and non-fatal injuries for agriculture in recent years. The incidence of fatal agricultural injuries was 23.4 injuries/100,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) workers vs. 4.7 for all industries combined in 2018.⁵ National BLS surveillance data show that agricultural fatality numbers have declined over time. Still, the rate of fatalities has remained persistently high during

the past two decades. The non-fatal injury rate was 5.3 injuries/100 FTE for hired farmworkers vs. 2.8 injuries/100 FTE for all industries combined in 2018.⁶ BLS surveillance of non-fatal injuries excludes self-employed farmers and ranchers, and there are currently no other national surveillance systems that cover this primary agricultural workforce in the United States. Under-reporting of agricultural injuries is also a challenge.⁷

Previous studies have identified numerous risk factors for agricultural injuries.^{8,9} Some are personal characteristics, such as age, gender, existing health conditions, medication use, and history of prior injury. Injuries are also related to specific work tasks such as operating machinery, handling

animals, and transporting goods.¹⁰ Social-cultural factors also contribute to the risk of injury, including economic pressures and the division of labor on farms.¹¹ Studies indicate that risk factors for serious injuries and all injuries are similar, but the severity of injuries varies by source: livestock incidents are most frequent, but machinery incidents are most often fatal.¹² Injuries suffered by farmers tend to be severe, but farmers often continue working even after injured or not fully healed from injury events.¹⁰ Similarly, hired agricultural workers often continue working after injury due to fear of lost wages or losing the job. Injuries affect the farmer's ability to manage the operation, having to absorb costs resulting from the injury, and also having to work with limited ability while recovering from the injury. Injury costs per person are roughly 30% higher for agricultural workers compared to the national average.¹³ However, there are no recent estimates of agricultural injury costs in the United States.

There is great variation in agricultural injury characteristics and risk factors by region, type of production, and over time. Therefore, further research on the injury frequency, sources, risk factors, and preventive strategies is needed to reduce the burden of injury in agriculture.¹⁴ This surveillance study aimed to describe the incidence, characteristics, costs, and risk factors of injuries among self-employed farm and ranch operators, using a 5-year injury surveillance dataset (2011–2015) from the CS-CASH surveillance system.

Methods

Study population and design

This study was conducted as part of the Central States Center for Agricultural Safety and Health (CS-CASH) surveillance program in the Center's geographic region that consists of seven states: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Annual mail surveys were administered on contract by the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS). The annual samples, stratified by state, were drawn randomly by NASS from their database of agricultural operations that responded to the most recent Census of Agriculture (2007 or

2012).⁴ USDA defines agricultural operations (farms and ranches) as "any place from which 1,000 USD or more of agricultural products were produced or sold, or normally would have been sold, during the year".¹⁵ There is no official USDA definition for a ranch, but ranches are commonly known as operations that raise grazing livestock on large areas of land. Ranching is prevalent in the western part of the study region, and we asked respondents to self-identify their operation as a farm or a ranch.

In 2007, the Census of Agriculture reported 437,042 agricultural operations and 658,412 operators in the central states region, which represented (20%) of the total US agricultural operations ($n = 2,204,792$), and (20%) of operators ($n = 3,281,534$). Samples for the 2011 and 2012 surveys were drawn from the 2007 Ag Census population, and 2012 Census data were used in the 2013, 2014, and 2015 surveys. NASS administered the stratified random sampling; 1000 operations per state were selected randomly for each annual survey.

The surveillance research plan was reviewed by the University of Nebraska Medical Center's (UNMC) biomedical institutional review board (IRB), which determined this surveillance research to be Exempt (not human subjects research) (#452-11-EX).

Data collection

The Central States Center for Agriculture Safety and Health (CS-CASH) research team designed a four-page survey form, which included questions about demographics and injuries for up to three operators on the farm or ranch. The annual surveys were administered by NASS, including first mailing of the survey forms, second mailing to non-respondents, and data entry of the returned responses. The mailings occurred in the spring, requesting information on injuries during the previous calendar year (2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015). After removal of duplicates, the final number of farms included in the annual mailings in the seven-state region were: $n = 6953$, 6912, 6912, 7000, and 7000 in the five consecutive years, 2011–2015; a total of 34,777 operations. The sample size was estimated based on expected injury

incidence and exposed population proportions. The projected sample was expected to provide adequate power to detect meaningful differences (odds ratios 1.3 or higher) in injury incidence between major population segments at risk.

NASS entered the data from returned surveys ($n = 11,226$ responses in five years) and merged selected farm production variables for each operation from the most recent Census of Agriculture data. NASS created a de-identified dataset and made it available for analyses by CS-CASH investigators authorized by UNMC IRB and USDA/NASS. Statistical analyses were conducted at the NASS office in Lincoln, Nebraska, using NASS computers and software. The investigators were required to comply with both UNMC IRB and NASS confidentiality procedures.

The primary outcome in this study was non-fatal injury, self-reported by the question: “How many farm-related injuries occurred to each operator during [calendar year]?” Response options were 0 (none), 1 (one), 2 (two), and 3 (three or more). “Injury” was defined as follows: “Injury” is the result of a sudden, unexpected, forceful event, which has an external cause, and which results in bodily damage or loss of consciousness. “Farm-related” was defined as: work and leisure activities on an operation, plus commuting, transport, and business trips for an operation. Similar definitions have been used in Iowa’s Certified Safe Farm study¹⁶ and worker’s compensation systems.^{14,17} The survey form also included several questions on injury characteristics for the most serious injury.

Independent variables in this study included demographic variables from the injury survey and farm production variables from existing Ag Census data. Individual-level factors included: operator age (age groups 18–44, 45–64, 65+), sex (male, female), operator status (principal, 2nd, 3rd), primary occupation (farm/ranch, other), and percent of total work time spent on the farm/ranch work (0–24%, 25–49%, 50–74%, 75–99%, and 100%). Farm-level independent variables included operation type (farm, ranch), total acres, field crops, hay/forage, woodland crops, cattle, hogs, poultry, sheep/lambs, horses/ponies, other animals, number of tractors by horsepower, internet access, principal operator’s

total household income, percent of the total household income that came from the agricultural operation, off-farm workdays, retirement status, and number of households sharing income from the operation.

Data analysis

Descriptive analyses included calculating injury rates for all operators during the 5-year study period and specific rates for sub-groups and years. Each operator could report 0, 1, 2, or 3 or more injuries. All reported injuries for an individual were included in the injury rate calculations (vs. counting only injured people). Three or more injuries were counted as three. Person-years were used as the denominator of injury rates. Each person was considered as a full-time worker. The injury rate was calculated by dividing the total number of injuries by the total number of person-years multiplied by 100. Injury rates at the sub-population level were calculated similarly; that is, the incidence rate for each level of all categorical variables was calculated by dividing the number of injuries within the variable level by the total number of person-years reported for that level.

Analytical statistics included testing correlations of continuous variables and associations of class variables, followed by regression analyses of potential risk factors for injury. Unadjusted (crude) and adjusted models were tested to identify risk factors for injury. Regression analyses utilized Poisson regression, using the count of injuries as the dependent variable. Models were fitted using the Generalized Estimation Equations (GEE) procedure with exchangeable working correlations, accounting for the clustering of operators on the same operation. We converted all continuous variables into categorical variables as seen in tables and conducted separate unadjusted analyses of all potential risk factors. Predictor variables that were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) were entered in multivariable models. Multivariable analyses were conducted adjusting for operator status, gender, and age group. The GEE results are expressed by using odds ratios (OR) and their respective 95% confidence intervals (CI). All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS software (version 9.4; SAS Institute, Cary, NC).¹⁸

Results

Annual farm and ranch health and safety surveys were mailed to 34,777 operations during 2011–2015. A total of 11,226 responses were received containing information for up to three individual operators per operation. The average response rate (for all years and states combined) was 32.2%. The response rate was highest in 2013 (36.5%) and lowest in 2015 (29.5%). Among the seven states, Minnesota had the highest response rate (37.2%), and North Dakota had the lowest response rate (24.2%). The respondents reported 15,173 individual operators; 72.0% of them were principal operators, 23.3% second operators, and 4.7% third operators. Among the 11,226 responding farms and ranches, most were identified as farms (83%), and the remainder (17%) were ranches.

A total of 874 operators (5.8%) were injured, reporting one or more non-fatal injuries. Most injured operators were male ($n = 751$, proportion = 6.2%) while 118 (proportion = 4.2%) were female (Table 1).

Out of 875 injured operators, 731 had one injury, 95 had two injuries, and 49 had three or more injuries. The number of injuries during 2011–2015 was 1,068 in total when three or more injuries were counted as three injuries. Most injuries (89%) occurred during agricultural work, while (11%) occurred during leisure time. The most frequent sources of injury were livestock (22%), machinery (13%), and hand tools (12%). More than half of the injuries (56%) required a doctor visit and 12% required hospitalization. The average medical costs were 1,937 USD out of pocket and 8,035 USD paid by insurance; 9,972 USD in total. Two-thirds of the injuries (66%) resulted in some lost time from agricultural work, and 13% were serious, resulting in more than 30 days of lost work time. The overall injury rate (number of injuries/number of person-years * 100) for all 5 years combined was 7.04 injuries/100 person-years. The highest injury rate was observed in 2014 (8.3), followed by 2012 (7.5), 2011 (7.4), 2015 (6.3), and 2013 (6.1). Injury rates reported by state from highest to lowest were North Dakota (8.4), South Dakota (7.9), Iowa (7.5), Nebraska (7.3), Kansas (6.7),

Table 1. Injury proportions by demographic characteristics ($n=15,173$)

Characteristics	Farm-related injuries ^a	
	One or more ^b n (%)	None n (%)
Total	875 (5.8)	14,298 (94.2)
Sex		
Male	751 (6.2)	11,453 (93.8)
Female	118 (4.2)	2,694 (95.8)
Missing	6 (3.8)	151 (96.2)
Age group		
18-44	176 (6.7)	2,441 (93.3)
45-64	486 (6.4)	7,097 (93.6)
65+	209 (4.4)	4,551 (95.6)
Missing	4 (1.9)	209 (98.1)
Main occupation		
Farm/ranch work	603 (7.2)	7,833 (92.8)
Other	264 (4.0)	6,293 (96.0)
Missing	8 (4.4)	172 (95.6)
Operation		
Ranch	216 (7.7)	2,580 (92.3)
Farm	659 (5.3)	11,718 (94.7)
Percent work time on farm/ranch		
0-24%	126 (3.1)	3,904 (96.9)
25-49%	153 (5.4)	2,703 (94.6)
50-74%	123 (6.5)	1,769 (93.5)
75-99%	179 (8.1)	2,023 (91.9)
100%	285 (7.3)	3,647 (92.7)
Missing	9 (3.5)	252 (96.5)
State^c		
IA	150 (6.2)	2,278 (93.8)
KS	129 (5.9)	2,077 (94.1)
MN	126 (5.1)	2,349 (94.9)
MO	110 (4.9)	2,151 (95.1)
NE	124 (6.0)	1,955 (94.0)
SD	105 (6.4)	1,524 (93.6)
ND	130 (6.2)	1,962 (93.8)
Missing	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)
Year		
2011	168 (6.2)	2,551 (93.8)
2012	195 (5.9)	3,086 (94.1)
2013	185 (5.3)	3,313 (94.7)
2014	187 (6.6)	2,661 (93.4)
2015	140 (5.0)	2,687 (95.0)

a. Farm-related injury: Sudden, unexpected, forceful event, that happens during work and leisure activities on this operation, plus commuting, transport, and business trips for this operation.

b. Each operator could report: None, One, Two, or Three or more injuries.

c. IA: Iowa, KS: Kansas, MN: Minnesota, MO: Missouri, NE: Nebraska, ND: North Dakota, SD: South Dakota.

Minnesota (6.2), and Missouri (5.7). The frequencies are presented in more detail in Table 2.

Several significant individual and farm-level risk factors were identified through univariable (crude) regression analyses (Table 3). All predictors that were significant in univariable models were assessed in multivariable (adjusted) models and the following were identified as significant risk factors: operator's primary occupation, worktime, land in use, retirement status, tractors on the

Table 2. Distribution, rates, and average cost of non-fatal injuries among respondents (n=15,173)

Number of Injuries reported by operators ^a	Injury count ^c	Injury rate ^d	Average cost of the most serious injury (USD)		Any ^b (%)	Out-of-pocket ^e	Insurance paid ^f	Combined Cost ^g			
			0	1						2	3
Total^h (n)ⁱ	Avg^j	Total^h (n)ⁱ	Avg^j								
Total	14,298	731	95	49	15,173 (100)	1,0687.0	1,338,369 (691)	1,936	3,678,330 (540)		
Operator											
Principal	10,249	561	80	39	10,929 (72.1)	838 7.7	1,102,517 (552)	1,997	3,597,294 (425)		
Operator 2	3,374	140	14	10	3,538 (23.3)	198 5.6	191,144 (118)	1,620	666,500 (99)		
Operator 3	675	30	1	0	706 (4.6)	32 4.5	44,708 (21)	2,129	79,870 (16)		
State											
IA	2,278	122	23	5	2,428 (15.9)	183 7.5	164,990 (109)	1,513	394,721 (89)		
KS	2,077	118	4	7	2,206 (14.5)	147 6.7	141,872 (103)	1,377	860,582 (80)		
MN	2,349	104	17	5	2,475 (16.2)	153 6.2	110,430 (103)	1,072	1,060,740 (77)	13,775	10,551
MO	2,151	96	10	4	2,261 (14.9)	128 5.7	199,221 (90)	2,213	344,934 (70)	4,927	5,914
NE	1,955	106	9	9	2,079 (13.7)	151 7.3	471,910 (92)	5,129	531,765 (76)	6,996	10,347
ND	1,524	83	12	10	1,629 (10.7)	137 8.4	164,257 (85)	1,932	649,987 (67)	9,701	9,148
SD	1,962	102	20	8	2,092 (13.8)	166 7.9	85,679 (108)	793	500,935 (80)	6,261	5,237
Year											
2011	2,551	139	20	9	2,773 (18.4)	206 7.4	231,080 (136)	1,699	788,045 (103)	7,650	7,279
2012	3,086	160	24	11	3,233 (21.5)	241 7.5	521,627 (157)	3,322	770,069 (111)	6,937	7,924
2013	3,313	163	18	4	3,446 (22.8)	211 6.1	214,072 (140)	1,529	1,191,587 (115)	10,361	9,371
2014 ^k	2,661	152	24	11	2,801 (18.6)	233 8.3	225,250 (136)	1,656	1,014,901 (98)	10,356	8,612
2015	2,687	117	9	14	2,827 (18.7)	177 6.3	146,350 (122)	1,199	579,062 (113)	5,124	5,757

a. Count of operators by the number of injuries they reported. Options: 0, 1, 2, and 3 or more (counted as 3)

b. Any; Count and percentage of operators: total of columns 0, 1, 2, and 3

c. Count of injury cases: F053(1) +((2) *2) +((3) 3); = sum; 1,2,3= number of injuries in corresponding column

d. Rate: count of injuries / count of person-years * 100

e. Out of pocket: Total out of pocket medical costs (USD)

f. Insurance paid: Total medical costs paid by insurance (USD)

g. Combined cost: calculated as the sum of out of pocket and insurance costs / respondents reporting any (either or both) injury-associated medical costs

h. Total: Total cost reported

i. N: Number of people reporting any costs

j. Avg: Average out of pocket costs

k. In 2014 data, state was not identified in 3 responses.

operation (40–99 horsepower and 100+ horsepower), field and hay crops, poultry on the operation, other animals, total sales for operation and internet use (Table 3).

Discussion

Reliable surveillance information is critical for prevention of occupational injuries. This is a challenge in agriculture, however, as there no

Table 3. Risk factors for farm-related injuries, 2011-2015 (n=15,173)

Risk factors	Farm-related injury ^a		Crude OR	95% CI	Adjusted OR ^d	95% CI ^d
	One or more ^b	None				
Operator status						
Principal	680	10,249	1.50	(1.07-2.10)	-	-
Operator 2	164	3,374	1.09	(0.78-1.54)	-	-
Operator 3	31	675	Ref ^c	-	-	-
Operation						
Ranch	216	2,580	1.42	(1.21-1.68)	-	-
Farm	659	11,718	Ref ^c	-	-	-
Operator age (years)						
18-44	176	2,441	1.53	(1.26-1.86)	-	-
45-64	486	7,097	1.42	(1.21-1.66)	-	-
65+	209	4,551	Ref ^c	-	-	-
Missing	4	209	-	-	-	-
Gender						
Male	751	11,453	1.53	(1.28-1.82)	-	-
Female	118	2,694	Ref ^c	-	-	-
Missing	6	151	-	-	-	-
Primary occupation						
Farming/ranching	603	7,833	1.76	(1.53-2.04)	1.74	1.74
Other	264	6,293	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	8	172	-	-	-	-
Worktime on operation (%)						
0-24%	126	3,904	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
25-49%	153	2,703	1.80	(1.41-2.27)	1.63	1.63
50-74%	123	1,769	2.15	(1.68-2.76)	2.03	2.03
75-99%	179	2,023	2.63	(2.08-3.30)	2.42	2.42
100%	285	3,647	2.42	(1.96-3.00)	2.22	2.22
Missing	9	252	-	-	-	-
Land in use (acres)						
0 to 100	221	4,275	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
101 – 1000	427	7,220	1.15	(0.97-1.37)	1.17	1.17
1001 – 3000	172	1,935	1.67	(1.35-2.07)	1.59	1.59
3001 - 10,000	41	756	1.02	(0.72-1.46)	0.94	0.94
10,001 and up	13	110	1.91	(0.89-4.10)	1.62	1.62
Missing	1	2	-	-	-	-
Principal operator retirement status						
Active	742	11,272	1.54	(1.26-1.88)	1.33	1.33
Retired	131	2,982	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	2	41	-	-	-	-
Tractor of 40-99 hp						
Yes	372	5,982	1.24	(1.04-1.48)	1.24	1.24
No	218	4,412	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	285	3,904	-	-	-	-
Tractor of 100hp						
Yes	254	3,779	1.48	(1.23-1.78)	1.44	1.44
No	260	5,800	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	361	4,719	-	-	-	-
Field crops						
Yes	460	6,626	1.34	(1.15-1.56)	N/A	N/A
No	309	5,953	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	106	1,719	-	-	-	-
Hay crops						
Yes	471	6,309	1.41	(1.22-1.63)	1.38	1.38
No	372	7,296	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	32	693	-	-	-	-
Poultry on operation						
Yes	78	1,005	1.29	(1.01-1.65)	1.27	1.27
No	723	11,906	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	74	1,387	-	-	-	-
Other animals						
Yes	120	1,489	1.33	(1.07-1.65)	1.19	1.19
No	559	9,583	Ref ^c	-	-	Ref ^c
Missing	196	3,226	-	-	-	-

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued).

Risk factors	Farm-related injury ^a		Crude OR	95% CI	Adjusted OR ^d	95% CI ^d
	One or more ^b	None				
Organic						
Yes	14	89	2.37	(1.42-3.95)	2.53	
No	830	13,552	Ref ^c	-	Ref ^c	
Missing	31	657	-	-	-	
Total sales (USD)						
0 to 9,999	153	2,838	Ref ^c	-	Ref ^c	
10,000 - 69,999	208	3,405	1.18	(0.95-1.46)	1.16	
70,000 - 249,999	185	2,591	1.34	(1.07-1.67)	1.28	
250,000 and up	248	3,165	1.51	(1.23-1.85)	1.52	
Missing	58	1,771	-	-	-	
Internet access						
Yes	673	10,377	1.25	(1.06-1.47)	1.19	
No	201	3,919	Ref ^c	-	Ref ^c	
Missing	1	2	-	-	-	

a. Farm-related injury: Sudden, unexpected, forceful event, that happens during work and leisure activities on the operation, plus commuting, transport, and business for this operation. Totals may vary due to missing data

b. Farm-related injury: The injury variable was dichotomizing to represent respondents' odds of having experienced at least one injury vs. none

c. Ref: Reference category

d. Each variable was adjusted for operator status, age, gender, and operation using Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE).

e. N/A: The model did not converge

national surveillance systems covering the primary agricultural workforce in the United States: farmers and ranchers.¹⁹ The problem is universal; similar difficulties in agricultural injury surveillance exist in Canada²⁰ and much of Europe.²¹ The Central States Center for Agricultural Safety and Health (CS-CASH) contributes to filling this gap by conducting surveillance of occupational injuries to self-employed farmers and ranchers in a seven-state region of the US.

Our analyses of the 2011–2015 surveillance data showed that the incidence rate, 7.0 injuries/100 person-years, was higher than the rate reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for hired workers in agriculture.⁶ The NIOSH surveys of hired crop workers also found much lower injury rates, ranging from 2.9 to 4.3/100 workers in the 1999–2015 surveys.²² Other studies of agricultural injuries have reported rates ranging from 4.1–16.6 injuries/100 workers per year.^{23–27}

Several risk factors for injury were identified in this study. Being a principal operator involved 1.8 times greater odds of injury compared to being the third operator. Similarly, McCurdy and Carroll found that the risk of injury to the primary operators was higher compared to all other operators.²⁸ Operating a ranch involved 1.5 times higher odds of injury compared to operating a farm. This is a unique finding in our surveillance study; we were unable to find other studies comparing injuries on

farms vs. ranches. Earlier report⁴ from three years of our surveillance data suggested the same, and with the current larger five-year dataset, this finding was statistically significant.

Younger age groups (18–44 and 45–64 years) had a significantly higher risk of injury compared to the oldest age group (65-years or more). Interestingly, age is included in most injury risk factor studies, but a systematic review and meta-analysis of 38 studies found inconclusive evidence on age as a risk factor.⁹ However, there is a clear difference between non-fatal and fatal injuries in this regard as fatal injury counts and rates commonly increase by age, particularly in populations over 50 years of age.²⁷

The odds of injury increased gradually with work exposure time, being highest for those who spent 75–99% of their work time on the farm or ranch (vs. off-farm employment). The risk was slightly lower in the full-time (100% agricultural work) group. An increase of injury risk with work-time is expected in studies where the rates are calculated assuming that each person works full time. Other factors may also contribute. Brison et al. suggested that full-time workers have greater exposure to risky tasks such as operating machinery, handling animals, and transporting goods.¹⁰ In contrast, some studies have also reported a higher risk of injury to part-time farmers.^{25,26} Operators who reported being retired were at

a lower risk of injury. Similarly, when serious injuries were examined, retired farmers were less likely to be at risk.⁹ While many retired farmers still participate in agricultural work, their work time and exposures are likely reduced, resulting in a lower risk of injury.⁴

Operators using the internet for agricultural business were at increased risk of injury. Jadhav et al. reported similar results in a meta-analysis of two studies concerning internet use.⁹ Opposite results should be expected, as internet use in itself could hardly cause injuries. On the contrary, Aakkula hypothesized that computer use is a predictor of knowledge-intensive management, which reduces uncertainties in farming, and should be related to better management, and lessening the number of disturbances and related injuries.^{29,30} These unexpected results may be due to reporting bias or confounding factors, including longer working hours on modern farms.

The results of this study showed that having larger tractors (100+ hp) and medium-size tractors (40–99 hp) (vs. not having them) increased the risk of injuries. The majority of cultivation, planting, and other fieldwork in this region is done with large tractors, the largest ones over 600 hp (~450 kW). Operating largest tractors that are only used for pulling tillage, planting and harvesting equipment should be less risky than using mid-size tractors that are used for a variety of tasks including mowing, loading, haymaking, providing power for hydraulic and power take-off (PTO) driven implements, etc. A large number of non-fatal accidents happen in these types of tasks when connecting and disconnecting implements and stepping in and out of the operator station/cab.³¹ Tractor overturns, which are the most common sources of fatal injuries in agriculture, also tend to happen with small and mid-size tractors, particularly older ones that lack roll-over protective structures (ROPS).²⁸

Many types of crops are grown in this region including corn, soybeans, wheat, oats, sorghum, millet, and hay. Growing (any) field crops increased the risk of injury in this study, as did growing (any) hay crops. Among specific crops that increased the risk of injury were soybeans, wheat, and corn. Others have reported that crop-growing farmers are at an increased risk for injury

when operating larger machinery, particularly when using combines for harvesting crops.³²

Many types of livestock are raised in this region ranging from small-scale family farms and ranches to large scale confined animal feeding operations. Raising livestock in general increased the risk of injuries in the current study. Specific production of poultry and “other animals” also increased the risk while raising hogs or dairy cattle had no association with injuries. Other studies have found similar results about increased injury risk in livestock production in general, as well raising specific livestock species.^{33–35}

Organic farming increased the risk of injury. Organic farming is often done on a smaller scale, with smaller and older equipment, and it may require more manual labor per unit produced. Performing a multitude of tasks contributes to physical stress among organic farmers.³⁶ Other studies have found a significant decline in work ability among organic farmers.³⁷ Sources of injuries in organic farming may be similar to traditional farming practices, except for chemical exposures. Previous studies have shown that organic farming involves psychosocial, interpersonal, social, and contextual factors, with both adverse and protective effects.^{36,38}

Our analyses showed that operating larger areas of land was associated with a higher risk of farm-related injury. Previous studies have shown similar results.^{39–43} This may be partially due to the increase in exposure time on larger farms, however, larger operations typically also hire greater numbers of employees to complete the physical work.⁴⁴ Also, low-intensity agriculture is more risk-averse, which minimizes hazards from environmental factors such as terrain, livestock, and landscape modification.³⁴ Greater sales from the operation was a significant risk factor for farm-related injury in both univariable (crude) and multivariable (adjusted) analyses. These findings are similar to the results in the meta-analysis conducted by Jadhav et al.⁹

Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this surveillance include providing systematic population-based information on injury counts, rates, characteristics, medical costs,

and lost time for farmers and ranchers, who are currently excluded from national surveillance efforts. The strengths also include covering a large, well-defined geographic area that contains about one-fifth of all US farms, ranches, and operators with diverse production of crops and animals. The ability to use existing Ag Census data rather than adding farm operation and production questions into the survey enabled condensing the surveys, and focusing just on injury outcomes. Keeping the surveys short is important as the survey length is linked to response rates.⁴⁵ With the short 4-page survey, we were able to achieve a 32% average response rate, which can be considered typical. USDA NASS has extensive experience in surveys of farms and ranches, and having NASS administer the surveys ensured high data security, quality, and reliability in data management. Data analyses were conducted at NASS premises under their data security procedures, following the research plan approved by UNMC IRB. The injury surveys included questions on medical expenses and lost work time; both are essential aspects describing the burden of injury but are rarely included in surveillance efforts.

The response rate (32% on average) may limit the generalizability of the results. Due to the data sharing agreement with USDA NASS, we had no access to non-respondents' data. Other limitations of this study include the potential for errors in recall, as the survey (and Ag Census data) relies on self-reporting. The recall time, previous calendar year, is relatively long although commonly used in injury surveys. The accuracy of some answers may also depend on who on the operation responded. People may remember their own injuries better than injuries to their family members. These errors in recalling injury incidents would bias the injury counts and rates downward. We did not attempt to estimate the working hours for each operator in rate calculations, but considered all operators as full-time workers. This also contributes to underestimating the injury rates as the denominator is larger than it would be if the actual working hour-based FTE person-year data were available and used as denominator. Missing data reduced the power of some analyses, and unclassified "other" categories left some of the detailed information on

injury sources and risk factors unknown. In several cases, the "other" category was identified as a risk factor, which is not useful for understanding what preventive action and targeting might be needed.

Conclusions

This study indicates that the non-fatal injury rate for self-employed farmers and ranchers is higher than rates reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for any industry; also hired agricultural workers. Male gender, younger age, farming/ranching as primary occupation, being principal operator, operating a ranch (vs. farm), organic production, as well as several specific crops and animals raised on the operation were identified as risk factors for injury. These results reaffirm farming/ranching as a dangerous occupation and emphasize the need for prevention of injuries, especially those associated with identified injury sources and risk factors. The results could be used for evaluating injury trends and characteristics, to target analytical studies, and for designing interventions and targeting them to specific populations at risk.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [U54 OH 010162].

References

1. World Health Organization, Regional Office for the eastern Mediterranean. Health of workers in agriculture. 2004. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/119693>. Accessed February 22, 2020.
2. Vyas R. Mitigation of musculoskeletal problems and body discomfort of agricultural workers through educational intervention. *Work*. 2012;41(Suppl 1):2398–2404. doi:10.3233/WOR-2012-0473-2398.
3. Missikpode C, Peek-Asa C, Young T, Swanton A, Leinenkugel K, Torner J. Trends in non-fatal agricultural injuries requiring trauma care. *Inj Epidemiol*. 2015;2(1):30. doi:10.1186/s40621-015-0062-3.
4. Jadhav R, Achutan C, Haynatzki G, Rajaram S, Rautiainen R. Injury risk factors to farm and ranch

- operators in the Central United States. *Am J Ind Med.* 2017;60(10):889–899. doi:10.1002/ajim.22757.
5. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Number and Rate of fatal work injuries by industry sector. 2018. <https://www.bls.gov/iif/oshcfoi1.htm>. Accessed February 23, 2020.
 6. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Survey of occupational injuries and illnesses (SOII), summary estimates charts package. <https://www.bls.gov/iif/soii-chart-data-2018.htm>. Accessed February 23, 2020.
 7. Leigh JP, Marcin JP, Miller TR. An estimate of the U.S. Government's undercount of nonfatal occupational injuries. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2004;46(1):10–18. doi:10.1097/01.jom.0000105909.66435.53.
 8. Jadhav R, Achutan C, Haynatzki G, Rajaram S, Rautiainen R. Risk factors for agricultural injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Agromedicine.* 2015;20(4):434–449. doi:10.1002/ajpa.23103.
 9. Jadhav R, Achutan C, Haynatzki G, Rajaram S, Rautiainen R. Review and meta-analysis of emerging risk factors for agricultural injury. *J Agromedicine.* 2016;21(3):284–297. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2016.1179611.
 10. Brison RJ, Pickett CW. Non-fatal farm injuries on 117 eastern Ontario beef and dairy farms: a one-year study. *Am J Ind Med.* 1992;21(5):623–636. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700210503.
 11. McCoy CA, Carruth AK, Reed DB. Women in agriculture: risks for occupational injury within the context of gendered role. *J Agric Saf Health.* 2002;8(1):37–50. doi:10.13031/2013.7224.
 12. Rautiainen RH, Ledolter J, Donham KJ, Ohsfeldt RL, Zwerling C. Risk factors for serious injury in Finnish agriculture. *Am J Ind Med.* 2009;52(5):419–428. doi:10.1002/ajim.20688.
 13. Leigh JP, McCurdy SA, Schenker MB. Costs of occupational injuries in agriculture. 433021. 2001;116(3):235–248. doi:10.1016/S0033-3549(04)50039-0.
 14. Lehtola MM, Rautiainen RH, Day LM, et al. Effectiveness of interventions in preventing injuries in agriculture—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 2008;34(5):327–336. doi:10.5271/sjweh.1279.
 15. United States Department of Agriculture. 2007 Census of agriculture United States summary and state data. https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Full_Report/Volume_1,Chapter_1_Summary_State_level/. Accessed February 23, 2020.
 16. Rautiainen RH, Lange JL, Hodne CJ, Schneiders S, Donham KJ. Injuries in the Iowa certified safe farm study. *J Agric Saf Health.* 2004;10(1):51–63. doi:10.13031/2013.15674.
 17. Rautiainen RH, Ohsfeldt R, Sprince NL, et al. Cost of compensated injuries and occupational diseases in agriculture in Finland. *J Agromedicine.* 2005;10(3):21–29. doi:10.1300/J096v10n03_03.
 18. Statistical Institute Inc. Statistical analysis system. http://www.sas.com/en_us/home.html. Published 2019. Accessed August 28, 2019.
 19. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). CDC - Looking to the future for agriculture injury surveillance at NIOSH - Agriculture, forestry and fishing resources. Status of National Agriculture Injury Surveys at NIOSH. <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/agforfish/aginjurysurv.html>. Accessed February 23, 2020.
 20. Canadian Agricultural Injury Reporting, Surveillance des blessures dans le secteur agricole au Canada. Canadian Agricultural Injury Reporting. 2019. <https://www.cair-sbac.ca/>. Accessed February 23, 2020.
 21. Merisalu E, Leppälä J, Jakob M, Rautiainen RH. Variation in Eurostat and national statistics of accidents in agriculture. *Agron Res.* 2019. doi:10.15159/ar.19.190.
 22. National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health. CDC - agricultural safety: national agricultural workers survey (NAWS): hired crop worker injury rate tables - NIOSH workplace safety and health topic. <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/aginjury/naws/injratetables.html>. Accessed January 5, 2020.
 23. Rautiainen RH, Reynolds SJ. Mortality and morbidity in agriculture in the United States. *J Agric Saf Health.* 2002;8(3):259–276. doi:10.13031/2013.9054.
 24. Pratt DS, Marvel LH, Darrow D, Stallones L, May JJ, Jenkins P. The dangers of dairy farming: the injury experience of 600 workers followed for two years. *Am J Ind Med.* 1992;21(5):637–650. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700210504.
 25. Zhou C, Roseman JM. Agricultural injuries among a population-based sample of farm operators in Alabama. *Am J Ind Med.* 1994;25(3):385–402. doi:10.1002/ajim.4700250307.
 26. McGwin G, Enochs R, Roseman JM. Increased risk of agricultural injury among African-American farm workers from Alabama and Mississippi. *Am J Epidemiol.* 2000;152(7):640–650. doi:10.1093/aje/152.7.640.
 27. Crawford JM, Wilkins JR, Mitchell GL, Moeschberger ML, Bean TL, Jones LA. A cross-sectional case control study of work-related injuries among Ohio farmers. *Am J Ind Med.* 1998;34(6):588–599. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0274(199812)34:6<588::aid-ajim7>3.0.co;2-k.
 28. McCurdy SA, Carroll DJ. Agricultural injury. *Am J Ind Med.* 2000;38(4):463–480. doi:10.1002/1097-0274(200010)38:4<463::AID-AJIM13>3.0.CO;2-N.
 29. Aakkula J, Jokinen P, Lankoski L, Nokkala M. Abstract: agriculture, the information society and sustainable development: A pilot study on the effects of information and telecommunication technology changes on agricultural sustainability. *MTT Agrifood Res Finland.* 2002;19:5. <http://www.mtt.fi/mtts/pdf/mtts19.pdf>. Accessed December 4, 2020.
 30. Taattola K, Rautiainen RH, Karttunen JP, et al. Risk factors for occupational injuries among full-time

- farmers in Finland. *J Agric Saf Health*. 2012;18(2):83–93. doi:10.13031/2013.41348.
31. Suutarinen J. Tractor accidents and their prevention. *Int J Ind Ergon*. 1992;10(4):321–329. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-8141\(92\)90099-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-8141(92)90099-L).
 32. Keskin M, Yunus E. An evaluation of combine harvester accidents in Turkey. *Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2018;23:137–147.
 33. Layde PM, Nordstrom DL, Stueland D, Brand L, Olson KA. Machine-related occupational injuries in farm residents. *Ann Epidemiol*. 1995;5(6):419–426. doi:10.1016/1047-2797(95)00056-9.
 34. Erkal S, Gerberich SG, Ryan AD, Renier CM, Alexander BH. Animal-related injuries: a population-based study of a five-state region in the upper Midwest: regional rural injury study II. *J Safety Res*. 2008;39(4):351–363. doi:10.1016/j.jsr.2008.03.002.
 35. Park H, Sprince NL, Lewis MQ, Burmeister LF, Whitten PS, Zwerling C. Risk factors for work-related injury among male farmers in Iowa: a prospective cohort study. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2001;43(6):542–547. doi:10.1097/00043764-200106000-00007.
 36. Soto Mas F, Handal AJ, Rohrer RE, Tomalá Viteri E. Health and safety in organic farming: a qualitative study. *J Agromedicine*. 2018;23(1):92–104. doi:10.1080/1059924X.2017.1382409.
 37. Mattila TEA, Heikkinen JM, Koivisto AM, Rautiainen RH. Predictors for interest to change from conventional to organic horticultural production. *Agri Food Sci*. 2018;27(3). doi:10.23986/afsci.65392.
 38. Brigance C, Soto Mas F, Sanchez V, Handal AJ. The mental health of the organic farmer: psychosocial and contextual actors. *Workplace Health Saf*. June 2018;2165079918783211. doi:10.1177/2165079918783211.
 39. Schwab CV, Mosher GA, Ryan SJ. Agricultural worker injury comparative risk assessment methodology: assessing corn and biofuel switchgrass production systems. *J Agric Saf Health*. 2017;23(3):219–235. doi:10.13031/jash.12245.
 40. Lambert PM, Welker MH. Traumatic injury risk and agricultural transitions: A view from the American Southeast and beyond. *Am J Phys Anthropol*. 2017;162(1):120–142. doi:10.1002/ajpa.23103.
 41. Glaser J, Lemery J, Rajagopalan B, et al. Climate change and the emergent epidemic of CKD from heat stress in rural communities: the case for heat stress nephropathy. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2016;11(8):1472–1483. doi:10.2215/CJN.13841215.
 42. Zambon I, Piergentili A, Salvati L, Monarca D, Matyjas-Lysakowska P, Colantoni A. Applied research for a safer future: exploring recent job accidents in agriculture, Italy (2012–2017). *Processes*. 2018;6(7):87. doi:10.3390/pr6070087.
 43. Wroblicky G, Graham L, Schneider E, et al. Pesticide use data and the distribution of acute illness episodes: the promise and challenges of geoinformatics. *Health (Irvine, Calif)*. 2018;19:431–462.
 44. Taiwo AM, Arowolo TA. Impacts of agricultural poultry farming on water and sediment qualities. Proceedings of the 2nd World Congress on Civil, Structural, and Environmental Engineering. World congress on civil, structural, and environmental engineering. Barcelona, Spain: Avestia Publishing; 2017 Apr 2–4. doi:10.11159/icesdp17.159
 45. Rolstad S, Adler J, Rydén A. Response burden and questionnaire length: is shorter better? A review and meta-analysis. *Value Health*. 2011;14(8):1101–1108. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2011.06.003.