

A study by SPEK and SuPer indicates there are significant gaps in all aspects of home care safety

The study has assessed the housing safety of customers with special needs, the occupational safety of employees and safety training from an employee perspective. In addition to the elderly and people with memory disorders, other customer groups with reduced functional capacity have also been examined as customer groups. The study is based on a long-standing concern about the safety of these customers' housing in general and fire safety.

The study is based on a survey conducted in collaboration with the Finnish Union of Practical Nurses SuPer and the Finnish National Rescue Association. The data were collected in February-March 2019. The sample of the survey was 31,454 people and 3,430 responses were received.

A key finding of the study is the strong concern of community caregivers about customer safety.

According to the study, nearly three out of four home care workers had noticed several safety problems in their clients' everyday lives. Of the respondents, 91% had identified safety problems with indoor mobility, 88% with outdoor mobility, 86% with general housing safety, 80% with fire safety, 77% with cooking and hob safety, and 72% with exit safety. The concern affects several different areas of customer safety and is consistent with the incidents reported in the survey.

Concerns about home care client safety are more common and broader than concerns about client safety in other forms of care. In home care, two-thirds of respondents (66%) felt concerned about their clients at least weekly. More than a third (38%) were concerned on a daily or ongoing basis.

The difference is parallel to almost every area of safety; the client's activities and mobility, falls, mistakes and disappearances, the safety of housing in general, housing fire, safety of cooking and smoking, and the dangers of substance abuse. The only exception is violence. The threat of violence was more frequently raised in other forms of care than home care. Violence burdened almost two-thirds (60%) of all respondents.

Anxiety and other mental causes, along with urgency, are the biggest stressors among home care workers. The burden of travel was very strong in home care, with three-quarters of respondents (74%) agreeing or somewhat agreeing with the statement.

In addition to the differences between home care and other forms of care, the survey material highlights clear areas for development, such as the inclusion of safety in clients' care and service plans. Only 42 percent of respondents reported that safety was included in the client's care and service plan at the time of the survey. Inclusion of safety in the service plan was less common for home care clients than for other forms of care.

The third significant result is the low level of awareness of the reporting obligation required by law. Only a quarter of the respondents had received guidance, counseling, or training on the reporting obligation. If safety is not considered in the service plan and the reporting obligation is not instructed, customer safety may be endangered and the situation may accumulate as accidents or, for example, housing fires.

Training for conducting a notification of the need for social welfare services were considered necessary by about three-quarters (72%) of respondents. The need was strongest in home care (84%). In other forms of care, the need was clearly lower than this (69%).

Of the fire safety technology, both the fire alarm and fire alarm system and the automatic extinguishing system were clearly less common in home care than in other forms of care. The difference is partly explained by the requirements of the legislation. For example, an automatic fire extinguishing system is required at sites if residents have a reduced ability to function and the opportunity to leave the premises is

reduced as a result, and if staff are unable to help the resident out quickly enough. In home care, the corresponding requirement is being considered but not implemented yet.

Hob safety features were more common in home care than in other forms of care. The difference between hob safety features between forms of care can be natural, as their need may be more common in home care, where the home care client still makes food. In other types of care, the resident may be provided with ready-made food, in which case there is no need for a hob or hob safety features in all cases.

A client in home care pays for a significantly higher share of safety technology than a client in other forms of care. Almost half (45%) of home care clients pay for the safety technology in full and about a third (33%) pay for the safety technology in part. In other forms of care, the corresponding percentages are less than one-tenth. (5% and 8%).

The results confirm those of previous studies, according to which the situation in home care is worse for many safety indicators than in other forms of care. In addition, home care appears to have an agreed and conscious approach less frequently than other forms of care. The study shows significant grievances in all aspects of safety.

Research: Housing safety of people with reduced functional capacity, occupational safety of care staff and safety training experienced by caregivers

https://issuu.com/spek_ry/docs/spek_puheenvuoroja_10?fr=sODVkJzIMxOTY1Mzg

Author of the research: Tarja Ojala, SPEK's specialist researcher

Additional information:

SPEK, Specialist Researcher, Tarja Ojala, +358 44 761 0376

SuPer, Specialist, Soili Nevala, +3589 2727 9157