The Indonesian Journal of Occupational Safety and Health
2023, 12 (2): 246-255
p ISSN: 2301 8046, e ISSN: 2540 7872
http://doi.org10.20473/ijosh.v12i2.2023.246-255

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Factors Related with Unsafe Action in Palm Oil Harvesters at PT. Priatama Riau Kebun Rupat Island

Iskandar[1], Y. Denny A. Wahyudiono[2], Noeroel Widajati[3], Zulkifli[4]

[1,2,3]Departemen of Occupational Health and Safety, Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
Campus C Mulyorejo, Surabaya, East Java 60115 Indonesia
[4]Politeknik Negeri Bengkalis, Indonesia
Jl. Bathin Alam, Sungai Alam Bengkalis, Riau 28711 Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Work accidents can be caused by unsafe action factors in the field, such as not wearing personal protective equipment (PPE), not following work procedures, and not following work safety regulations. The purpose of this study was to analyze the factors related to unsafe actions (unsafe behavior) in oil palm harvesters at PT Priatama Riau. **Methods:** This is an observational study. The study population consisted of 111 workers in the plantation harvester section. The research sample was calculated using the Slovin formula for as many as 86 workers. The independent variables consisted of OHS knowledge, attitudes, education, length of working period, age, OHS supervision, and OSH training. The dependent variable was Unsafe Action (unsafe behavior). Essential information was obtained through meetings, perceptions, and polls. The information collection instruments used in this study were survey sheets, agenda sheets, and cameras for documentation. Data analysis consisted of univariate and bivariate analyses. Bivariate analysis was performed using the chi-squared statistical test. **Results:** The factors related to unsafe action/unsafe behavior in oil palm harvesters were sex, years of service, knowledge, attitudes, OHS supervision, OHS training, and unsafe conditions. **Conclusion:** Judging from the factual test as a whole or together, the factors of tenure, gender, attitude, knowledge, OSH supervision, OSH training, work equipment, and unsafe conditions are related to Unsafe Actions.

Keywords: occupational health and safety, palm oil harvester, unsafe action, work accident

Corresponding Author:
Iskandar
Email: Iskandar-2019@fkm.unair.ac.id
Telephone: +6281267237380

INTRODUCTION

Work-related Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) is a significant element that can influence the efficiency of workers. The gamble of mishaps and word-related illnesses frequently occurs on the grounds that the OHS program is not running well. In view of information from the Employment Social Security Administration (BPJS) in Indonesia, there were 105.182 work accident cases by the end of 2017, of which 2,375 cases were cases of serious accidents that resulted in death (Mas'ari, 2019).

Work accidents are unwanted cases that can cause loss and occur during working hours and at work. Work accidents can cause losses to workers, the government, and the surrounding community. Work accidents, in addition to being direct obstacles, are also indirect causes of losses, such as damage to workers' machines and equipment, cessation of the production process, and damage to the work environment (Suma'mur, 1996).

According to Siregar (2014), citing research by the International Labor Organization (ILO), the factors that cause work accidents include age, gender, education, knowledge, skills, working hours, work shifts, attitudes, behavior, fatigue, and the physical condition of workers. The management factor consists of organizational or management policies, socialization, OHS, Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), training, supervision, and work environment factors such as housekeeping, lighting, noise and warning colors, signs, and labels. Heinrich revealed that 80% of work accidents are caused by hazardous activity factors, as we frequently

Cite this as: Iskandar, I., Wahyudiono, Y. D. A and Zulkifli, Z. (2023) 'Factors Related with Unsafe Action in Palm Oil Harvesters at PT. Priatama Riau Kebun Rupat Island', *The Indonesian Journal of Occupational Safety and Health*, 12(2), pp. 246-255.

 doi:10.20473/ijosh.v12i2.2023.246-255
Received July 04, 2022; 1st revision August 14, 2022; 2nd revision October 03, 2022; Accepted October 17, 2022; Published: August 2023. Published by Universitas Airlangga.

experience in the field where laborers do not utilize Personal Protect Equipment (PPE), and the remaining 20% of work accidents are caused by unsafe conditions such as workers throwing the rubbish carelessly, workers crossing safe limits, and others (Khairiah and Widajati, 2020).

Unsafe behavior is an action that can make the dangerous for the worker himself or others and can cause work accidents that can be caused by various factors such as not wearing PPE, not following work procedures, not following work safety regulations, and working recklessly (Istih, Wiyono and Candrawati, 2017). Unsafe refers to failure (human failure) in following the correct requirements and work procedures, causing work accidents, such as actions without qualifications and authority, lack of use of personal protective equipment, failure to save equipment, working at a dangerous speed, avoiding or moving safety equipment, using inappropriate equipment, using certain equipment for other deviant purposes, working in a dangerous place without proper protection and warning, repairing equipment incorrectly, failure to warn, working with rude, wearing unsafe clothes when working, and taking unsafe work positions (Winarsunu, 2008).

PT Priatama Riau is a regional private company that has won the government's trust in developing palm oil plantations in two villages, namely Darul Aman and Tanjung Kapal Village, Rupat District, Rupat Island, Bengkalis Regency, and Riau Province. The distance from the city of Pekanbaru is ± 195 km, which can travel within 8 h by car. PT Priatama Riau's oil palm plantation management activities include planting and caring for immature plants (TBM).

Based on the observations made on Tuesday, February 16, 2021, for employees at the company's clinic in 2020, it was stated that there were many work accidents in the company with 36 accidents, of which there were 34 accidents for harvesters and 2 accidents for workers loading palm oil into trucks. Work-related accidents occur almost every day, such as stabbing, crushing, pinching, and falling. As a result of these accidents, both minor and serious accidents require workers to have an accident to have 1 to three days of rest. Accidents that occur in the company are due to unsafe worker behavior, such as smoke while working, messaging with partners, and not utilizing Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). The motivation behind this research is to study the elements associated with risky activities (dangerous ways of behaving) in oil palm reapers at PT Priatama, Riau.

METHOD

The type of exploration was observational in nature. The exploration configuration used was a cross-sectional design. The research was conducted at PT. Priatama Riau Kebun Rupat Island. This study was conducted at the Company from January 2022. The research sample was calculated using the Slovin formula for as many as 86 workers. The independent variables consisted of OHS knowledge, attitudes, education, years of service, age, OHS supervision, and OSH training. The reliant variable (subordinate variable) is Unsafe Action (hazardous behavior). Essential information was obtained through meetings, perceptions, and polls. Optional information comes from composed archives, such as books, company documents, regulations or policies, other records, and reports that support this writing, as well as photographs of the aftereffects of exercises and execution of wording-related security and well-being at PT Priatama Riau Kebun Pulau Rupat. The data-collection instruments used in this study were questionnaire sheets, checklist sheets, and cameras for documentation. Information handling goes through several phases, including altering, coding, information passage, and information investigation. Data analysis consisted of univariate and bivariate analyses. Bivariate analysis used the chi-square test to correlate categorical variables with a significance level of $p<0.05$. This study used Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient analysis to determine the unwavering quality coefficient with the assistance of SPSS 26, which was conducted by taking into account ethics in research and has received moral endorsement from the Universitas Airlangga staff of dental medication well-being research moral leeway commission with number016/ HRECC. FODM/I/2022 dated January 19, 2022.

Validity and Reliability Test

Prior to the data analysis, validity and reliability tests were conducted. The validity test was used to determine the validity level of the instruments used in collecting data obtained by correlating each variable score of respondents' answers with the total score of each variable. The correlation results were compared with a significance value of 0.05. Based on the test results, the OHS Knowledge variable had seven valid questions and three invalid questions.

Only valid questions were included in the study. To test the validity of the attitude variable, there were 10 valid questions and no invalid questions. Only valid questions were included in the study. There were three valid questions and seven invalid questions to test the validity of the OHS supervision variable, there are 3 valid questions and 7 invalid questions. Only valid questions were included in the study. Testing the validity of the OHS Training variables requires 1 valid question. Only valid questions were included in the study. In testing the validity of the Work Equipment variable, there were nine valid questions and one invalid question. Only valid questions were included in the study. Testing the validity of the Unsafe Action variable, there were seven valid and three invalid questions. Only valid questions were included in the study. To test the validity of the Unsafe Condition variable, there were four valid questions and one invalid question. Only valid questions were included in the study.

A reliability test was used to measure the questionnaire, which is an indicator of a variable. A questionnaire is considered reliable if a person's answer to a statement is consistent or stable from time to time. This study used Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient analysis to determine the unwavering quality coefficient using SPSS. The consequences of the unwavering quality test are as follows.

Based on the table 1, the reliability test of the OHS knowledge variable contained 11 reliable items with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.478. The 11 attitude variable reliability test items were reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.737. The 11 items of the Supervision variable reliability test are reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.348. Test the reliability of the OHS Training Variable 2 items with a Cronbach's alpha value of 1,000. The reliability test of the Work Equipment variable 11 items are reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.630. The reliability test of the Unsafe Condition 6 Items variable is reliable, with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.588.

Table 1. Reliability Test

Research Variable	N of Item	Cronbach's Alpha
OHS Knowledge	11	0.478
Attitude	11	0.737
Supervision	11	0.348
OSH Training	2	1.000
Unsafe Condition	6	0.588

RESULTS

Characteristics of Respondents

The after-effects of the review showed that the qualities of the respondents in the company's representatives incorporate age, long periods of administration, and schooling. This can be seen in the accompanying 2 table.

From Table 2, it can be seen that most of the workers were aged 36-40 years (60.5%), and most of the workers were male (88.4). Most of the workers had a high school education level (74.4%), and the working period of the workers was 1-6 years (67.4%).

Factors Related with Unsafe Action

The consequences of the review showed that the qualities of the respondents in the company's workers include age, long stretches of administration, and schooling. This is shown in the following table 3.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Age, Education, Years of Service at PT. Priatama Riau in 2022

Characteristics	Respondent	
	n	Percentage
Age		
31-35	34	39.5
36-40	52	60.5
Gender		
Men	76	88.4
Women	10	11.6
Education		
Elementary School	1	1.2
Junior High School	21	24.4
Senior High School	64	74.4
Years of service		
1-6	58	67.4
7-12	28	32.6
13-18	0	0
Total	86	100

Table 3 shows that most workers (72.1%) had good knowledge. The majority of workers (89.5%) stated that the supervision carried out was not good, the attitude of the workers was not good (96.5%), OHS training had never been carried out (77.9%), and when making observations (75.6%), the condition in the Company was considered good.

Overview of Unsafe Action in the Company

Table 4 shows that when making observations, employee behavior in the company is considered not good. This can be seen from the percentage obtained, which is equal to 84.9% of respondents assessing that the action of employees is still poor.

Analysis of the Influence of Factors Related to Unsafe Action

The results show the research variables related to unsafe actions in a company. As presented in Table 5. The results of the cross tabulation in Table 5 show that the behavior of workers can be proven by the percentage of laborers 31-40 years of age whose conduct is protected (84.8%). In light of the aftereffects of the bivariate test utilizing the calculated relapse test, it shows that the p value <0.05 is 0.000, which means that there was a significant effect between age and unsafe action, so it can be interpreted that workers who have 31-40 years have a greater influence on unsafe action.

Table 3. Factors Associated With Unsafe Action at PT. Priatama Riau in 2022

Unsafe Action Factors	Respondent	
	n	Percentage
OHS Knowledge		
Bad	62	72.1
Good	24	27.9
OHS Supervision		
Bad	77	89.5
Good	9	10.5
Workers Attitude		
Bad	83	96.5
Good	3	3.5
OHS Training	64	74.4
Never	67	77.9
Ever	19	22.1
Unsafe Condition		
Bad	66	75.6
Good	20	24.4

The percentage of laborers with men with appropriate conduct is (84.8%). In view of the aftereffects of the bivariate test utilizing the strategic relapse test, it shows that the p value <0.05 is 0.000, which means that there is a significant influence between gender and unsafe action, so it very well may be deciphered that female laborers impact dangerous activity.

The laborers was with 7-12 years of safe administration (92.8%). In view of the consequences of the bivariate test utilizing the calculated relapse test, it shows that the p-value < 0.05 is 0.000, which means that there is a significant effect between tenure and unsafe action; therefore, it tends to be deciphered that specialists who have a functioning time of 7-12 years impact perilous activity.

The more significant the level of training, the better the way of behaving, as proven by the percentage of workers with a high school education level who exhibited good behavior (85.9%). Based on the results of the bivariate test using the logistic regression test, it shows that the p-value <0.05 is 0.000, and which indicates that there is a critical impact between the degree of instruction and risky activity, so it can be interpreted that workers who have a low level of education have a greater influence on unsafe action.

Workers with poor knowledge levels and unsafe behavior (83.3%). Based on the results of the bivariate test using the logistic regression test, a p-value <0.05 is 0.000, which means there is a strong influence between the level of knowledge and the level of unsafe acts.

The percentage of workers with unfavorable attitudes can be proven by the percentage of workers with unfavorable attitudes with unsafe behavior (84.3%). In view of the consequences of the bivariate test utilizing the strategic relapse test, the p-value <0.05 is 0.000, which means that there is a significant influence between attitude and unsafe action; thus, it can be interpreted that workers who have less good have a greater influence on unsafe action.

Table 4. Overview of Unsafe Action in Companies

Variable	Respondent	
	n	Percentage
Unsafe Action		
Bad	73	84.9
Good	13	15.1
Total	86	100

Workers who received good supervision, as evidenced by the percentage of workers who received good supervision and safe behavior (22.3%), and workers who received poor supervision had unsafe behavior, as evidenced by the percentage of workers who received poor supervision and unsafe behavior (85, 7%). In view of the aftereffects of the bivariate test utilizing the strategic relapse test, it shows that the p-value <0.05, is 0.000, which means that there is a significant effect between OHS supervision and unsafe action, so it can be interpreted that poor OHS supervisors have a greater effect on unsafe action.

Workers who had attended training as evidenced by the percentage of workers who had attended OHS training and safe behavior (5.6%) and workers who had never attended OHS training in unsafe behavior, as evidenced by the percentage of workers who had never had OSH training and unsafe behavior (82.3%). In light of the consequences of the bivariate test utilizing the calculated relapse test, it shows that the p-value <0.05 is 0.000, which means that there is a significant effect between OSH training and unsafe action; therefore, it can be interpreted that poor OHS training has a greater effect on unsafe action.

Good field conditions are evidenced by the percentage of field conditions and safe behavior (87.8%) and unsafe field conditions of unsafe behavior, as evidenced by the level of field conditions and dangerous way of behaving (75%). In light of the consequences of the bivariate test utilizing strategic relapse, it shows that the p-value <0.05 is 0.000, which means that there is a strong influence between unsafe conditions and unsafe action. Thus, it can be interpreted that unfavorable conditions have an impact on unsafe action.

Table 5. Analysis of the Influence of Factors Related to Unsafe Action in Companies

Variable	Unsafe Action				Total		p-value
	Safe Attitude		Unsafe Attitude				
	n	%	n	%	N	%	
Age							
31-40	13	15.2	73	84.8	86	100	0.000
Gender							
Men	13	15.2	73	84.8	86	100	0.000
Education							
Elementary School	1	100	0	0	1	100	
Junior High School	4	19.1	17	80.9	21	100	0.000
Senior High School	9	14.1	55	85.9	64	100	
Period of Working							
1-6	11	18.9	47	81.1	58	100	0.000
7-12	2	7.2	26	92.8	28	100	
OHS Knowledge							
Bad	4	16.7	20	83.3	24	100	0.000
Good	9	14.5	53	85.5	62	100	
OHS Supervision							
Bad	11	14.3	66	85.7	77	100	0.000
Good	2	22.3	7	77.7	9	100	
Worker Attitude							
Bad	13	15.7	70	84.3	83	100	0.000
Good	0	0	3	100	3	100	
OHS Training							
Never	12	17.7	56	82.3	68	100	0.000
Ever	1	5.6	17	94.6	18	100	
Unsafe Condition							
Bad	5	15	15	75	20	100	0.000
Good	8	12.2	58	87.8	66	100	

Considering the portrayal of the aftereffects of the exploration above, which shows that all variables have a p-value <0.05, it tends to be presumed that the variables of age, gender, instruction, years of service, knowledge, supervision, attitudes, training, work equipment, and field conditions are related to unsafe actions in the company.

DISCUSSION

The Effect of Worker Characteristics (age, gender, years of service and education)

In light of the aftereffects of the examination, it shows that there is an impact between age on unsafe actions in the company. According to Suryanto (2017), respondents aged 31–40 years tend to take unsafe actions. The large number of harvesters aged between 31-40 years who carried out unsafe action in the severe category can be due to the fact that most of the respondents who work are in that age group, so it is likely that more workers will take unsafe action when compared to other age groups. Those who are still in their productive period usually have a higher level of productivity than workers who are already old, so they are physically weak and limited. Therefore, they maintain work productivity by behaving safely because even minor accidents can reduce their performance and productivity (Agustiya, 2020).

Meanwhile, workers over the age of 40 years experience a decrease in their physical abilities for individuals (Priyono and Yasin, 2016). This is in line with Septiana's research (2014) and Pratama's research (2015) that unsafe actions on workers are mostly carried out by workers who are old, with an age range of 43 years. This is because as workers get older, their physical capacities, such as flexibility, strength, speed, vision, and coordination system, will also decrease.

Men and women have different physical and psychological differences, so the analysis of work accidents always sees gender as an important factor. Differences between men and women can be seen in physical factors such as muscle ability, endurance, and posture, which are related to the incidence of certain work accidents. Based on the results of the study, it is known that there is an influence between gender on unsafe actions in the company. This means that male workers with the safest behavior are as many as 84.8% of workers due to physical conditions such as strength, vision, and a higher coordination system as women.

Working period is the length of time a person works. The working period is firmly connected with the experience of a person in doing his job, where experienced workers are considered more capable of carrying out and understanding their work. (Suryanto and Widajati, 2017).

Tenure is also related to unsafe actions in a company. The experience of being alert to work accidents is improving in accordance with the increase in working period and length of work at the workplace concerned (Salmawati, 2019). Workers with a working period of 7-12 years who have more safe behavior because the working period has understood the actions that can cause accidents. Suma'mur (2014) states that a person's experience of recognizing hazards in the workplace will improve with age and working period, so old laborers will be more acquainted with the peril focus in their working environment, which can limit the event of blunders that can bring about a mishap. Based on a study by Sholehudin (2013), the longer the working period, the lower the percentage of workers who take unsafe action.

However, this is not the same as the examination conducted by Yusril *et al*. (2020) on workers in the production division of PT. Sermani Steel in 2020. In his research, it was found that there was no relationship between years of service and unsafe actions because long years of work or work experience did not determine whether the worker could behave safely at work.

The education referred to in this study was the last formal school level completed by the respondent. Judging from the results of this study, it is evident that there is an influence between worker education and unsafe action in the company. Respondents who are safer are those who have a higher level of education than those who have a lower level of education. Work accidents have various causes, one of which is unsafe acts, such as those caused by a lack of knowledge and skills and unsafe actions. Education is important and must be considered to increase awareness of the importance of occupational health and safety (Permana, 2014). A person's education greatly influences a mindset in understanding the work entrusted to him, and education will also affect a level of absorption of the training provided to carry out work and work safety (Meinita, 2015).

The Effect of Occupational Health and Safety Knowledge

Knowledge is the result of human sensing, in which a person knows and understands an object that is observed using the senses. The research analysis shows that there is an influence between knowledge and unsafe actions in the company, which can be seen from the respondents' answers (14.5%), indicating that workers in companies with good knowledge of OHS are safer against unsafe action and vice versa. Workers who have knowledge of OHS bad people are more likely to have unsafe behavior, which is also proven by the percentage of 83.3%.

The knowledge possessed by a person is one of the most important factors in interpreting the stimulus received. As in the research conducted by Utami (2021), the results of his research indicate that workers in the mine production section of building PT. Arteria Daya Mulia Cirebon has been able to recognize and understand OHS knowledge, especially at work. The OHS system is well-structured and implemented, not only in terms of workers or human resources. This is in accordance with the research of Irkas *et al*. (2020), who found that most of the respondents who experienced work accidents were workers who had a poor level of knowledge.

Workers can identify the presence of a hazard by sensing. Therefore, workers with good knowledge can prevent work accidents both for themselves and others (Notoatmodjo, 2007).

The Effect of Attitude

According to Sarwono (2009), attitude describes a person's feelings of pleasure, displeasure, or normal (neutral) feelings towards something. In view of the aftereffects of the directed exploration, it shows that there is an impact between mentalities towards perilous activity in the organization. Workers who have a bad attitude tend to engage in unsafe behavior, as evidenced by the percentage obtained, which is 84.3%. The results of the analysis of this study are the same as the results of research conducted by Ariyana (2019) and Larasatie *et al*. (2022), which indicates that there is a connection between unsafe work perspectives and conduct. This shows that the more workers who have a negative attitude, the greater the impact on unsafe behavior. According to Thought and Feeling theory, attitudes are obtained from one's own experience or that of others (Notoatmodjo, 2010). Workers take unsafe action even though they have a good attitude towards unsafe action, because the good attitude that workers are based on their experience is not due to the pure knowledge they have and they say that they are aware that if they take unsafe actions that result in work accidents, they do not manifest in an action.

The Effect of Occupational Health and Safety Supervision

In view of the consequences of the exploration directed, it shows that there is an impact between oversight and unsafe actions in the company. This is also in accordance with the research conducted by Amalia *et al*. (2021), who also showed that good supervision greatly affects the behavior of workers.

However, the aftereffects of this study are not in accordance with the research of Pratiwi (2009), Sebrina and Wahyuningsih (2021), which states that there is no relationship between supervision and unsafe action, where in his research information, respondents said the supervision carried out by the company was quite good, but according to the workers, it did not affect the attitude of workers at work. Supervision is an activity carried out by the company's manager to make the work carried out in accordance with the plans set and expected results. Supervision can be considered successful if the manager or supervisor conducts inspections, checks, controls inspections, and regulates and prevents possible events that may occur periodically (Sarwono, 2009).

The Effect of Occupational Health and Safety Training

In view of the after-effects of the exploration led, it shows that there is an impact between training on Unsafe Action in the company. Workers who do not receive training will have an impact on those who can cause work accidents due to a lack of knowledge about work safety.

Training is a form of educational process through which learning targets or educational targets gain learning experiences that will eventually lead to changes in their behavior (Notoatmodjo, 2007). Training helps workers gain effectiveness in their current or future jobs through the development of proper habits of thought, action, skills, knowledge, and attitudes (Hendrawan, 2020). Helliyanti's research (2009) showed that there is a statistically significant relationship between OHS training

and unsafe behavior. Workers who do not receive training are more likely to behave unsafely than those who receive training.

Notwithstanding, this is not the same as the examination led by Fitria and Waldani (2022), where the results obtained in his research show that there is no relationship between training and unsafe action, which is proven from the results of statistical tests that P value = 0.823 (P> 0.05), indicating that there is no connection between preparing and safe hazardous activity.

The scientist's examination of the consequences of the review showed that there was a connection between preparing and unsafe acts, namely when analyzed simultaneously between the variables of training and unsafe acts, it was found that the percentage of workers who had good training and safe actions was higher (61.1%) than that of workers. who had poor training and had unsafe actions (47.6%).

The Effect of Unsafe Condition

Unsafe conditions are physical or dangerous conditions that can directly result in accidents. In light of the consequences of the exploration, it shows that there is an impact between risky circumstances on unsafe action in the company. Good working conditions also have safe behavior with a percentage of 87.8%, indicating that good conditions are safer against unsafe action and vice versa; less good conditions have more unsafe behavior with a percentage of 15%. This is because unfavorable conditions affect the occurrence of work accidents. This is in accordance with Irawati (2018), who showed a relationship between unsafe conditions and work accidents (gram intake in the eye). This can be seen from the chi square test results (p = 0.000), so it may be reasoned that there is a relationship between the unsafe condition variable and work accidents (gram intake in the eye).

However, this is not quite the same as the outcome of research directed at Puspitasari, Supriyanto and Ginanjar (2019), who found no critical connection between unsafe conditions and accidents at work being stabbed by needles or other sharp objects. According to the English Encyclopedia, an unsafe condition is an unsatisfactory physical condition that exists in the work environment prior to the occurrence of work accidents carried out by workers.

Domino theory states that unsafe conditions contribute to 10% of accidents. Environmental factors are commonly referred to as the unsafe conditions of a machine, equipment, materials, environment and workplace, process, nature, work, and work system (Rakhmawati, Suroto and Setyaningsih, 2022).

Factors Related with Unsafe Action in the Company

In view of factual tests all the while or together, this shows that the factors of years of service, gender, attitudes, knowledge, OHS supervision, OHS training, work equipment, and unsafe conditions are each related to Unsafe Action. This is in line with the results of research from (Terok, Adam and Adam, 2020) it was found that of the 53 respondents who had experienced work accidents were those who performed unsafe acts, as seen from the percentage obtained as many as 40 (75.5%) respondents, and the remaining 13 (24.5%) respondents took safe actions. Other studies also obtained the same results, where factors related to unsafe acts are knowledge of hazards, attitudes towards hazards, and OSH training (Asriani, Hasyim and Purba, 2011). Unsafe acts can be prevented by increasing the workers' knowledge of work safety. OSH knowledge can be obtained through OHS training and education.

According to Reason (1990), unsafe behavior is one of the variables related to the occurrence of work mishaps. Unsafe behavior is a behavior that deviates from or is not in accordance with predetermined work procedures. Unsafe behavior is an active failure that is directly related to the occurrence of an accident. Unsafe behaviors consist of mistakes and violations committed by the workers. Unsafe action (unsafe action) is closely related to human factors, namely in the form of OSH culture, or are all actions taken by someone where these actions can endanger themselves, others, equipment, and the environment around them (Astuti & Zaenab, 2019).

CONCLUSION

From the results of the study, it was found that most of the workers in the company were aged 31-40 years which showed that older workers, better behavior, sex that was mostly male, 1-6 years of work experience, and length of working are determining factors that the workforce can behave safely during work, the highest level of education is at the high school level, and workers who have good OHS knowledge tend to behave safely. The characteristics of workers include age, gender,

education, and years of service, which affect unsafe action on workers in the company. Factors that influence unsafe actions on oil palm harvesters in the company include knowledge, attitudes, supervision, training, and unsafe condition relates to unsafe action on oil palm harvesters in the company.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments were conveyed by PT. Priatama Riau Kebun Rupat Island and respondents willing to provide research data. It is also to the supervising lecturers who have been directed during the research and scientific writing process.

REFERENCE

Agustiya, H. (2020) 'Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Tindakan Tidak Aman (Unsafe Action) Pada Pekerja', *PROMOTOR Jurnal Mahasiswa Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 3(5), pp. 473–487.

Amalia, S., *et al*. (2021) 'Faktor-faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Unsafe Action Pada Pekerja Ketinggian di Proyek Pembangunan Apartemen PT. Nusa Raya Cipta TBK-Tangerang Tahun 2021', *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 18(3), pp. 430–355.

Ariyana, I. (2019) *'Hubungan Antara Sikap Dengan Perilaku Kerja Tidak Aman Pada Pekerja Bagian Finishing Di PT. X Bogor Tahun 2019'*. Undergraduate Thesis. Jakarta Timur: Faculty of Public Health Universitas Binawan.

Asriani, M., Hasyim, H. and Purba, I. (2011) 'Faktor - Faktor Yang Berhubungan Dengan Perilaku Tidak Aman (Unsafe Act) Di Bagian Pabrik Urea PT. Pupuk Sriwidjaja Palembang', *Jurnal Ilmu Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 2(2), pp. 103–109.

Astuti, R. and Zaenab. (2019) 'Faktor-Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Kejadian Kecelakaan Kerja di Pabrik Gula Bone Arasoe', *Jurnal Sulolipu: Media Komunikasi Sivitas Akademika Dan Masyarakat*, 19(2), pp. 292–299.

Fitria, F. E. and Waldani, D. (2022) 'Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Tindakan Tidak Aman Pada Pekerja Bagian Produksi Tiang PJU Kunango Jantan Padang*', Ensiklopedia of Journal*, 4(3), pp. 49–55.

Helliyanti, P. (2009) *'Faktor-Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Perilaku Tidak Aman di Departemen Utility and Operation, PT. Indofood Sukses Makmur Tbk. Divisi Bogasari Flours Mills Tahun 2009'*. Undergraduate Thesis. Depok: Faculty of Public Health Universitas Indonesia.

Hendrawan, A. (2020) 'Program Kesehatan dan Keselamatan Kerja di Atas Kapal', *Jurnal Sains Teknologi Transportasi Maritim*, 2(1), pp. 1-10.

Irawati, I. (2018) 'Hubungan Unsafe Condition Dan Unsafe Action Dengan Kecelakaan Kerja (Kemasukan Gram Pada Mata) Pekerja Pengelasan', *Jurnal Kesehatan*, 9(2) pp. 89–94.

Irkas, A. U. D., *et al* (2020) 'Hubungan Unsafe Action dan Unsafe Condition dengan Kecelakaan Kerja pada Pekerja Industri Mebel', *Jurnal Kesehatan*, 11(3), pp. 363–370.

Istih, S. M. P., Wiyono, J. and Candrawati, E. (2017) 'Hubungan Unsafe Action Dengan Kecelakaan Kerja pada Perawat di Rumah Sakit Panti Waluya Malang', *Jurnal Ilmiah Keperawatan*, 2(2), pp. 337–348.

Khairiah, S. and Widajati, N. (2020) 'Analisis Implementasi Penanggulangan Kejadian Luar Biasa Difteri di Wilayah Kerja Dinas Kesehatan Provinsi Jawa Timur. *MTPH Journal*, 4(2), pp. 238–249.

Larasatie, A., *et al*. (2022) 'Faktor-faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Tindakan Tidak Aman (Unsafe Action) Pada Pekerja Produksi PT. X', *Environmental Occupational Health and Safety Journal*, 2(2), pp. 133–146.

Mas'ari, A. (2019) 'Analisa Kecelakaan Kerja di PT. Haluan Riau Pekanbaru', *Jurnal Teknik Industri*, 5(1), pp. 66–72.

Meinita, T. S. (2015) *'Analisis Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Kecelakaan Kerja di CV. Prima Logam Tegal Tahun 2015*'. Undergraduate Thesis. Semarang: Faculty of Sport Science Universitas Negeri Semarang.

Notoatmodjo, S. (2007) *Promosi Kesehatan dan Ilmu Perilaku*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Notoatmodjo, S. (2010) *Promosi Kesehatan Teori dan Aplikasi*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.

Permana, A. S. (2014) *'Hubungan Personal Factor dengan Unsafe Action Proses Pemasangan Pipa Baja oleh PT. Putra Negara Surabaya*'. Undergraduate Thesis. Surabaya: Faculty of Public Health Universitas Airlangga.

Pratama, A. K. (2015) 'Hubungan Karakteristik Pekerja dengan Unsafe Action', *The Indonesian Journal of Occupational Safety and Health*, 4(1), pp. 64–73.

Pratiwi, D. (2009) *'Tinjauan Faktor Perilaku Kerja Tidak Aman pada Pekerja Konstruksi Bagian Finishing Fasilitas dan Sarana Gelanggang*

Olahraga (GOR) Boker, Cilacas, Jakarta Timur 2009'. Undergraduate Thesis. Depok: Faculty of Public Health Universitas Indonesia.

Priyono, J., and Yasin, M. (2016) 'Analisis usia, gaji dan beban tanggungan terhadap produksi home industry sepatu di Sidoarjo (Studi Kasus di Kecamatan Krian), *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 1(1), pp. 95–120.

Puspitasari, S., Supriyanto, and Ginanjar, R. (2019). 'Faktor - Faktor yang Berhubungan Dengan Kecelakaan Kerja Tertusuk Jarum Suntik Atau Benda Tajam Lainnya Pada Perawat Di RSUD Leuwiliang Kabupaten Bogor Tahun 2018*', Jurnal Mahasiswa Kesehatan Masyarakat,* 2(2), pp.163–171.

Rakhmawati, J., Suroto, and Setyaningsih, Y. (2022) 'Apakah Unsafe Action Dan Unsafe Condition Berpengaruh Terhadap Kecelakaan Nelayan ?*', Jurnal Keperawatan*, 14(1), pp.301–312.

Reason, J. (1990) *Human Error*. New York: Cambridge university press.

Salmawati, L. (2019) 'Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Kejadian Kecelakaan Kerja pada Perawat di Ruang IGD RSU Anutapura Kota Palu*'*, *Jurnal Kesehatan Masyarakat,* 10(2), pp. 104–112.

Sarwono, P. (2009) *Ilmu Kebidanan*. Jakarta: Bina Pustaka.

Sebrina, R. N. F., and Wahyuningsih, A. S. (2021) 'Unsafe Action pada Pekerja Bagian Produksi di CV Kabupaten Kendal*', Indonesian Journal of Public Health and Nutrition*, 1(3), pp. 703–712.

Septiana, D. A. (2014) 'Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Unsafe Action Pada Pekerja*', The Indonesian Journal of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3(1), pp. 25–34.

Sholehudin, AK. M. (2013) 'Hubungan Personal Factor dengan Unsafe Action di Unit X- PT. Baja X*'*. Undergraduate Thesis. Surabaya: Faculty of Public Health Universitas Airlangga.

Siregar, S. (2014) '*Faktor-faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Kecelakaan Ringan di PT Aqua Golden Mississippi Bekasi'*. Undergraduate Thesis. Jakarta: Faculty of Medicin and Health Science Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah.

Suma'mur. (1996) *Higiene Perusahaan dan Kesehatan Kerja (Hiperkes)*. Jakarta: Cetakan Pertama CV. Haji Mas Agung.

Suma'mur. (2014) *Higiene Perusahaan dan Kesehatan Kerja (Hiperkes)*. Jakarta: Sagung Seto.

Suryanto, D. I. D. (2017) 'Hubungan Kebijakan K3 dan Pengawasan K3 dengan Unsafe Action TKBM*'*. Undergraduate Thesis. Surabaya: Faculty of Public Universitas Airlangga.

Suryanto, D. I. D. and Widajati, N. (2017) 'Hubungan Karakteristik Individu dan Pengawasan K3 dengan Unsafe Action Tenaga Kerja Bongkar Muat*', The Indonesian Journal of Public Health*, 12(1), pp. 51–63.

Terok, Y. C., Adam, D. V. D. D. and Adam, H. (2020) 'Hubungan Antara Pengetahuan Tentang Keselamatan dan Kesehatan kerja dan Tindakan Tidak Aman dengan Kejadian Kecelakaan Kerja Pada Kelompok Nelayan di Desa Tambala*', Jurnal KESMAS*, 9(1), 114–121.

Utami, S. A. (2021) 'Faktor-faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Tindakan Tidak Aman (Unsafe Action) Pada Pekerja Bagian Produksi Tambang PT. Arteria Daya Mulia Kota Cirebon Tahun 2021*', Journal Of Health Research Science*, 1(2), pp. 83–89.

Winarsunu, T. (2008) *Psikologi Keselamatan Kerja*. Malang: UMM Press.

Yusril, M., Alwi, M. K. and Hasan, C. (2020) 'Faktor yang Berhubungan dengan Tindakan Tidak Aman (Unsafe Action) Pada Pekerja Bagian Produksi PT. Sermani Steel*'*, *Window of Public Health Journal*, 1(4), pp. 370–381.