MEDWIN PUBLISHERS
Committed to create value for Researchers

Ergonomics International Journal
ISSN: 2577-2953

Occupational Health and Safety Needs Fewer Slogans and More Systems Thinking

Workman K*
Independent Researcher, Portugal

***Corresponding author:** Keysha Workman, Independent Researcher, Portugal

Editorial
Volume 10 Issue 3
Received Date: August 13, 2026
Published Date: August 21, 2026

Editorial

Every workplace in the developed world now displays some version of the same poster: a hard hat, a hi-vis vest, and a slogan urging workers to "put safety first." Walk through almost any facility and the visual language of occupational health and safety has become remarkably uniform, remarkably earnest, and, if the injury statistics are any guide, remarkably insufficient. This editorial argues for a shift in how the field allocates its attention away from behavioral messaging aimed at individual workers, and toward the systemic and organizational conditions that produce hazardous behavior in the first place.

The instinct to focus on the individual worker is understandable. It is administratively simple to require a training module, post a reminder, or issue a citation for a missed procedure. It is much harder to redesign a supply chain so that delivery drivers are not incentivized to skip rest breaks, or to restructure a shift schedule so that fatigue does not compound across a rotating roster. Yet the evidence base in occupational safety science has, for at least two decades, pointed toward the latter as the more durable lever. Heinrich's original accident triangle, whatever its methodological limitations, was never intended to justify an obsession with minor unsafe acts at the expense of examining the conditions that generate them. Somewhere along the way, a great deal of corporate safety programming absorbed the triangle's shape without absorbing its underlying systems logic.

This matters because the injuries that dominate compensation claims today look different from the injuries that dominated a generation ago. Acute traumatic injury from unguarded machinery has declined substantially across most regulated industries, which is a genuine achievement of engineering controls and enforcement. What has not declined at nearly the same rate is the burden of musculoskeletal disorders, chronic fatigue-related incidents, and stress-linked absence. These are not the kind of harms that a poster about ladder safety addresses. They emerge from workload design, staffing ratios, scheduling algorithms, and the broader psychosocial climate of a workplace variables that sit squarely in the domain of organizational and engineering decision-making, not individual vigilance.

We would therefore encourage safety professionals, and the journals and practitioner networks that shape their thinking, to give proportionally more space to organizational-level interventions: job redesign, exposure-limiting rotation schedules, participatory ergonomics programs where workers help identify hazards in their own tasks, and procurement standards that build safety into tools and equipment before they reach the floor. None of this is exotic. Much of it has a respectable evidence base. What it lacks is the institutional momentum that behavioral safety campaigns already enjoy, partly because systemic change is slower, costlier upfront, and less photogenic than a poster campaign.

There is a legitimate rejoinder here, and it deserves acknowledgment rather than dismissal. Individual behavior does matter. No amount of good system design eliminates the need for a worker to follow lockout-tagout procedure correctly, and there are documented cases where behavioral safety interventions produced measurable short-term reductions in incident rates. The point of this editorial is not that individual-level programs are worthless, but that they have become disproportionate to their actual contribution relative to systemic factors, and that this imbalance is itself a policy choice, not a neutral default.

If the field is serious about the next reduction in occupational harm, the more promising terrain is upstream: in how jobs are designed, how workloads are distributed, and how organizations are structured to either absorb or amplify hazard. That is a harder story to put on a poster. It is also, we would argue, the more honest one.

Copyright© Workman K.