

1 **Use of a systems engineering framework to assess perceptions and practices about**  
2 **antimicrobial resistance of workers on large dairy farms in Wisconsin**

3 Ashley E. Kates, Mary Jo Knobloch, Ali Konkol, Amanda Young, Andrew Steinberger, John  
4 Shutske, Pamela L. Ruegg, Ajay K. Sethi, Tony Goldberg, Juliana Leite de Campos, Garret  
5 Suen, Nasia Safdar

6 University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA (A.E. Kates, M.J. Knobloch,  
7 A.Konkol, A. Young, A. Steinberger, J. Shutske, A.K. Sethi, T. Goldberg, G. Suen, N. Safdar)

8 William S. Middleton Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Madison, Wisconsin, USA (A.E. Kates,  
9 M.J. Knobloch, N. Safdar)

10 Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA (P. L. Ruegg, J. Leite de Campos)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

## 20 **Abstract**

21 We studied farmworker practices potentially contributing to transmission of bacteria and  
22 antimicrobial resistant genes (ARGs) among animals and farm workers to identify human  
23 behavioral interventions to reduce exposure risk. Ten focus groups were conducted on eight  
24 farms to explore potentially high-risk practices and farmworker knowledge and experiences with  
25 antimicrobial use and resistance using the Systems Engineering in Patient Safety (SEIPS)  
26 framework. Farmworkers were asked to describe common tasks and the policies guiding these  
27 practices. We found workers demonstrated knowledge of the role of antibiotic stewardship in  
28 preventing the spread of ARGs. Knowledge of various forms of personal protective equipment  
29 was higher for workers who commonly reported glove-use. Knowledge regarding the importance  
30 of reducing ARG transmission varied but was greater than previously reported. Programs to  
31 reduce ARG spread on dairy farms should focus on proper hand hygiene and personal protective  
32 equipment use but at the level of knowledge, beliefs, and practices.

## 33 **Introduction**

34 Antimicrobials are essential to both human and animal health (1). However, antibiotics  
35 are frequently overused, which is a major driver of antibiotic resistance. Antibiotic use in  
36 agriculture is concerning due to the risk of transmission of antimicrobial resistance genes  
37 (ARGs) to people (2). Usage of antimicrobials on dairy farms is a potential risk to human health  
38 by increasing the risk of exposure via foodstuffs as well as potentially driving selection of ARGs,  
39 although direct evidence is scant (3). However, for ARGs to “escape” from farms into the human  
40 population, critical events would have to occur involving human infection and transport. In  
41 particular, workers on dairy farms are in frequent close contact with cattle and cattle manure and

42 may be at high risk of encountering potentially resistant pathogens (4). These workers may act as  
43 “entry points” for ARGs into the human population with the potential to travel beyond the dairy  
44 farm. To date, there is limited knowledge of how dairy farm worker health and safety practices  
45 and behaviors impact the transmission of ARGs within and beyond the farm. A wide range of  
46 activities and tasks take place on a dairy farm, and all pose varying levels of ARG exposure risk  
47 to workers (4, 5). For example, working with sick animals or handling manure may pose a  
48 greater risk for encountering enteric pathogens whereas working in the milking parlor with  
49 healthy cows may pose a lower risk. Largely missing from such studies, however, are  
50 assessments of the knowledge base of dairy workers and how this affects risk.

51 Here, we undertook a cross-sectional study to develop a better understanding of how  
52 dairy farm worker perceptions and routine practices may be associated with potential exposure to  
53 ARGs. Additionally, we aimed to identify potentially modifiable behaviors that could be targeted  
54 in future interventions to reduce exposure risks. We hypothesize that a potential lack of  
55 awareness may be a root cause of risky behaviors, policies, or practices (both at the worker and  
56 organization levels), which in turn may put workers at risk. We used a human factors and  
57 systems engineering framework which allows for a comprehensive assessment of the activities  
58 occurring on a farm.

## 59 **Methods**

60 We conducted focus groups with dairy farm workers to understand the human and system  
61 level factors related to ARG transmission on farms and into the greater community. Focus  
62 groups were chosen over individual interviews as they allow for the generation of multiple  
63 perspectives in an interactive setting (6). To do this, we adapted the Systems Engineering

64 Initiative for Patient Safety (SEIPS) model (7) for an agricultural setting. SEIPS highlights the  
65 interplay between work system elements (organization, environment, tasks, tools/technology)  
66 and people. The SEIPS model allows researchers to identify known barriers and facilitators to  
67 organizational outcomes which can contribute to the development of well-informed and targeted  
68 interventions to reduce exposure and other risk factors. Although SEIPS has been extensively  
69 used to examine healthcare work systems (8, 9), to our knowledge, the SEIPS model has not  
70 previously been used to examine agricultural work systems nor has it been used to specifically  
71 examine dairy operations. Figure 1 illustrates how the SEIPS model was adapted for the use on  
72 dairy farms in this study.

73 In this study, we explored daily routine practices, knowledge and experiences among  
74 farmworkers – obtaining a snapshot of activities related to antibiotic use\age on eight farms in  
75 Wisconsin selected to represent a range of antibiotic use in cattle. Farmworkers were asked to  
76 describe common tasks and work routines including hand hygiene, laundry and eating practices,  
77 use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and communication with managers in the context of  
78 farm guidelines and policies.

### 79 *Study population and recruitment*

80 As part of a related study, we collected antimicrobial use data from 40 large dairy farms  
81 in Wisconsin and ranked farms based on daily doses of antibiotics per 1000 cow-days used (10).  
82 From this data, four low use farms and four high use farms were enrolled. Figure 2 provides an  
83 overview of study enrollment. Eligible farm owners were sent a letter inviting them to  
84 participate. When farms agreed to participate, owners were provided with study information  
85 posters (in English and Spanish) to be displayed in common areas. These posters alerted workers

86 to the purpose of the research and the potential for researchers to visit the farm. Workers  
87 provided verbal informed consent and were compensated \$25 for participation. All study  
88 documents and activities were approved by the University of Wisconsin-Madison Institutional  
89 Review Board (application ID: 2017-1333) prior to the start of research.

90 Focus group semi-structured interviews were conducted in both English and Spanish by  
91 trained researchers. The focus group question guide was developed by the research team  
92 according to the adapted SEIPS model. When possible, a representative sample of workers with a  
93 range of duties on the farm (calf care, sick animal care, maternity care, milking, farm  
94 maintenance, etc.) were invited to participate in the study. Depending on the size of the farm,  
95 workers may have been responsible for multiple types of tasks. Initial groups (n= 2) included  
96 both English and Spanish speakers. In subsequent groups (n=8), English and Spanish speakers  
97 were divided to allow for a more fluid discussion. Focus group discussions took place on the  
98 farm and farm managers/owners were asked to avoid the area where focus groups were  
99 conducted in order to allow workers to speak freely about their work life.

#### 100 *Direct observations*

101 On the same day, but prior to the focus group interviews, a researcher familiar with dairy  
102 farm practices conducted direct observations of defined animal management practices following  
103 a checklist developed by the research team (Appendix figure 1). The goal of this observation was  
104 to better understand the workflow on the farm related to infection prevention and to inform the  
105 assessment of barriers and facilitators identified during focus group interviews.

#### 106 *Data analysis*

107 Focus groups discussions were recorded, transcribed, and translated. Transcription and  
108 translation services were provided by Premium Business Services (Madison, WI). Dedoose  
109 v.8.0.35 was used to organize the data. We employed an iterative process to create the code  
110 book. Three researchers examined the same section of one transcript and compared and agreed  
111 upon codes and definitions. This process was used two additional times to adjust codes and  
112 definitions. Each element of the SEIPS model was considered for each section of the transcript  
113 and was discussed as a team as part of the first level of coding. Sub codes and definitions were  
114 identified for each element and agreed upon by researchers (second level of coding). Remaining  
115 transcripts were then coded by two researchers separately, and a third researcher with  
116 agricultural experience and qualitative expertise coded all transcripts identifying barriers and  
117 facilitators (third level of coding).

## 118 **Results**

119 We conducted 10 focus groups across the eight farms enrolled into the study between  
120 December 2018 and October 2019. Observations of the facilities, equipment, PPE and worker  
121 behaviors were conducted on all eight farms prior to focus group interviews. A total of 60 farm  
122 workers participated in focus groups.

123 Table 1 lists SEIPS elements and sub-elements identified from the transcripts during the  
124 analysis as well as the number of times an element was coded as either a facilitator or a barrier to  
125 maintaining a healthy and safe work environment. Overall, facilitators (n=1041) were identified  
126 more often than barriers (n=307) across the farms. Representative quotations from each SEIPS  
127 element can be found in Table 2.

## 128 Organization

129 Many workers reported having knowledge of the farm's protocols related to PPE use,  
130 safety, and administering antibiotics, although knowledge of rules or protocols was often  
131 identified often as a barrier. Workers reported having good relationships with farm management  
132 and their superiors and reported few issues in communicating with management, even in  
133 instances where language barriers existed.

134 *“For that reason, we have restrictions because it could affect a lot. If we send milk to the*  
135 *tank that is contaminated with antibiotics, it's a huge problem. So, no, it is very clear to*  
136 *us that we don't give antibiotics, and that we keep them controlled. So only authorized*  
137 *people can do it”*

#### 138 Tasks

139 The culture around eating (meals and snacks eaten by workers) varied across farms. On  
140 some farms workers reported always eating only in the breakroom while on other farms, workers  
141 stated they ate wherever was most convenient or while performing their work duties, such as  
142 eating in the milking parlor or while driving around on the farm:

143 *“We always eat in there. When I was on day crew, occasionally, they would, when*  
144 *they're doing the expansions, they would have people in here, and they would be talking.*  
145 *So sometimes we would eat upstairs, or we would go into this room or that room”*

146 While six of the eight (75%) farms provided a clean place for preparing and eating food, the  
147 observer noted food wrappers and drink containers in other zones on four (50%) of the farms  
148 (Table 3).

149 Many workers demonstrated an understanding of the importance minimizing the spread  
150 of infectious organisms on the farm. Workers told us their farms had policies (either written or  
151 verbal) related to working with sick animals.

152 *“They’ve gotten a bit more strict on the sick cattle and on the calving, when a cow is*  
153 *calving. They like it when you, they tell us that we have to keep our boots clean if we*  
154 *deal with a sick cow, and then we go in by a calf, we have to make sure that it is clean,*  
155 *because we don’t want to spread it.”*

## 156 Tools and Technology

157 Worker perceptions on the tools and technology related to AMU on farms were variable.  
158 Use and availability of personal protective equipment (PPE) and availability of PPE was  
159 inconsistent across farms. While some farms provided coveralls and/or boots for workers to  
160 wear, others expected the worker to provide these items themselves. Some workers reported  
161 cleaning their boots before getting into personal vehicles or leaving for the day, while others said  
162 boot cleaning was not something they often did. Similarly, on some farms it seemed normal for  
163 workers to change out of their work clothes before leaving for the day and to wash them on the  
164 farm using the farms dedicated laundry equipment, while on other farms workers tended to wear  
165 their work clothes home. During the observations, the observer noted workers laundering work  
166 clothes on the farm and washing or changing boots before leaving on five farms (62.5%).

167 Many workers felt PPE use was important on the farm. When asked about handwashing  
168 practices, one worker stated:

169 *“Yes, every time a calf is born, you have to change all the, if you are milking, you’re*  
170 *using gloves, you have to change. You change the [milk] tank, you have to wash your*



171 *boots, change gloves, so they're clean, and change yourself so that, to not contaminate*  
172 *the milk at all. That's what we do".*

173 Glove use was supported by observations where we identified 100% of workers using gloves in  
174 the milking parlor; most workers identified this practice as mandatory on their farm. On seven  
175 (87.5%) of the farms, workers were observed wearing PPE in the calf housing zones. Hand  
176 hygiene stations were available and contained appropriate materials in 100% of the bathroom  
177 and breakroom facilities in most high-risk areas. However, only three (37.5%) of the farms had a  
178 hand hygiene station in the hospital/isolation pen, although five (62.5%) provided easily  
179 accessible gloves in this zone. Easily accessible gloves were noticeably available in six (75%)  
180 milking parlors. Hand hygiene stations were only available in three (37.5%) of milking parlors  
181 (Table 4). Workers reported changing gloves most frequently after coming in contact with a sick  
182 and/or mastitis infected cow, eating, drinking, when gloves rip, when changing the line to the  
183 milk tank, and after going to the bathroom. Workers also reported they did not think there were  
184 necessarily specific rules around hand hygiene, but it was important to use common sense. Boot  
185 washing stations (presence of a hose at a minimum) were inconsistently available across farms,  
186 and not available in most zones. Calf housing was the exception to this with six (75%) of the  
187 farms having some type of boot washing station available near the entry.

#### 188 Environment and Physical Layout

189 The majority of farms had clean breakrooms (n= 6, 75%) and laundry facilities (n= 5,  
190 62.5%) as well as locker facilities for workers to change clothes. Showers were also available on  
191 six farms (75%) (three provided showers in the locker room, three in the bathroom). On most  
192 farms, on-farm microbiology labs were kept away from human food preparation areas, although

193 on one farm, the microbiology lab and drug storage cabinet was located in the breakroom, while  
194 on another, medication and bacterial culture supplies were also stored in close proximity to food  
195 items next to a coffee pot. Personal vehicles were not allowed past the entry on a majority of  
196 farms (n=5, 62.5%).

#### 197 Person/People

198 Overall, knowledge of antibiotic administration protocols was higher than anticipated and  
199 workers indicated there were only select individuals on the farm who were authorized to  
200 administer antibiotics; these workers always went to authorized workers for medications. When  
201 discussing general knowledge about antibiotics and antibiotic resistance, there was a sense  
202 workers understood the importance of good antibiotic stewardship. When discussing  
203 antimicrobial use in cattle, one worker stated:

204 *“All dairy farmers have a responsibility not to overdo it”*

205 Similarly, there was a general understanding of the risks associated with antimicrobial resistance  
206 with two workers summarized the issue by stating:

207 *“I feel like the antibiotic resistance is those can be contracted anywhere. They can start*  
208 *anywhere, and it comes down to how people deal with their antibiotics with the animals*  
209 *or with people. If we’re not prescribed the right dosage, too little or too much, we can kill*  
210 *it or we can just make the disease or the infections, you know, they will adapt to continue,*  
211 *so ...”*

212 *“I think that, well, I believe, that the bacteria, how would you say, they get used to it, they*  
213 *become stronger, that’s why it doesn’t work anymore”.*

214           While many workers demonstrated an understanding of antibiotics and resistance, this  
215 was not true for all workers. While workers may have known why it is important to use  
216 antibiotics correctly, when providing examples, they did not always appropriately identify  
217 medications as antibiotics with one worker discussing the pain reliever Tylenol when discussing  
218 experiences using antibiotics. Some workers also felt the farm managers could do more to  
219 discuss antimicrobial use and policies with the workers (Table 2).

## 220 **Discussion**

221           We conducted focus groups and observations across eight large farms in Wisconsin to  
222 assess farm culture and behaviors potentially relating to ARG spread on farms using a systems  
223 engineering approach. Overall, farm owners/managers have successfully implemented many of  
224 the biosecurity protocols associated with mitigating ARG transmission and have implemented a  
225 positive culture around worker safety and antimicrobial use. The use of the adapted SEIPS model  
226 allowed us to identify barriers and facilitators to reducing the spread of ARGs on farms and  
227 identified several factors to considered when developing interventions to reduce the spread of  
228 ARGs.

229           Previous research has shown U.S. dairy farmers are not concerned about the impact of  
230 antimicrobial use on the presence of ARGs in humans and in the community (11-14). Studies  
231 have also documented lack of knowledge/belief among farmers about relationships between  
232 antimicrobial use in livestock leads and antimicrobial resistant infections in humans (12). Other  
233 research has shown most farmers do believe they are using the appropriate amount of antibiotics  
234 (15, 16) and feel they have a “moral obligation” to use antibiotics in their herds (17). A recent  
235 study of New York dairy farmers found conventional farmers had little concern for the impact of

236 antimicrobial use on the larger community and were skeptical of policies to reduce antibiotic use  
237 on farms (11). In contrast, the workers in our study seemed to understand the importance of  
238 antimicrobial stewardship for both animal and human health. Workers in our study also  
239 demonstrated a knowledge of how wearing PPE, particularly gloves, was important for reducing  
240 transmission of ARGs. The difference in beliefs between our study and the existing literature  
241 may be due to who was interviewed. In our study, the focus was on workers while prior research  
242 focused on farm managers and owners (11, 12). Farm manager interest in antibiotic use have  
243 been reported to be associated with costs, time, and veterinary guidance (18) with conventional  
244 farmers concerned about the negative impact on animal health when reducing antimicrobial use  
245 (11). Farm workers likely have different priorities than managers and owners and further  
246 research is needed to understand these dynamics.

247         Workers identified substantially more facilitators to reducing ARGs than barriers. The  
248 most commonly identified facilitators were related to communication on the farm. Workers felt  
249 they had someone on the farm (herdsman, manager, or owner) they were able to talk to about any  
250 issues or needs. Most workers reported a positive culture around the use of PPE and hand  
251 hygiene. These feelings were supported by our observations on most farms. However,  
252 observations revealed boot washing and hand hygiene stations were not available in all high-risk  
253 areas and were frequently lacking in the hospital/ isolation pens. Although worker knowledge of  
254 antimicrobial resistance and its associated risks was higher than expected and previously  
255 reported, workers identified a lack of written protocols as a barrier. As previously noted,  
256 communication between workers and management was good and therefore deemed sufficient by  
257 most workers. While workers primarily identified laundry practices and access to clean clothing  
258 and coveralls as facilitators, our observer noted dirty laundry facilities on several farms.

259 Additionally, the observer noted milk and cow towels being washed with worker clothing on  
260 several farms.

261 Interventions to reduce ARG spread need to be seen as both financially feasible and  
262 perceived as effective for farmers to be willing to undertake. Further education on antibiotic  
263 resistance for both the workers and managers/ owners may be a potentially effective and  
264 inexpensive intervention to reduce the spread of ARGs on farms. Workers noted a lack of  
265 education from managers/owners on this subject, though workers did have awareness of the  
266 importance of reducing resistance. Educational efforts could include signage on ways to reduce  
267 the spread of ARGs around the farms, reminders on how and when to perform hand hygiene, and  
268 when to change PPE. Furthermore, adding boot wash and hand hygiene stations may be  
269 potentially beneficial. While it may not be feasible to ask farms to add these stations where  
270 plumbing does not already exist, our observer noted sinks on several farms where no soap and/or  
271 disinfectants or towels were available.

272 Our study has several strengths. To our knowledge this is the first study to our knowledge  
273 to apply a systems engineering approach to assess farm workers beliefs and behaviors related to  
274 ARG transmission points. We complemented the focus group surveys with observations of  
275 worker practices on the farm as well as the availability of PPE and hand hygiene on the farms.  
276 The methods used here can be applied to future studies addressing a wide variety of farm safety  
277 topics. Additionally, these methods can be used to assess future interventions aimed at reducing  
278 ARG spread on farms.

279 Our study also has several limitations. Whenever workers are being observed, there is a  
280 risk they may change their behaviors while under observation (Hawthorne effect) (19) which

281 might have led to an overestimation of glove and other PPE use. Similarly, it is possible workers  
282 told the interviewer what they thought the interviewer wanted to hear during focus group  
283 discussions To minimize these effects, observations were conducted prior to the group  
284 discussions and interviewers were trained to keep a neutral tone during discussions. Another  
285 limitation may be the size of the farms in our study – all were large operations with over 250  
286 cows using an electronic records system to document antibiotic use, a requirement for a different  
287 aim of the project. It is possible the culture on larger farms is different than on smaller or family-  
288 run operations. We also interviewed only workers for this study and not include farm managers.  
289 As previous studies have shown, farm managers and owners may have different beliefs and  
290 priorities than workers which we were likely not captured in this study. However, farm  
291 managers’ and owners’ perceptions will be essential to developing, implementing and sustaining  
292 interventions to reduce ARG transmission

## 293 **Conclusions**

294 Knowledge and beliefs related to ARG transmission among dairy workers were varied  
295 and viewed in a positive light, although worker knowledge was not always accurate.  
296 Interventions to reduce ARGs on dairy farms should focus on access to education on how ARGs  
297 may spread on a farm and how to reduce spread through hand hygiene practices and PPE use.  
298 The mixed methods design used (adapted SEIPS model plus direct observations) was useful in  
299 identifying barriers and facilitators relating to ARG transmission and current farm practices and  
300 identifying potential systems-level interventions. We believe this model will be of use in future  
301 studies of related issues, such as farm worker safety. Future research exploring worker and  
302 manager beliefs around ARGs is needed to better understand the extent to which knowledge and  
303 beliefs impacts ARG transmission.

304 **Acknowledgments**

305 Funding was supplied by USDA-NIFA Food Safety Challenge Grant 2017-68003-26500.

306 AEK was supported by a National Library of Medicine training grant to the Computation and

307 Informatics in Biology and Medicine Training Program, USA (NLM 5T15LM007359). NS is

308 supported grant number R01HS026226 from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

309 The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the

310 official views of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

311

312 **Author Bio** (first author only, unless there are only 2 authors)

313 Dr. Kates is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and

314 Public Health, Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Disease. Her primary research

315 interests include reducing colonization and infections with multidrug resistant pathogens as well

316 as the role of the microbiome in human health.

317 **References**

318 1. Prescott JF. History of Antimicrobial Usage in Agriculture: an Overview. Antimicrobial

319 Resistance in Bacteria of Animal Origin: American Society of Microbiology; 2006.

320 2. Economou V, Gousia P. Agriculture and food animals as a source of antimicrobial-

321 resistant bacteria. Infect Drug Resist. 2015;8:49-61.

322 3. Ruegg P, Tabone T. The relationship between antibiotic residue violations and somatic

323 cell counts in Wisconsin dairy herds. Journal of Dairy Science. 2000;83(12):2805-9.

- 324 4. Marshall BM, Levy SB. Food animals and antimicrobials: impacts on human health.  
325 Clinical microbiology reviews. 2011;24(4):718-33.
- 326 5. Ruegg PL. Practical Food Safety Interventions for Dairy Production. Journal of Dairy  
327 Science. 2003;86:E1-E9.
- 328 6. Krueger RA, Casey MA. Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. .  
329 Washington, DC: Sage Publications; 2014.
- 330 7. Carayon P, Schoofs Hundt A, Karsh BT, Gurses AP, Alvarado CJ, Smith M, et al. Work  
331 system design for patient safety: the SEIPS model. Qual Saf Health Care. 2006;15 Suppl 1(Suppl  
332 1):i50-i8.
- 333 8. Musuuza JS, Hundt AS, Carayon P, Christensen K, Ngam C, Haun N, et al.  
334 Implementation of a Clostridioides difficile prevention bundle: Understanding common, unique,  
335 and conflicting work system barriers and facilitators for subprocess design. Infection control and  
336 hospital epidemiology : the official journal of the Society of Hospital Epidemiologists of  
337 America. 2019;40(8):880-8.
- 338 9. Redwood R, Knobloch MJ, Pellegrini DC, Ziegler MJ, Pulia M, Safdar N. Reducing  
339 unnecessary culturing: a systems approach to evaluating urine culture ordering and collection  
340 practices among nurses in two acute care settings. Antimicrobial resistance and infection control.  
341 2018;7:4.
- 342 10. Leite de Campos J, Kates A, Steinberger A, Sethi A, Suen G, Shutske J, et al.  
343 Quantification of antimicrobial usage in adult cows and preweaned calves on 40 large Wisconsin  
344 dairy farms using dose-based and mass-based metrics. J Dairy Sci. 2020;Under Review.



- 345 11. Wemette M, Safi AG, Beauvais W, Ceres K, Shapiro M, Moroni P, et al. New York State  
346 dairy farmers' perceptions of antibiotic use and resistance: A qualitative interview study. PLOS  
347 ONE. 2020;15(5):e0232937.
- 348 12. Friedman DB, Kanwat CP, Headrick ML, Patterson NJ, Neely JC, Smith LU. Importance  
349 of prudent antibiotic use on dairy farms in South Carolina: a pilot project on farmers' knowledge,  
350 attitudes and practices. Zoonoses and public health. 2007;54(9-10):366-75.
- 351 13. Habing G, Djordjevic C, Schuenemann GM, Lakritz J. Understanding antimicrobial  
352 stewardship: Disease severity treatment thresholds and antimicrobial alternatives among organic  
353 and conventional calf producers. Preventive veterinary medicine. 2016;130:77-85.
- 354 14. Young I, Hendrick S, Parker S, Rajić A, McClure JT, Sanchez J, et al. Knowledge and  
355 attitudes towards food safety among Canadian dairy producers. Preventive veterinary medicine.  
356 2010;94(1-2):65-76.
- 357 15. Hoe FG, Ruegg PL. Opinions and practices of wisconsin dairy producers about  
358 biosecurity and animal well-being. J Dairy Sci. 2006;89(6):2297-308.
- 359 16. Ekakoro JE, Caldwell M, Strand EB, Okafor CC. Drivers of Antimicrobial Use Practices  
360 among Tennessee Dairy Cattle Producers. Vet Med Int. 2018;2018:1836836.
- 361 17. McIntosh W, Dean W. Factors associated with the inappropriate use of antimicrobials.  
362 Zoonoses and public health. 2015;62 Suppl 1:22-8.
- 363 18. Vasquez AK, Foditsch C, Dulièpre SC, Siler JD, Just DR, Warnick LD, et al.  
364 Understanding the effect of producers' attitudes, perceived norms, and perceived behavioral  
365 control on intentions to use antimicrobials prudently on New York dairy farms. PLoS One.  
366 2019;14(9):e0222442.

367 19. Chen LF, Vander Weg MW, Hofmann DA, Reisinger HS. The Hawthorne Effect in  
368 Infection Prevention and Epidemiology. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*.  
369 2015;36(12):1444-50.

370

371 Address for correspondence: Ashley Kates, Clinical Science Center, 600 Highland Ave,  
372 Madison, WI 63792, USA; email: [akates@medicine.wisc.edu](mailto:akates@medicine.wisc.edu)

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385 Table 1. Number of barriers and facilitators associated with each SEIPS element

	Facilitators	Barriers
<hr/>		
Organization		
Communication with Management	36	5
Rules and Protocols	49	18
Organization Culture	14	3
Safety	21	11
Work Schedule/ Routines	18	2
Tasks		
Administering medications	11	2
Handwashing	26	9
PPE use	22	6
Tools and Technology		
Laundry	13	4
Boots	17	6
Clothing	33	10
Farm equipment	22	5

---

---

Hand hygiene tools	10	2
Medications	18	4
Environment (Physical)		
Physical Layout/ equipment	26	6
Cleaning and maintaining cleanliness	13	4
Person/ People		
Knowledge of antibiotics (personal)	31	16
Farm antibiotic use	11	4

---

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395 Table 2. Representative quotes associated with each SEIPS element

SEIPS Element	Quotations
Organization (communication, protocols, culture, and safety)	<p><i>Well, we are all clear on the job that we do.</i></p> <p><i>...they give us work protocols, and from there, they are reviewing constantly that there aren't deviations from the protocols.</i></p> <p><i>It's optional if you it or not. But they do provide you with safety glasses. They give you gloves, bags, and aprons. And then you decide if you're going to use them or not.</i></p>
Tasks (Hand hygiene, administering medications, use of personal protective equipment)	<p><i>Yeah, there are specific people that can use that. We, I can't touch the antibiotics.</i></p> <p><i>Every time a calf is born, you to change all the, if you are milking, you're using gloves, you have to change. You can change the tank, you have to wash your boots, change gloves, so they're clean and change yourself so that, to not</i></p>

---

*contaminate the milk at all. That's what we do.*

Tools and Technology

*I mean, I rinse off my boots, but if I, you know, have to run somewhere quick after, I might change. But, I mean, other than that I just, I'm five minutes away...*

*I believe that, for your own good, well, we have to use gloves...because, if not, we are going to be getting sick all the time.*

Environment (physical layout, maintaining cleanliness)

*We have a changing area where our lockers are. Each worker is assigned a locker where they keep their personal things. When you come in, you change. We keep the clothing we use for work here. It's washed and dried here.*

*Yes, washer and dryer. So you come here. You have a locker area, and there's going to be a big pile of clothing...a big pile. From there, you pick out what is yours. You get dressed. You put your clean clothes in your locker, and you can go.*

---

---

Person/ People (personal  
knowledge of antibiotics  
use/resistance and personal  
experiences)

*Perhaps if the farm was smaller, they would teach us more  
but not this big. There are too many people.*

*Well, there are bacteria that can be passed to others. That's  
also why, when someone is sick, it's very important that they  
have a face mask on because sometimes they cough, and if  
there's someone close by, they could breathe that in. Here,  
when people are sick like that, they almost always ask for the  
day off to rest. And, well, in some ways, rest is the best thing.*

---

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403 Table 3. Observations of general biosafety practices on the farms

---

	Yes	404
	(N=8)	405
Workers launder clothing/shoes before leaving farm	5	406
Coveralls are provided to workers	3	407
Boots and/or shoe coverings are provided to workers	2	408
Workers typically eat in the breakroom/kitchen	4	409
Personnel vehicles are allowed past the entry	3	410
		411

---

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420 Table 4. Observations of biosafety, personal protective equipment use and availability by farm

421 zone



---

Zone	Yes (N=8)
<hr/>	
Entry	
Limiting non-essential traffic	4
Visitor entry	3
Visitor sign-in	3
Visitor's provided PPE	0
Locker Facilities	
Boot wash station	2
Access to working showers	3
Breakroom and Kitchen	
Boot wash station	1
Clean tables for eating/food preparation	6
Refrigerators for food storage only	7
Hand hygiene station	8
Hand hygiene instructions	2
Microbiology/nutrition lab present	1
Bathroom Facilities	

---

---

	Boot wash station	3
	Working showers	3
	Hand Hygiene station	8
	Hand hygiene instructions	3
Laundry Room		
	Laundry done on-site	8
	Proper use instructions	3
	Clean equipment	5
	Operational equipment	7
	Commercial grade equipment	8
Milking Parlor		
	Easily accessible gloves	6
	Technicians wearing gloves	8
	Technicians wearing aprons or coveralls	7
	Technicians wearing safety glasses	3
	Technicians wearing arm protection	7
	Clean bulk tank area	7

---

---

Boot wash station	4
Hand hygiene station	3
Hand hygiene instructions	2
Eye wash station	3
Soiled PPE garments changed between activities	5
Medicine Storage	
Locked entry	1
Controlled entry	4
Hand hygiene station	7
Disposable obstetrical sleeves available	5
Adult Lactating Cows	
Equipment only for healthy lactating cows	4
Hospital/Isolation Pen	
Boot wash station	3
Easily accessible gloves	5
Clothing change or protective clothing available	2
Hand hygiene station	3

---

---

	Hand hygiene instructions	1
Calving Pen/Maternity		
	Boot wash station	3
	Easily accessible gloves	6
	Hand hygiene station	6
	Hand hygiene instructions	0
Calf Housing		
	Boot wash station	6
	Easily accessible gloves	6
	Workers wearing PPE	7
	Hand hygiene station	6
	Hand hygiene instructions	0
	Restricted access to calf housing	3
	Equipment for calf use only	5
Dry Cows		
	Easily accessible gloves	3
	Boot wash station	2

---

---

Hand hygiene station	4
Hand hygiene instructions	1

---

422

423

424

425

426 Figure 1. Systems Engineering in Patient Safety (SEIPS) model adapted for use on dairy farms.

427 Headers represent the original SEIPS categories and bullet points represent how these categories  
428 related to dairy operations.

429 Figure 2. Flowchart of study enrollment. HU=high use farms; LU=Low use farms. \*Two  
430 separate focus groups were conducted on two of the farms.

431 **Appendix Figure 1.** Direct observations checklist.

WORK SYSTEM

PROCESS

OUTCOMES

**Environment**

- > Physical layout
- > Cleanliness

**People/Person**

- > Knowledge of rules
- > Knowledge of antibiotics (personal & on farm)

**Tools/ Technology**

- > Laundering Facilities
- > Hand-washing (soap)
- > PPE (Gloves, boots, etc)
- > Veterinary medications

**Tasks**

- > Hand-washing
- > PPE use
- > Administering medications
- > Eating
- > Animal care
- > Dairy production

**Organization**

- > Communication
- > Rules/Protocols
- > Culture
- > Safety

**Processes**

- > Animal care
- > Farm maintenance

**Employee**

- > Behaviors associated with ARG exposure
- > Barriers and facilitators to promote optimal risk reduction

**Organization**

- > Healthy workers and animals

External Environment



