

## Chapter 16

### Agreement in classification between WRFS 1 and WRFS 2

#### 16.1 INTRODUCTION

One of the aims of the study was to compare the rate and circumstances of fatalities that occurred during the study period with those that occurred during the three years covered by WRFS 1. The validity of such a comparison is maximised by ensuring that, as much as possible:

- the two studies used similar definitions;
- the availability of relevant information was similar between the two studies; and
- the application of the definitions was similar between the two studies.

These aspects are all relevant to attempting to ensure that the type of fatal incidents identified as being work-related (or not work-related) in WRFS 2 would have been similarly identified for WRFS 1.

The definitions used for WRFS 2 were developed with the comparison in mind, and the two studies used similar definitions and inclusion/exclusion criteria, especially for work-related cases of workers. Similarities and differences between the definitions used for the studies are considered in more detail in Chapter 3.

The availability of relevant information is largely dependent on the quality of the coronial files. Ad-hoc comparison of files from the WRFS 2 period with those from the WRFS 1 period suggested that the detail included in the coronial files had improved between the two studies. However, the improvement was inconsistent within and between jurisdictions, and was not of an extent that was likely to significantly influence

the likelihood of files being able to be appropriately classified, except possibly for motor vehicle incident deaths, for which ascertainment of work-related deaths was probably more reliable in the second study. Similarities and differences between the quality of information in the coronial files available for the studies are considered in more detail in Chapter 3.

The third aspect regarding valid comparison, that of the application of the definitions, is considered in detail in this Chapter.

The aim of the work presented here was to:

- determine the level of coding agreement between research officers from WRFS 1 and WRFS 2; and
- identify circumstances that were differently classified by research officers from the two studies.

## **16.2 METHODS**

For both WRFS 1 and WRFS 2, deaths were classified as “Cases”, “Indeterminates” or “Non-cases”. Cases were further classified into more specific categories. In addition, for WRFS 2, Indeterminates were classified as to what categories of work-relatedness were being considered. For example, if a process worker was killed in a motor vehicle incident at 0630 hours on a Monday, but there was no information as to why the person was travelling at the time, the death would probably be classified as an indeterminate commuting case. The same circumstances for WRFS 1 would have resulted in a general indeterminate code.

Short descriptions of each death, and the accompanying classification, were recorded on cards by WRFS 1 officers during the WRFS 1 data collection. For some non-cases and Indeterminates, there was little or no information available on the circumstances. For deaths classified as cases, more detailed information was available in the form of coded data and structured text. This information was available for use in the comparison described here.

A random selection of deaths was made from each of the case, indeterminate and non-case groups from WRFS 1. The intention was to select about 100 deaths from each jurisdiction, with the ratio 5:2:3 for case : indeterminate : non-case, based on the classifications made by the WRFS 1 study team. This weighting to the inclusion of cases was designed because the accuracy of the applied codes for cases was of primary interest in this comparison. For New South Wales and Victoria, in which there were more deaths and more data collectors than in other jurisdictions, approximately 200 deaths were selected, in the same ratio (Table 16.1). A different data collection method had been used in Queensland for WRSF 1 and, as a result, there was no information on Indeterminate cases for this State.

The deaths, once selected, were then sorted randomly and the name, date of death and coronial file number recorded on sheets of paper, five to a page. These sheets were used by the WRFS 2 research officers to identify the relevant coronial files in the jurisdiction in which the officers were working. The files were then identified in the coronial archives, read, classified according to the definitions used for WRFS 2, and a brief description made of the deaths. This classification was performed without knowledge of the classification assigned by the WRFS 1 research officers. Each of the officers in a given jurisdiction classified approximately the same number of files, or, in the case of

Victoria, the appropriate number of files in proportion to how long they had been classifying files in the study, as some research officers were recruited after data collection started. This classification was performed in all jurisdictions except the Northern Territory, for which files from the WRFS 1 period were not available.

**Table 16.1 Comparison of classification of WRFS 1 deaths by WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers: selection of deaths from WRFS 1.**

Jurisdiction <sup>1</sup>	Cases	Indeterminate	Non-case	Total
<b>ACT</b>	20	31	45	96
<b>NSW</b>	132	33	64	229
<b>QLD</b>	73	0	23	96
<b>SA</b>	43	20	35	98
<b>TAS</b>	62	14	29	105
<b>VIC</b>	94	36	61	191
<b>WA</b>	39	18	25	82
<b>Australia</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>897</b>

1: Northern Territory files were not included as they were no longer available for the WRFS 1 period.

The codes assigned by the WRFS 2 officers to each death were then compared to the codes originally assigned by the WRFS 1 officers. Since there were some case categories used in WRFS 2 that were not used in WRFS 1 (17: Road Bystander; and 18: Other Farm), such codes assigned by the WRFS 2 coders were modified at the analysis stage to make them consistent with the categories used for WRFS 1. This involved most deaths classified as “7” and “18” being re-coded to non-cases. The exceptions to this were where the description specifically stated that the officer did not know what the deceased person was doing at the time (in which instance the death was re-coded as indeterminate), or, in the case of on-farm deaths, the description clearly stated that the person could also have been considered to be a workplace bystander (in which instance they were re-coded as a bystander case).

The codes assigned by the officers from the two studies were then compared, using Kappa as a measure of agreement. Kappa was calculated using the method described by Fleiss (1981). When considering the results for the whole of Australia, Kappa was calculated using the combined data from the seven jurisdictions. An adjusted Kappa was also calculated for Australia by weighting the jurisdiction-specific Kappa values by the proportion of all files classified in each jurisdiction during WRFS 2. Also, the circumstances of deaths where there was disagreement were inspected to see if the reason for the discrepancies could be identified. In incidents where more than one death occurred, only one death from each such incident was included.

Comparison was initially made on the basis of the three main categories (Case, Indeterminate and Non-case), with Cases being any death identified as being of a worker, commuter, volunteer, student, home duties person or workplace bystander. Additional comparisons were also made, using a combined Indeterminate/Non-case group compared to cases. For these comparisons, Cases were defined in two ways. Firstly, cases included all the above specific case categories. Secondly, only working deaths were included as cases, with the other case categories re-assigned to the Indeterminate/Non-case group. This last comparison was regarded as the most useful one for assessing the validity of the comparison of results from WRFS 1 and WRFS 2, because the results were being compared primarily on the basis of the identification of working cases in the two studies (see Chapter 6).

## **16.3 RESULTS**

### **OVERALL COMPARISON**

Eight hundred and ninety seven WRFS 1 files were classified by the WRFS 2 officers, comprising 463 (51.6%) cases, 152 (16.9%) Indeterminates and 282 non-cases (31.4%) as classified by WRFS 1 officers. Fifty four additional files were listed for this coding comparison but were unable to be found in the coronial archives by the WRFS 2 officers. The comparison is summarised for Australia in the Tables 16.2 to 16.4.

Overall agreement was 0.81 (723 of 897 files), with a Kappa of 0.68, and an adjusted Kappa of 0.64. The agreement for each jurisdiction ranged from 0.69 in South Australia to 0.87 in Tasmania, and the corresponding Kappas from a low of 0.33 for Queensland to a high of 0.77 for New South Wales (Table 5). Most of the disagreement arose from deaths classified as indeterminate by one study group and non-case by the other study group. WRFS 1 officers were more likely to classify deaths as indeterminate (16.9% of the total) than WRFS 2 officers (12.9% of the total), and 61% (106/174) of the discordant codes arose from this source of disagreement (Table 16.2).

### **COMPARING CASES TO COMBINED INDETERMINATES/NON-CASES**

Since the results from the two studies are based on information about cases, differences in agreement between the Indeterminate and Non-case categories are of little practical importance. Therefore, the Indeterminate and Non-case categories were collapsed for further analysis. Once this was done, overall agreement increased to 0.92 (ranging from 0.86 to 0.97), the Kappa to 0.85 (range 0.61 to 0.94) and the adjusted Kappa to 0.82 (Tables 16.3 and 16.5).

**Table 16.2 Comparison of classification of WRFS 1 deaths by WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers: all three categories**

		Case	WRFS 1		Total
			Indeterminate	Non-case	
WRFS 2	Case	431	10	26	467
	Indeterminate	24	64	28	116
	Non-case	8	78	228	314
	<b>Total</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>897</b>

**Table 16.3 Comparison of classification of WRFS 1 deaths by WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers: combining indeterminate and non-case categories**

		Case	WRFS 1	Total
			Non-case	
WRFS 2	Case	431	36	467
	Non-case	32	398	430
	<b>Total</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>434</b>	<b>897</b>

The final comparison involved considering as cases only the deaths of working persons, with all other work-related deaths being re-assigned to the combined Indeterminate/Non-case category. This analysis of working deaths (versus all other deaths) is regarded as the most appropriate one when assessing the effect of coding disagreement on comparisons between the two studies. For this analysis, the level of agreement between the two studies was very high. The overall agreement was 0.96, with the lowest level, in Queensland, being 0.88. The overall Kappa was 0.92, and the adjusted Kappa was 0.91. Only 34 (3.8%) of the 897 deaths were coded differently using this approach, and a similar number of these deaths were coded as cases by one study and non-cases by the other (Tables 16.4 and 16.5).

**Table 16.4 Comparison of classification of WRFS 1 deaths by WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers: combining indeterminate and non-case categories and including only working deaths as cases**

		Case	WRFS 1 Non-case	Total
WRFS 2	Case	334	16	<b>350</b>
	Non-case	18	529	<b>547</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>897</b>

**Table 16.5 Comparison of classification of WRFS 1 cases by WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers: agreement and Kappa values**

Jurisdiction	All categories		Combining Indeterminates and non-cases		Using only working deaths as cases	
	Agree <sup>1</sup>	Kappa	Agree	Kappa	Agree	Kappa
ACT	0.77	0.63	0.92	0.76	0.97	0.89
NSW	0.86	0.77	0.94	0.89	0.99	0.97
QLD	0.74	0.33	0.86	0.61	0.88	0.74
SA	0.69	0.51	0.92	0.83	0.96	0.90
TAS	0.87	0.75	0.97	0.94	0.96	0.92
VIC	0.82	0.71	0.93	0.86	0.98	0.97
WA	0.78	0.64	0.88	0.76	0.94	0.87
<b>Australia</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.92</b>
<b>Australia (adj)<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.64</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.91</b>

1: Agreement

2: Adjusted Kappa (Australia)

#### SOURCES OF DISAGREEMENT

The brief text descriptions of the circumstances recorded by the WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers for each of the deaths for which there was a coding disagreement contained very similar information. This implies that the officers involved for each of the two studies identified similar key data from the same files, but that for a few files the interpretation of the information varied.

An example of this was a death which a WRFS 2 officer coded as working:

*“Foreman tool setter who fell at work and at a later date hit his head at work. He didn’t seek medical attention and died as a result of raised intra-cranial pressure due to a sub-dural haematoma.”*

The same death was coded as indeterminate by a WRFS 1 officer:

*“Sustained minor head injury and a fall at work, but unable to determine if they caused death. Open finding given. Also suffered from fainting spells.”*

Nearly all the files where there was a discrepancy in the information recorded involved motor vehicle incidents. For most of these, only one of the officers had identified specific information in the file which explained the purpose of the journey of the deceased person. This situation resulted in a definite classification as a case or non-case by one officer, and an indeterminate classification by the other officer, because the second officer did not know the purpose of the journey. For example, a WRFS 2 officer coded a death as indeterminate, recording:

*“Male, riding his motorcycle in the early hours of the morning. Hit a kangaroo and then a cement post. No other information other than he was an air traffic controller. Perhaps on his way to work?”*

The same death was coded as commuting by a WRFS 1 officer, and described as:

*“Riding his motorcycle to work along a highway when he collided with a kangaroo – suggests he then slid along the road and struck a concrete guide post.”*

Differences also arose from different interpretation of when work activity started or stopped, often leading to one research officer coding a death as working and the other as

commuting, or of whether certain travel was for work purposes. A few other discrepancies in coding appeared to arise from either mis-reading the file or from simple mistakes in applying the coding rules. In nearly all instances of discordance, it appeared that the classification of the death as a case, by whichever research officer was involved, was correct (Table 16.6).

#### **16.4 CONCLUSIONS**

The coding agreement between officers from WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 for WRFS 1 deaths was very high, especially when considering the allocation of deaths as either working cases or not. This high level of agreement supports the conclusion that the definitions used for the two studies were very similar and were similarly applied by different research officers working in two different study teams and about nine years apart.

No systematic differences between the coding of officers between the two studies were identified, apart from a slightly greater tendency for WRFS 1 coders to code files as indeterminate rather than as non-cases. For the deaths that were coded differently, the main source of disagreement seemed to arise from different interpretations of the same information. These differences highlighted some circumstances (“grey areas”) that proved difficult to code consistently, as well as a problem with identifying the level of uncertainty required to definitively classify a death as a case or, more commonly, as a non-case. The difficulty in distinguishing between Indeterminates and non-cases is not surprising, because the distinction between the two categories relies heavily on the level of certainty required to make a definitive assignment. In most instances, it was clear when a death should be included as a case. However, the information required to confidently exclude a death as a non-case was harder to determine and so harder to standardise. Most of the deaths coded as indeterminate by WRFS 1 and as non-cases

for WRFS 2 involved motor vehicle incidents, with the uncertainty surrounding the purpose of the journey of the deceased person.

**Table 16.6 Comparison of classification and description of WRFS 1 deaths coded differently by WRFS 1 and WRFS 2 officers: combining indeterminate and non-case categories and including only deaths coded as working by a research officer**

Case	WRFS 2 officer Code Description	WRFS 1 officer Code Description	Comment
WA 3	Commuter Painter contracted for work in country town, Had single MVA. BAC 0.178%	Worker Arrived in town, collected rent-a-car hired by employer, collected paint supplies and then had MVA.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 1 code seems correct
TAS 3	Home duties Cleaning up own property to build house. Used tractor to pull log. Tractor flipped and pinned deceased underneath.	Worker Subject clearing log from disused sawmill in cleaning up site with purpose of erecting home. The tractor he was using flipped completely over back axle, pinning him beneath the tractor.	Different interpretation of what constitutes work. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
ACT 1	Bystander Male, 10 years, killed in a garbage truck when going for a ride with friend's Dad who operated the truck. He was playing in the back when the other kid operated the crushing device.	Worker Primary school student. Friend's father was a garbage collector. Friend often went out collecting with his father, performing appropriate tasks, and when the subject was staying with them, he went too. The friend decided to operate the ramming device. The subject climbed into the truck while it was compressing the garbage and the ramming device squashed his head.	Different interpretation of whether the boy's activity amounted should be considered to be work. The classification is difficult, since it is not clear if he was receiving any benefit from his "work", but the WRFS 1 code seems correct.
ACT 2	Indeterm - worker 33yr male. Storeman-driver crushed between truck and wall when handbrake failed. No information as to why he was there or if he was there for work. I strongly suspect it is a 11 (ie working case), but since no information, must be a 29 (indeterminate).	Worker Storeman/driver left a truck he was driving in the course of his employment in neutral with the hand brake on in the driveway. He walked between the truck and a brick wall and the truck rolled back and crushed him.	Not clear whether the WRFS 1 officer made a (reasonable) assumption about the purpose of the activity, or if more information was available/found by the WRFS 1 officer. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
NSW 1	Indeterm - general Died as a result of stab wounds. No other information. Inquest terminated.	Worker Was a ship's bosun who while on board a ship had a fight with the cook who stabbed him	Different information available. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
NSW 2	Indeterm - worker Fumigating and waterproofing a garage he was going to use as storage, while drinking alcohol, with the car engine running. Carbon monoxide poisoning	Worker Owned giftware store. Had just leased a garage, which he was going to use for storing stationary and cards. Prior to storing, he decided to damp-proof the garage and erect shelving, leaving his utility running to provide light and power while he did so. He died of carbon monoxide poisoning.	Not clear if more information was available/found by the WRFS 1 officer, or whether the WRFS 2 officer interpreted it differently. The WRFS 1 code seems correct
QLD 8	Indeterm - general Unemployed. Died from chest injuries on a property. Need more information	Worker Occupation stated as unemployed but he was last seen trying to yard horses on his property. Was found at the bottom of a gully apparently after falling off his horse.	Different information available. Not clear which code is correct.

**Table 16.6 continued**

<b>Case</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>WRFS 2 officer Description</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>WRFS 1 officer Description</b>	<b>Comment</b>
QLD 5	Indeterm - worker	Deckhand/ barman - fall from height. Unable to determine if work related.	Worker	Employed as deckhand/ barman on a cruise boat. Subject was assisting with lines and lost balance and fell from the boat onto a concrete ramp (20 feet) and then into the water.	Different information available. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
QLD 6	Indeterm - worker	Female escort died in her home {as a result of attack by} males convicted of manslaughter. Unsure if worker at the time.	Worker	Female escort found lying on floor beside her bed. Had a deep laceration to throat.	Not clear whether the WRFS 1 officer made a (reasonable) assumption about the circumstances of the death, or if more information was available/found by the WRFS 1 officer. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
QLD 7	Indeterm - worker	Farmhand kicked by a horse. Need more info.	Worker	Deceased was worker with horses when one kicked him in the chest. Admitted to hospital and died 26 days after accident.	Different information available. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
VIC 2	Indeterm - commuter	Passenger in car that left the roadway to avoid an animal and struck a tree. Were members of the army reserve that were photographing a bridge for a future exercise and the deceased was travelling to get a bolt for an alternator on the return journey.	Worker	Passenger in a motor car that hit a tree. The victim and three others had been photographing and inspecting an old bridge for the Army Reserve for a future exercise involving its demolition. A nut was discovered missing on a bolt on the Starter Motor of one of the two cars and it was decided to drive into town to get a replacement. It was on returning from obtaining a nut and bolt that the motor car accident occurred.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 1 code seems correct
VIC 3	Indeterm - worker	Was the driver of a passenger charter boat that had taken out a group of divers. On his return, he dropped the divers at a jetty and then took off, with just himself on board. Boat was reported missing and body not recovered.	Worker	Disappeared when his vessel foundered and his body was not recovered. The deceased had taken a party of people out on a diving training exercise in his boat, which was used for both pleasure and, as in this case, business. Later that day, he dropped off his passengers and their equipment. He then sailed his boat from this point towards where he had set out from (his car was parked there), but he never reached his destination.	Different interpretation of when the work activity finished. The WRFS 1 code seems correct

**Table 16.6 continued**

<b>Case</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>WRFS 2 officer Description</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>WRFS 1 officer Description</b>	<b>Comment</b>
WA 4	Indeterm - commuter	Deceased driver of dodge truck that collided with a semi-trailer.	Worker	Spending a few days helping collect old railway sleepers, commercially, from along a railway line. Unclear if he received remuneration.	Possibly had different information. Not clear which code is correct.
ACT 2	Non-case	34 year old male. 1.30am. Passenger in a car with drunk driver travelling 160 km/h. Hit a taxi.	Worker	Taxi driver who was involved in a MVA whilst transporting a client.	Looks like the file was misread by one of the officers. Not clear which code is correct.
SA 2	Non-case	Driver of car collided with a truck. Deceased intended to pick up a horse from a farm property.	Worker	Vehicle is subject's workplace on occasions such as when accident occurred. Horse he was going to pick up was for another client.	Not clear whether the WRFS 1 officer made a (reasonable) assumption about the circumstances of the death, or if more information was available/found by the WRFS 1 officer. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
TAS 2	On-farm	Deceased attempting to put fire break around stockpile of wood when was burnt from bush fire in area.	Worker	Subject finished usual job early (process worker) in order to go to timber stockpile he had on a property which was under threat from bush fire with intention of building firebreak and retrieving tractor. Was leasing bush land on which he was establishing firewood business. Several witnesses saw him drive by truck into bush area before fire swept through and did not see him return after fire. His burnt body was found in his burnt-out truck.	Not clear if more information was available/found by the WRFS 1 officer, or whether the WRFS 2 officer interpreted it differently. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.
VIC 1	Non-case	Survey assistant driving to check out accommodation when his vehicle collided with a grader.	Worker	The subject was driving a government vehicle when it collided with a grader. The subject and his assistant were travelling to check out accommodation for a job that was to be done after Easter.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 1 code seems correct
WA 2	On-farm	Invalid pensioner – mentally retarded, holidaying on farm of friends. Entered paddock to move stock without assistance – gored to death by bull in enclosure.	Worker	Subject was somewhat mentally retarded. He had been befriended by a farmer and periodically had spent time living with the farmer and his family and working on their farm. Whether any monetary payment was made for the work is unclear. At the time of accident, the subject had been on the farm for about 5 months continuously. He looked after a vegetable patch and helped with livestock. He was crushed by a bull in paddock.	Different interpretation of what constituted work. The WRFS 1 code seems correct.

**Table 16.6 continued**

<b>Case</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>WRFS 2 officer Description</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>WRFS 1 officer Description</b>	<b>Comment</b>
QLD 9	Worker	Air crash - pilot. Private aircraft that was chartered by a rural hospital to fly a doctor out to an outpatients' clinic that crashed into trees.	Commuter	The subject had just taken off to return home after charter flights with doctor when plane was seen to go down behind trees at end of runway.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct, as the pilot is still performing work duties.
QLD 11	Worker	Electrical contractor failed to give way at an intersection and had an MVA with another car.	Commuter	At 6.00 a.m. the deceased and his son picked up another man and set off to work. As he drove through an intersection his van was hit in the side by a car travelling along the road.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct, because the contractor has picked up the other man as part of his job, so by the time of the incident he should be deemed to be at work.
QLD 12	Worker	Carpenter's labourer passenger in ute travelling to a construction job. Driver lost control and hit a power pole.	Commuter	The driver and his two passengers were involved in a motor vehicle accident when the truck ran into the gravel and collided with a timber power pole. Both passengers were killed.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct
SA 1	Worker	Fisherman in MVA. At time of accident he was working for the National Parks and Wildlife service.	Commuter	Travelling home in a NPandW {National Parks and Wildlife} ute after planting grass all day. Also a commercial fisherman.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct, because the man hasn't finished work until he has returned to his usual base of work.
TAS 4	Worker	Deceased was travelling to her school (sister at convent). Car left road and collided with a truck tray parked on the side of the road.	Commuter	Subject died from injuries received in a MVA. Subject was a presentation nun who moved around the State lecturing, and was known to be going to a convent school on that day.	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct, because the nun is essentially on a business trip, driving around the State to deliver lectures.
WA 1	Worker	Drowned when dingy swamped by a wave. Employed as a deckhand.	Commuter	Deceased and another deckhand attempting to attach a line to another dingy which was sinking when wave broke over stern of dingy. Deceased a non-swimmer.	This seems to have been a mistaken coded by the WRFS 1 officer.
QLD 10	Worker	On board a trawler when it was going to assist a yacht in trouble when it capsized. Deceased was an area officer for the Department of Harbour and Marine.	Volunteer	Harbour master who asked to accompany a trawler going out to rescue a yacht in difficulty. The trawler capsized and the man was drowned.	Different interpretation of what constitutes work The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
NSW 3	Worker	Foreman tool setter who fell at work and at a later date hit his head at work. He didn't seek medical attention and died as a result of raised intra-cranial pressure due to a sub-dural haematoma.	Indeterm	Sustained minor head injury and a fall at work, but unable to determine if they caused death. Open finding given. Also suffered from fainting spells.	Different interpretation of the required connection to work. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.

**Table 16.6 continued**

<b>Case</b>	<b>WRFS 2 officer</b>	<b>WRFS 1 officer</b>	<b>Comment</b>
	<b>Code</b>	<b>Code</b>	
	<b>Description</b>	<b>Description</b>	
SA 4	Worker	Indeterm	Different interpretation of the required level of certainty. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	Driver of ute in single MVA with a car. Letter stating workers comp claim by widow.	But for solicitor's letter mentioning intention of wife to claim workers' comp, this case would be classified indeterminate.	
WA 5	Worker	Indeterm	Not clear if more information was available/found by one of the officers, or whether one of the officers interpreted it differently.
	Accidental electrocution while working on an electric motor of an old washing machine.	Electrocuted while trying to test a washing machine motor in his shed at home. Contractor. Unclear if activity at time of injury was part of his work. Info available suggests he knew little about the task.	
QLD 1	Worker	Non-case	Not clear if more information was available/found by the WRFS 2 officer, or whether the WRFS 1 officer interpreted it differently. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	MVA - pedestrian struck by car. Deceased at fault and was apparently collecting cans from the side of the road. He was a pensioner.	An elderly man stepped out on to the roadway without looking and was hit by a motor vehicle.	
QLD 2	Worker	Non-case	Different interpretation of what constitutes work. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	MVA - pedestrian. Was collecting aluminium cans for pocket money when hit by a car as she crossed to road.	Collecting cans (for pocket money) along the highway with her father and sister. Hit by a car as she crossed the road after picking up a can.	
QLD 3	Worker	Non-case	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	Company director - passenger in car on a business trip, when car lost control, rolled and ignited	A company director, died as a result of injuries he received in a motor vehicle accident. En route to a function with fellow employees at the Coast.	
QLD 4	Worker	Non-case	Not clear if more information was available/found by the WRFS 2 officer, or whether the WRFS 1 officer interpreted it differently. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	Hairdresser using petrol to remove adhesive from lino floor tiles when an electric polisher sparked and ignited the room. Property was an investment for the deceased.	Had removed vinyl tiles from the floor and then covered the floor with petrol to soften the adhesive so that it could be removed by using an electric floor polisher. When he switched on the polisher there was an instant explosion and fire and the deceased was thrown to the floor in flames.	
SA 3	Worker	Non-case	Not clear if more information was available/found by the WRFS 2 officer, or whether the WRFS 1 officer interpreted it differently. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	Manager of vineyard estate and racing horses. Thrown from horse while he was training it.	It is unclear whether the deceased was engaged in work required of him as the vineyard foreman or whether it was his own work he was doing. ie training his own race horse. Evidence suggests it was his horse.	
TAS 1	Worker	Non-case	Different interpretation of when travel is part of work duties. The WRFS 2 code seems correct.
	Deceased driving car and had single MVA. Deceased was working at time of death.	Co-director of a company, traveling with her friend and co-director. They concluded some business and left separately in their own vehicles. The purpose of the journey was then uncertain, but probably to go to pre-arranged accommodation.	