
**MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI
UNIVERSITATEA "VALAHIA" DIN TÂRGOVIȘTE
IOSUD – ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE ȘTIINȚE ECONOMICE
ȘI UMANISTE
DOMENIUL MANAGEMENT**

REZUMATUL TEZEI DE DOCTORAT

**MANAGEMENTUL RISCURILOR PSIHOSOCIALE ÎN
SECTORUL AGRICOL DIN ROMÂNIA**

**CONDUCĂTOR DE DOCTORAT:
Prof.univ.dr. Delia Mioara POPESCU**

**DOCTORAND:
Cătălin Ionuț LĂSCAIE**

**TÂRGOVIȘTE
2022**

CUPRINS

Importanța, actualitatea și motivația temei abordate _____	5
Stadiul cunoașterii în domeniul riscurilor psihosociale _____	52
Structura tezei de doctorat _____	53
Specificul metodologic al cercetării _____	54
Obiectivele cercetării _____	55
Ipotezele cercetării _____	56
Analiza de corelație și verificarea ipotezelor _____	57
Concluzii finale _____	59
Contribuții personale _____	63
1. Contribuții teoretice cu caracter de sinteză _____	63
2. Contribuții teoretice în domeniul managementului riscurilor psihosociale _____	63
3. Contribuții experimentale _____	64
4. Contribuții la optimizarea cadrului normativ al managementului riscurilor psihosociale _____	65
5. Contribuții la dezvoltarea cercetării științifice _____	65
Direcții viitoare de cercetare _____	66

CUPRINSUL TEZEI DE DOCTORAT

LISTA ABREVIERILOR/3

LISTA FIGURILOR/4

LISTA TABELELOR/10

INTRODUCERE/12

CAPITOLUL 1. STADIUL CUNOAȘTERII ÎN DOMENIUL RISCURILOR PSIHOSOCIALE/17

1.1. Conceptualizarea și semnificația riscului/ 17

1.2. Augmentarea riscurilor sistemice/ 19

1.2.1. Riscurile schimbărilor climatice / 21

1.2.2. Riscurile tehnologice/ 23

1.2.3. Riscurile asociate contextului socio-economic actual/ 26

1.2.4. Cadrul riscurilor pentru securitatea și siguranța în muncă/29

1.3. Necesitatea cercetării riscurilor psihosociale/ 32

1.3.1. Factorii de risc psihosociale din mediul de lucru/ 34

1.3.2. Influența stresului asupra productivității muncii/ 38

1.3.3. Abordarea riscurilor psihosociale la nivelul Uniunii Europene/ 41

1.3.4. Direcții și tendințe în managementul riscurilor psihosociale la nivelul Uniunii Europene/ 46

1.4. Teorii și modele de cercetare a riscurilor psihosociale/ 47

1.4.1. Modelul dezechilibrului efort-recompensă la locul de muncă/ 51

1.4.2. Teoria cereri de muncă – resurse/ 54

1.4.3. Modelul Health and Safety Executive, de analiză a stresului la locul de muncă/ 57

1.4.4. Cadrul general al consecințelor pentru sănătate, a stresului la locul de muncă/60

CAPITOLUL 2. MANAGEMENTUL RISCURILOR PSIHOSOCIALE ÎN AGRICULTURĂ/ 67

2.1. Imperativul agrar/67

2.2. Cadrul riscurilor psihosociale și de reziliență a fermierilor/69

2.2.1. Nivel politic/mediu/73

2.2.2. Nivelul instituțiilor guvernamentale/75

2.2.3. Nivelul comunitar /77

2.2.4. Nivel organizațional/78

2.2.5. Nivel individual/84

2.3. Riscuri și predictorii de stres actuali pentru fermieri, la nivelul Uniunii Europene/87

2.3.1. Efectele schimbărilor structurale asupra agriculturii în Uniunea Europeană/87

2.3.2. Îmbătrânirea forței de muncă din agricultură /92

2.3.3. Pandemia Covid 19 și criza resurselor/ 94

2.3.4. Impactul noilor tehnologii asupra securității și sănătății în muncă în agricultură/97

2.4. Determinanți ai satisfacției în muncă și ai calității vieții fermierilor/99

CAPITOLUL 3. CERCETAREA EMPIRICĂ A RISCURILOR PSIHOSOCIALE ACTUALE PENTRU FERMIERII DIN ROMÂNIA/102

3.1. Contextul științific, motivația și relevanța temei de cercetare/102

3.2. Obiectivele cercetării/103

3.3. Ipotezele cercetării/104

3.4. Metodologia cercetării empirice a riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri/ 105

3.5. Descrierea compoziției eșantionului/107

3.6. Analiza și interpretarea rezultatelor/110

3.6.1. Riscurile fizice, chimice și biologice/110

3.6.2. Factorii psihosociale de risc/111

3.6.2.1. Factorii de stres excepționali/111

3.6.2.2. Factorii de stres extrinseci muncii/115

3.6.2.3. Factorii de stres intrinseci muncii/117

3.6.3. Determinanți ai rezilienței fermierilor/135

3.6.3.1. Strategiile de coping/135

3.6.3.2. Echilibrul muncă-familie/138

3.6.3.3. Satisfacția în muncă și asupra vieții/140

3.6.4. Influența stresului asupra sănătății fermierilor/142

3.6.4.1. Starea de sănătate auto-percepută/142

3.6.4.2. Simptome de stres/144

3.6.4.3. Boli legate de stres/146

3.7. Analiza de corelație și verificarea ipotezelor/148

CAPITOLUL 4. PROPUNEREA UNUI CADRU REFERENȚIAL DE EVALUARE ȘI GESTIONARE A RISCURILOR PSIHOSOCIALE PENTRU FERMIERII DIN ROMÂNIA/196

4.1. Predictorii actuali de stres în muncă pentru fermierii din România /196

4.1.1. Evaluarea riscurilor psihosociale specifice fermierilor/204

4.1.2. Conformarea la regulile de securitate și sănătate în muncă/ 207

4.2. Evaluarea, reprezentarea și compararea riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri/209

4.3. Proiectarea registrului riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri/210

4.4. Matricea nivelurilor de risc psihosocial/214

CONCLUZII/217

CONTRIBUȚII PERSONALE/222

1. Contribuții teoretice cu caracter de sinteză /222

2. Contribuții teoretice în domeniul managementului riscurilor psihosociale/222

3. Contribuții experimentale/223

4. Contribuții la optimizarea cadrului normativ al managementului riscurilor psihosociale /224

5. Contribuții la dezvoltarea cercetării științifice/224

LIMITE ȘI DIRECȚII VIITOARE DE CERCETARE/225

BIBLIOGRAFIE/226

ANEXE/247

Importanța, actualitatea și motivația temei abordate

Lumea agricolă este una de risc iar mediul psihosocial al muncii în agricultură face parte dintr-o lume complexă, în schimbare. Integrarea agriculturii în economia de piață a condus spre o vulnerabilitate crescândă a sectorului agricol. Tendințele de pe piețele globale și locale influențează direct populația agrară. Activele pot fi grav și rapid afectate de război, condiții meteorologice extreme, boli sau lipsa lichidităților.

Agricultura implică o gamă largă de utilaje, animale, plante și produse, cu care se lucrează atât în mediul interior cât și în exterior, în condiții geografice și climatice variate. Există fermieri care nu sunt conștienți de obligațiile, drepturile și responsabilitățile lor, domeniul confruntându-se cu cele mai mari provocări legate de organizarea forței de muncă, izolare geografică și diverse atitudini culturale.

Sănătatea și siguranța reprezintă o cerință fundamentală a unei afaceri agricole durabile și ar trebui considerată o parte esențială a managementului afacerilor agricole. Asumarea riscurilor este o problemă obișnuită în agricultură, iar cei care lucrează pe cont propriu sunt deosebit de vulnerabili.

Expunerea fermierilor la riscuri a crescut în timp și continuă să apară evenimente neanticipate, cu impact considerabil asupra acestora, de aceea gestionarea riscurilor psihosociale este mai importantă ca niciodată. Este responsabilitatea cercetătorilor și a factorilor de decizie, să înțeleagă complexitatea problemelor cu care se confruntă fermierii astăzi. Având în vedere acest context, este necesară o evaluare constantă a riscurilor relevante pentru activitățile fermierilor. În mod ideal, noile inițiative care încearcă să promoveze și să sprijine gestionarea holistică a riscurilor ar trebui să fie fundamentate prin dovezi, privind modul în care fermierii fac față riscurilor multiple.

Riscurile psihosociale variază enorm la nivel individual, fiind afectate de resursele materiale și sociale, factori de personalitate și culturali. Efectele stresului sunt dificil de măsurat, fiind de natură cronică sau acută, generând insatisfacție și anomie, de la un nivel scăzut până la boli mintale severe, violență și sinucidere.

În ultimele decenii, schimbările economice, sociale și politice profunde au dus la o

transformare considerabilă (și încă în desfășurare) a mediului de muncă din România. Sectorul agricol și viața rurală, ce cuprind o mare varietate de activități distincte, au cunoscut o serie de schimbări în ultimii ani.

Teza de doctorat explorează și dezvoltă bazele teoretice, metodologice și practice ale studiului riscurilor psihosociale, dintr-o perspectivă nouă și complexă, oferă o legătură necesară între cercetarea în materie de sănătate și siguranță și agricultură.

Este importantă atât pentru cercetătorii din domeniul managementului sănătății și siguranței, cât și pentru practicieni, oferă o perspectivă teoretică și empirică, bazându-se atât pe literatura existentă, cât și pe propriile cercetări, reușește să aducă mai multă claritate într-un domeniu conceptual până acum oarecum confuz, deși foarte important.

Legislația europeană și națională impune angajatorilor să protejeze securitatea și sănătatea lucrătorilor, inclusiv gestionarea riscurilor psihosociale. În acest sens atât angajații cât și angajatorii trebuie să își asume responsabilitatea gestionării riscurilor psihosociale la locul de muncă. Angajatorii au obligații și sunt responsabili pentru efectuarea evaluărilor de risc adecvate și suficiente, pentru atenuarea oricăror posibile efecte negative privind sănătatea și securitatea angajaților. În același timp este imperativă menținerea stării de sănătate a forței de muncă și asigurarea sănătății societății în general.

Relevanța cercetării întreprinse rezidă din abordarea și evidențierea factorilor de risc psihosociali pentru fermieri. Lucrarea contribuie la clarificarea unor probleme de interes general, având un număr mare de beneficiari. Rezultatele obținute aduc un plus de valoare cercetării realizate în domeniul riscurilor pentru sănătatea și siguranța lucrătorilor, abordarea propusă deschizând calea unor cercetări viitoare. Pentru o evaluare detaliată a percepțiilor fermierilor asupra riscurilor psihosociale și impactului asupra bunăstării acestora, au fost utilizate metode de cercetare calitative și cantitative care au permis realizarea obiectivelor propuse și demonstrarea ipotezelor stabilite.

Stadiul cunoașterii în domeniul riscurilor psihosociale

Munca dă oamenilor un scop în viață, ajută la modelarea și dezvoltarea identității și satisface o gamă largă de nevoi umane. Realitatea vieții profesionale de zi cu zi are implicații majore, care transformă această realitate într-o zonă de confort destul de dependentă. Pentru realizarea și menținerea activității profesionale este nevoie de mult efort, pentru a dobândi abilitățile necesare, multă muncă repetitivă și o disciplină strictă a timpului și atenției. Ca urmare, există tendința de a percepe această activitate, ca pe o parte a identității fiecărei persoane. Presiunea exterioară asupra acestei activități, este percepută ca un pericol care poate provoca tot felul de reacții de stres. O astfel de presiune poate genera emoții neplăcute, cu care cei mai mulți oameni preferă să nu se confrunte, apare tendința de a lupta împotriva unor astfel de pericole, rezultând sentimente asociate cu

conceptul de stres, ceea ce implică de fapt un răspuns inconștient și irațional.

Evidențierea tendințelor și factorilor adiacenți care au un impact asupra locurilor de muncă, poate conduce la conștientizarea modului în care schimbările tehnologice, societale, politice, economice și ecologice afectează siguranța și sănătatea lucrătorilor. În termeni generali, riscurile pentru securitatea și siguranța în muncă presupun acțiunile sau activitățile legate de locul de muncă, inclusiv alegerea inacțiunii, care pot să ducă la o pierdere sau la un rezultat nedorit. Aproape orice activitate umană prezintă un anumit risc, dar unele activități sunt mult mai riscante decât altele.

Riscurile psihosociale (PSR) sunt catalogate în prezent în categoria riscurilor emergente pentru securitatea și sănătatea profesională. Această categorie de riscuri se referă la probabilitatea ca o persoană să fie afectată, sau să aibă efecte adverse asupra sănătății dacă este expusă unui pericol psihosocial¹. Ele provin din interacțiunile dintre mediul de lucru, conținutul locului de muncă, organizarea muncii, capacitățile, cultura, considerațiile extra-job ale lucrătorilor și pot influența sănătatea, performanța în muncă și satisfacția acestora în legătură cu locul de muncă². Aceste interacțiuni includ o multitudine de factori de stres profesional.

Cerințele legate de securitate și sănătate în muncă sunt conduse de considerente morale, legale și economice și joacă un rol esențial atât pentru lucrători cât și pentru angajatori. Sistemele de management al riscurilor încearcă să sistematizeze modul în care obiectivele organizaționale sunt îndeplinite și ajută la asigurarea unei organizații durabile. Managementul securității și sănătății la locul de muncă a fost în trecut în mare parte centrat pe pericol, astăzi se încearcă însă o abordare mai cuprinzătoare. În domeniul siguranței și sănătății, reglementările legislative reprezintă nivelul minim acceptabil. Aceste reglementări reprezintă un nivel standard de siguranță care este definit specific, verificat prin inspecții și corectat prin amenzi.

Acest nivel este minim acceptabil pentru o organizație, în ceea ce privește cultura de siguranță și valorizarea stării de bine a lucrătorilor lor. Deciziile însă trebuie să aibă în vedere nu numai ceea ce este necesar, ci și ceea ce ar trebui făcut pentru a oferi un loc de muncă mai sigur, pentru a minimiza riscurile asociate activității. Astfel organizațiile ar trebui să ia în considerare cele mai bune practici și să le adapteze pentru organizația lor.

Modul în care organizațiile se confruntă cu riscurile legate de locul de muncă și îndeosebi al riscurilor psihosociale, poate diferi de contextul în care organizațiile operează.

Necesitatea îmbunătățirii sănătății și siguranței nu provine doar din considerente etice, este condusă în egală măsură de economia și cultura națională, direcțiile, barierele și politicile

¹ILO, (2012). *Workplace Stress: A Collective Challenge*, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), *Management of psychosocial risk at work: An analysis of the findings of the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risk (ESENER)*, Accesat 3.02.2021.

²Eurofound, (2021). *Psychosocial Risk*. disponibil la: <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/topic/psychosocial-risk>. Accesat 05.02.2022.

organizațiilor, mărimea și sectorul în care activează, preocupările părților interesate și cerințele naționale de reglementare.

Structura tezei de doctorat

Capitolul 1 al tezei de doctorat cuprinde o conceptualizare a semnificației riscului în cercetarea științifică, a noilor riscuri sistemice pentru securitatea și sănătatea umană. Amplificarea riscurilor sistemice produse de schimbările climatice, dezvoltarea tehnologică, globalizare și efectele pandemiei, aduce în atenție necesitatea cercetării continue a riscurilor psihosociale, din mediul de lucru actual și a influenței negative a stresului asupra productivității muncii.

Au fost detaliate influențele socio-politice și tehnologice asupra caracteristicilor muncii și riscurilor asociate, internaționalizarea riscurilor pentru sănătate, noile riscuri și vulnerabilități ale forței de muncă și a relațiilor de muncă.

În cadrul capitolului a fost realizată o prezentare a celor mai influente teorii și modele de cercetare a riscurilor psihosociale: Modelul Dezechilibrului Efort-Recompensă la locul de muncă, Teoria Cereri de Muncă – Resurse și Instrumentul indicator al stresului la locul de muncă al Health and Safety Executive, cadrul general al consecințelor pentru sănătate a stresului la locul de muncă, toate acestea constituind cadrul teoretic ce a stat la baza cercetării întreprinse în teza de doctorat.

Capitolul 2 al tezei de doctorat evidențiază cele mai noi aspecte legate de managementul riscurilor psihosociale la nivelul Uniunii Europene și conformarea la regulile de securitate și sănătate în muncă, fiind realizată o descriere a modului de abordare a riscurilor psihosociale, a direcțiilor și tendințelor în managementul riscurilor psihosociale.

Capitolul introduce în prim-planul cercetării, imperativul agrar, un aspect fundamental al cadrului riscurilor psihosociale și de reziliență a fermierilor. Acest cadru de analiză multinivel, vizează nivelul politic și de mediu, nivelul instituțiilor menite să sprijine activitatea fermierilor, nivelul comunitar, nivelul fermei, nivelul interpersonal și nivelul individual și o serie de determinanți ai satisfacției în muncă și ai calității vieții fermierilor. Sunt evidențiate riscurile mediului psihosocial de muncă în agricultură la nivelul Uniunii Europene, pornind de la efectele schimbărilor structurale asupra agriculturii, îmbătrânirea forței de muncă, pandemia de COVID-19 și criza resurselor, impactul noilor tehnologii asupra securității și sănătății lucrătorilor din agricultură.

Capitolul 3 al tezei de doctorat prezintă rezultatele cercetării empirice a riscurilor psihosociale actuale pentru fermierii din România. Obiectivele generale ale cercetării realizate prin teza de doctorat au presupus, identificarea factorilor de risc psihosocial pentru fermieri, examinarea impactului factorilor de risc psihosocial asupra sănătății individuale și a satisfacției muncii pentru fermieri, identificarea strategiilor folosite de aceștia, pentru a face față riscurilor psihosociale.

Capitolul 4 al tezei de doctorat propune un cadru referențial de evaluare și gestionare a riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri. Pornind de analiza predictorilor actuali de stres în muncă pentru fermierii din România și necesitatea conformării la regulile de securitate și sănătate în muncă a acestora, este realizată evaluarea, reprezentarea și compararea riscurilor psihosociale, proiectarea registrului riscurilor psihosociale și matricea nivelurilor de risc psihosocial pentru fermieri

Specificul metodologic al cercetării

Cercetarea empirică efectuată în cadrul tezei de doctorat a avut la bază o anchetă de tip descriptiv și a vizat fermierii cu personalitate juridică din România. Scopul acesteia a fost acela de a aduna informații cu privire la anumite aspecte și fenomene, existente în prezent în acest domeniu. Subiectele de interes pentru cercetare sunt aspecte legate de condițiile de muncă, încărcarea excesivă în muncă, cu sarcini, roluri suplimentare pe fondul schimbărilor sociale continue și multiple, concomitent cu reducerea resurselor, controlul avut asupra modului de lucru și relațiile de muncă. Au fost testate diverse surse de nemulțumire, care pot evidenția o creștere a gradului de stres în muncă, sprijin social redus, echilibrul muncă – familie, precum și unele aspecte care moderează stresul la locul de muncă.

Structurarea întrebărilor a urmărit taxonomia stabilită de Modelul de analiză a riscurilor psihosociale al Health and Safety Executive (HSE), fiind adaptată circumstanțelor specifice domeniului studiat. Astfel s-a urmărit evaluarea condițiilor generale ale muncii fermierilor din România și evidențierea posibililor factori de stres.

Abordarea HSE sugerează utilizarea unui sondaj, ca sursă utilă de informații pentru a se analiza dacă stresul reprezintă o problemă potențială pentru forța de muncă. Sondajul este doar începutul procesului de evaluare a riscurilor și un indicator larg al situației existente. Acesta poate să ofere un punct de plecare, nu un diagnostic clar al tuturor surselor posibile de stres legat de muncă.

Percepțiile individuale joacă un rol important în precizarea stării de sănătate, în condiții de stres. Opiniilor fermierilor au reprezentat un indicator util al stării de sănătate autopercepute și a potențialelor riscuri psihosociale pentru aceștia.

Cercetarea empirică realizată în teza de doctorat, a vizat obținerea unei imagini cât mai clare asupra condițiilor de muncă, a potențialilor factori psihosociale de risc pentru fermieri. Aceasta s-a concretizat prin proiectarea unui chestionar, cuprinzând 35 de întrebări, denumit Chestionar de evaluare a riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermierii din România.

Structura întrebărilor a urmărit evidențierea factorilor de risc asociați conținutului și contextului actual al muncii fermierilor: riscuri fizice, chimice, biologice, factori de stres excepționali din timpul sau ca urmare a pandemiei de COVID-19, alți factori excepționali de stres

specifici muncii în agricultură, factori de stres proveniți din cerințele extrinseci și intrinseci muncii fermierilor, factori de stres legați de controlul asupra timpului și modului de lucru, de sprijinul primit din partea autorităților și comunității, de relațiile de muncă, cei proveniți din exercitarea rolului, cei legați de percepția asupra schimbărilor, echilibrul muncă-familie, satisfacția asupra muncii. Pe de altă parte chestionarul a urmărit evidențierea reacțiilor fermierilor în fața unor situații stresante, posibilelor simptome sau boli legate de stres și o auto-raportare a stării de sănătate a acestora.

Obiectivele cercetării

Cercetarea efectuată în cadrul tezei de doctorat, a analizat o serie de condiții și cerințe specifice muncii fermierilor, precum și modul în care aceste probleme le pot afecta sănătatea fizică și psihică.

Formularea obiectivelor reprezintă o componenta esențială a oricărei cercetări. Obiectivele cercetării realizate în cadrul tezei de doctorat reprezintă scopul de bază al acesteia. Obiectivul fundamental al cercetării l-a constituit examinarea impactului factorilor de risc psihosocial asupra sănătății individuale și a satisfacției muncii, pentru fermierii din România.

Ca obiective derivate, cercetarea a urmărit analiza influențelor cerințelor actuale ale muncii fermierilor, raportate la nivelul de stres, investigarea relației dintre controlul exercitat de fermieri asupra propriilor activități și nivelul de stres, determinarea relației dintre nivelul de stres și sprijinul instituțional și comunitar acordat fermierilor din România.

Ipotezele cercetării

Formularea obiectivelor cercetării a fost urmată de crearea ipotezelor empirice, iar acestea vor fi supuse unor testări sistematice pentru a fi dovedite sau infirmate. Ipotezele postulate în cadrul cercetării indică așteptările cu privire la variabilele construite în urma aplicării chestionarului. Variabilele folosite pentru testarea și verificarea ipotezelor, au la bază fundamentarea teoretică a tezei de doctorat, fiind definite pe parcursul cercetării, ipotezele propuse au fost testate și verificate prin intermediul acestora.

Ipotezele cercetării au fost formulate, pornind de la necesitatea ca acestea să reflecte realitatea obiectivă, esența, intercondiționarea și cauzalitatea faptelor, fenomenelor și proceselor care constituie factori psihosociali de risc în activitatea fermierilor.

În concordanță cu obiectivele derivate au fost propuse spre a fi demonstrate următoarele ipoteze:

- I.1. Cerințele actuale ale muncii fermierilor se asociază pozitiv cu nivelul de stres al acestora.
- I.2. Controlul exercitat asupra propriei activități, se asociază negativ cu nivelul de stres al fermierilor.

I.3. Sprijinul instituțional și comunitar acordat fermierilor, se asociază negativ cu nivelul acestora de stres.

Obiectivele derivate și corelația cu ipotezele cercetării

Obiective derivate	Ipoteze
O.1. Analiza influențelor cerințelor actuale ale muncii fermierilor, raportate la nivelul de stres	I.1. Cerințele actuale ale muncii fermierilor se asociază pozitiv cu nivelul de stres al acestora
O.2. Investigarea relației dintre controlul exercitat de fermieri asupra propriilor activități și nivelul de stres	I.2. Controlul exercitat asupra propriei activități, se asociază negativ cu nivelul de stres al acestora
O.3. Determinarea relației dintre nivelul de stres și sprijinul instituțional și comunitar acordat fermierilor	I.3. Sprijinul instituțional și comunitar acordat fermierilor, se asociază negativ cu nivelul acestora de stres

Analiza de corelație și verificarea ipotezelor

Pentru demonstrarea ipotezelor s-a urmărit cercetarea legăturilor de interdependență dintre variabilele puse în discuție cu ajutorul chestionarului. Întrucât atitudinile și modurile de reacție umane nu pot fi observate în mod direct, au fost construite mai multe seturi de întrebări, formulate astfel încât să reflecte cât mai bine realitatea. Itemii chestionarului au fost concepuți pentru a măsura anumite atribute (cerințe, atitudini, factori, comportamente) ale fermierilor.

Răspunsurile obținute în urma prelucrării chestionarelor primite de la fermieri s-au materializat într-o bază de date de mari dimensiuni. Ca modalitate de asigurare a unui număr minim de factori ipotetici care pot fi explicați, cât și ca mod de a explora datele în scopul unei posibile reduceri a acestora, a fost folosită analiza factorială exploratorie.

Pentru construirea unui set de date de dimensiuni mai mici, variabilele inițiale au fost grupate pe principalele dimensiuni ale mediului de lucru considerate factori de stres de către standardele HSE³. Cu ajutorul programului SPSS, au fost selectați itemii referitori la cerințele/sarcinile de lucru, controlul asupra modului de lucru, sprijinul primit din partea comunității, sprijinul primit de la autorități, relațiile de muncă, claritatea rolului deținut, modul în care este gestionată schimbarea, satisfacția legată de aspecte ale locului de muncă, precum și modul de reacție la situații stresante, autoevaluarea simptomelor specifice stresului și autoevaluarea stării de sănătate.

Concluzii în urma verificării ipotezelor

Folosind corelații Pearson s-a verificat măsura în fermierii sunt afectați de anumite

³ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/index.htm>

dimensiuni ale locurilor de muncă purtătoare de risc. Între dimensiunile analizate au fost înregistrate corelații pozitive și negative, înalte, moderate și scăzute.

Ca urmare a rezultatelor obținute s-a confirmat Ipoteza 1, cerințele actuale legate de muncă fiind corelate pozitiv cu creșterea stresului fermierilor. Pandemia COVID-19 a crescut cerințele generale ale muncii fermierilor și s-au intensificat factorii de stres ($r=829$). Accelerarea schimbărilor recente legate de munca fermierilor, conduce spre cerințe crescute ale muncii acestora ($r=582$), iar creșterea cerințelor extrinseci muncii fermierilor, cresc factorii de risc psihosociali ai acestora ($r=711$). Odată cu creșterea cerințelor extrinseci muncii fermierilor, cresc și bolile legate de stres ale acestora ($r=221$), iar creșterea cerințelor intrinseci muncii fermierilor, cresc și simptomele de stres ale acestora ($r=529$).

În ceea ce privește Ipoteza 2 și aceasta s-a confirmat, controlul redus asupra propriei activități, fiind corelat negativ cu stresul fermierilor. Controlul scăzut asupra timpului și modului de lucru, în timpul sau ca urmare a pandemiei COVID-19, a condus la creșterea factorilor de stres pentru fermieri ($r=505$). Creșterea cerințelor extrinseci muncii fermierilor, a scăzut controlul acestora asupra timpului și modului lor de lucru ($r= - 415$). Schimbările multiple și frecvente afectează munca fermierilor, aceștia având posibilități reduse de control asupra timpului și modului lor de lucru ($r=641$). Totodată creșterea dezechilibrului dintre muncă și familie, a crescut factorii generatori de stres ($r=591$). Scăderea controlului fermierilor asupra timpului și modului lor de lucru, crește numărul bolilor legate de stres ($r= - 788$).

Rezultatele obținute au confirmat și Ipoteza 3, lipsa de sprijin acordat fermierilor contribuie la creșterea stresului acestora. Sprijinul scăzut acordat de autorități și comunitate fermierilor, este corelat negativ cu factorii de stres generați de pandemia COVID-19 ($r= - 456$). În ciuda amplificării schimbărilor legate de munca fermierilor, a scăzut sprijinul oferit acestora de către autorități ($r= - 515$). Odată cu sprijinul redus al autorităților, cresc factorii de risc psihosociali legați de muncă, pentru fermieri ($r= - 449$). Concomitent cu creșterea cerințelor extrinseci muncii fermierilor a scăzut sprijinul primit din partea autorităților și comunității ($r= - 705$), scăderea sprijinului din partea autorităților, contribuie la o stare de sănătate scăzută a fermierilor ($r= - 644$), iar sprijinul scăzut din partea autorităților și comunității, scade satisfacția fermierilor legată de muncă ($r= - 705$).

Munca fermierilor este afectată de cerințe ridicate, un control redus asupra timpului și a modului de lucru și lipsa sprijinului din partea autorităților și comunității în realizarea muncii, ceea ce determină simptome și boli legate de stres psihologic și conduce la deteriorarea stării de sănătate a acestora. Comparând rezultatele obținute se poate aprecia că se confirmă ipoteza centrală a Modelului Cerințe - Control – Suport (DCSM), care afirmă că sprijinul social este vital pentru angajați atunci când se confruntă cu cerințe crescute la locul de muncă. Ipoteza DCSM afirmă că

locurile de muncă, caracterizate prin cerințe ridicate, un control redus și izolare socială sau lipsă de sprijin social, determină stres psihologic și conduce la deteriorarea stării de sănătate a lucrătorilor⁴.

Concluzii finale

Lumea muncii s-a schimbat în multe moduri și trebuie să învățăm cum să procesăm această metamorfoză. Viitorul muncii trebuie să dea șansa fiecărei persoane să se prezinte la locul de muncă, pentru a-și îndeplini rolul, bucurându-se de sprijin, scop, claritate, echilibru, sănătate și siguranță. Asigurarea sănătății și siguranței angajaților trebuie să rămână prioritară, fiind imperios necesar ca liderii de afaceri să introducă sau să-și adapteze strategiile, pentru a gestiona impactul crizei și a se pregăti pentru viitor.

Suntem într-un punct de inflexiune în modul în care munca este gestionată, planificată și chiar trăită. Valurile tehnologice, globalizarea, criza provocată de pandemie și crizele geo-politice, forțează liderii de afaceri să-și reprojeteze afacerile. În mod necesar organizațiile regândesc locurile de muncă, iar oamenii își regândesc carierele, nu doar învățarea de noi abilități, ci învățarea de noi roluri, relații și modalități de măsurare a progresului.

Sondajul realizat în cursul cercetării doctorale, a fost conceput pentru a acoperi zonele care sunt cunoscute a fi potențiale cauze ale stresului pentru fermierii din România. Derularea sondajului în sine nu va rezolva problemele, însă este important ca rezultatele să fie utilizate în combinație cu alte surse de date, ca parte a unui proces de îmbunătățire. Instrumentul de analiză conceput de autorul cercetării este util pentru că exprimă opiniile și experiența fermierilor, rezultatele obținute reprezentând dovezi cuantificabile pe baza cărora poate fi construit un plan de acțiune. Cercetarea întreprinsă a plecat de la ideea că orice sursă de date despre riscurile psihosociale, poate deveni parte a unui puzzle, iar când tot mai multe piese sunt montate împreună, poate fi obținută o imagine cât mai completă.

Stresul fermierilor reprezintă o provocare deosebită pentru cercetători, deoarece agricultura funcționează într-un context organizațional neobișnuit, unul care nu dispune de cadrele în care funcționează tehnicile tradiționale de gestionare a stresului. Din aceste considerente, în teza de doctorat s-a dorit identificarea atributelor celor care lucrează în ferme, evaluarea surselor negative de stres, a capacității fermierilor de a răspunde factorilor de stres obișnuiți și excepționali, pentru a se redresa și a prospera.

Chestionarul realizat de către autorul tezei de doctorat, a urmat taxonomia stabilită Health and Safety Executive (HSE), modelul JDCS, modelul ERI precum și alte modele de cercetare a stresului la locul de muncă. Cercetarea a relevat factorii din domeniul de activitate al fermierilor,

⁴Karasek, R. A. (1979), Job demands, decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, p.285

care generează stres, cerințele locului de muncă, lipsa controlului asupra modului de lucru, lipsa sprijinului din partea autorităților și schimbările multiple.

Teza de doctorat oferă o bună indicație asupra modului în care fermierii văd mediul în care lucrează și domeniile importante legate de stres. Printr-o abordare complexă, s-a analizat influența unei game largi de factori de risc psihosociali, generali sau specifici muncii fermierilor, care adesea se combină sau interacționează. Cercetarea oferă o măsură a expunerii la condițiile psihosociale de muncă care pot avea rezultate legate de stres, pentru fermierii din România.

Cercetarea întreprinsă este în concordanță cu procesul de reglementare a riscurilor legate de securitatea și sănătatea lucrătorilor, iar rezultatele pot fi folosite pentru a produce o schimbare reală, prin gestionarea cauzelor stresului fermierilor. Există puncte fierbinți de risc, datorate factorilor extrinseci cât și intrinseci muncii fermierilor, acestea fiind evaluate și evidențiate prin intermediul matricei riscurilor. Concomitent au fost investigate consecințele acestor riscuri asupra sănătății, angajamentului și bunăstării fermierilor. Înțelegerea percepțiilor fermierilor asupra mediului lor de lucru, informează asupra domeniilor unde trebuie depuse eforturi de îmbunătățire.

Angajatorii au datoria de a se asigura că riscurile care decurg din activitatea de muncă sunt controlate adecvat. Modelul socio-ecologic privind riscul și reziliența fermierului arată că dincolo de primele trei niveluri, individual, interpersonal și fermă, sunt nivelurile comunitare, organizaționale și de politică/mediu care afectează nivelul de stres al fermierilor. În interconexiunea acestor niveluri, orice acțiune, decizie luată la un nivel afectează celelalte niveluri.

Așadar cercetarea stresului în rândul fermierilor trebuie văzută dincolo de managementul stresului la nivel individual, sau managementul riscurilor fermei, extinzându-se la un nivel mai larg, al sistemelor, mediilor și politicilor care afectează fermierii. Această abordare pleacă de la considerentul că managementul individual al stresului este necesar dar nu suficient. O abordare bazată pe mai multe niveluri poate oferi un cadru pentru luarea în considerare a opțiunilor de prevenire și atenuare a factorilor de stres și de reducere a stresului.

Cercetarea întreprinsă prin intermediul tezei de doctorat oferă un punct de plecare pentru acțiuni, o modalitate de organizare a răspunsurilor și de raportare a dovezilor de impact.

Fermierii sunt afectați de factori de stres extrinseci și intrinseci muncii lor, din domeniile economic, de mediu, social și instituțional. Aceștia sunt provocați să reziste, să se adapteze și/sau să se transforme ca răspuns la impacturile din ce în ce mai complexe din toate cele patru domenii. Interconectarea, dinamica schimbărilor și incertitudinile care decurg din fiecare domeniu de provocare pot duce la factori de stres excepționali asupra fermierilor. Pentru comunitatea agricolă, factorii de stres excepționali devin o problemă care necesită soluții comunitare, inclusiv politici publice.

Schimbările recente din agricultură au intrat adesea în conflict cu așteptările fermierilor și

au crescut nivelul de stres în moduri nemăsurabile. Acest lucru s-a întâmplat în special în cazul dimensiunilor legate de muncă și extrinseci ale stresului, inclusiv al fluctuațiilor prețurilor, al creșterii cererii de documente, al intensificării volumului de muncă și al modificărilor reglementărilor agricole. Creșterile prețurilor materiilor prime agricole, însoțite de fluctuații substanțiale ale prețurilor la energie și îngrășăminte, au condus la îngrijorări legate de faptul că practicile de producție agricolă ar putea să nu mai țină pasul cu cererea. Fermierii se confruntă cu un număr tot mai mare de ore de lucru, în special în întreprinderile mai mici care încearcă să compenseze costurile inflaționiste cu o forță de muncă redusă.

Acestea au cauzat o escaladare calitativă a aspectelor activității, pe care comunitățile agricole se simt neputincioase să le controleze sau să le influențeze și reprezintă un domeniu major pentru intervențiile politice.

În ciuda percepției generale că agricultura este o ocupație sănătoasă, fermierii se confruntă cu numeroși factori de risc, care conduc la boli multiple, niveluri ridicate de stres și niveluri relativ scăzute de bunăstare. Natura solicitantă a muncii în fermă, forțază fermierii să acorde prioritate productivității fermei, în detrimentul îngrijirii sănătății personale.

Factorii de stres obișnuiți includ echilibrarea afacerii agricole și a vieții personale, abordarea problemelor de sănătate, gestionarea finanțelor fermei și ale familiei. Factorii de stres excepționali includ fenomenele meteorologice neobișnuite, prețuri crescute ale materiilor prime, problemele comerciale legate de valorificarea producțiilor, modificări ale reglementărilor legale, efectele pandemiei etc. Efectele negative ale stresului amenință fermierii și familiile acestora, de aici necesitatea ca fermierii să învețe despre reducerea riscurilor, construind în același timp reziliența. Modul în care fermierii, familiile și întreprinderile acestora gestionează cerințele și schimbările stresante va determina, rezultatele sau impactul acestora. Gestionarea cererilor sau a schimbărilor este influențată atât de sensul perceput al cerințelor și al schimbărilor, cât și de resursele sau capitalul intern și extern disponibile fermierilor. Răspunsurile la factorii de stres și practicile agricole în rândul fermierilor și al membrilor familiei sunt de obicei considerate ca fiind de natură personală. Ele se mută în arena publică atunci când impactul merge dincolo de familie, la afacerile agricole, comunități, organizații și politici.

Fermierii trebuie să îndeplinească foarte multe cerințe administrative, să gestioneze din ce în ce mai multe sarcini, legate de documente cerute de instituții ale statului, ceea ce le reduce gradul de autonomie în modul de lucru, volumul de muncă și generează stres legat de muncă. Cauzele stresului fermierilor includ completarea documentelor și îndeplinirea cerințelor de reglementare, dificultățile de înțelegere a formularelor și problemele care decurg din efectele noilor acte legislative și reglementări.

La nivelul instituțiilor responsabile reacțiile mentale, emoționale, comportamentale ale

populației agricole, raportate la nevoile socio-economice, nu sunt bine înțelese. Agențiile de sprijin trebuie să ofere o serie de servicii receptive și proactive însă de multe ori acest lucru nu se întâmplă în practică. În mod concret, sprijinul trebuie să fie multidimensional, reflectând gama largă de necesități ale fermierilor și impactul acestora în rândul comunităților agricole.

Cadrul de reglementare a agriculturii este o temă critică în rândul fermierilor, aceștia considerând că acesta cuprinde prevederi, mai degrabă restrictive decât de protecție. Diferitele sisteme administrative și reglementări referitoare la agricultură, sunt considerate de fermieri a fi prost concepute, presupunând cereri contradictorii. Pe de altă parte reglementările se schimbă mult prea frecvent, înainte ca fermierii să aibă timp să se adapteze la acestea, aceștia se confruntă cu un vid de informații din partea autorităților agricole, urmată de o cerere rapidă de conformitate pe care o văd aproape ca pe o amenințare. Aceste aspecte aduc un grad de incertitudine și constituie factori de stres.

Astfel cerințele conformării, combinate cu veniturile agricole în scădere, îi fac pe mulți fermieri să considere că beneficiile agriculturii continuă să scadă sub poverile sale.

O problemă care provoacă un anumit grad de suferință personală fermierilor este și modul în care simt că sunt percepuți de opinia publică, prin faptul că primesc prea puțin respect pentru munca pe care o depun. Acest lucru se datorează în parte faptului că alimentele sunt prea ieftine iar aceștia nu primesc un preț corect pentru munca lor. Acest lucru are un efect negativ asupra moralului și sentimentului de sine, care este strâns legat de identitatea lor profesională.

Instituțiile de sprijin ale agriculturii sunt criticate în special în ceea ce privește răspunsul la crize, fermierii considerând că nu sunt sprijiniți într-un mod echitabil. Unii au resurse personale, familiale și comunitare, pentru reziliență și adaptare la schimbări, pentru a trece prin criza economică, pentru alții schimbările sunt copleșitoare, forțându-i să renunțe la afacere. Din cauza dinamicii complexe, a caracteristicilor afacerilor agricole și a interdependenței cu familia, fermierii se pot confrunta cu provocări mai mari în ceea ce privește perturbările financiare și emoționale care pot reduce satisfacția muncii și implicit de viață.

Astfel, în joc sunt nu numai sănătatea și bunăstarea fermierilor și a întreprinderilor lor, ci și bunăstarea comunităților agricole și prosperitatea viitoare a agriculturii.

Cercetarea întreprinsă deschide teme noi, ce au nevoie de reconsiderare și cercetare aprofundată, pentru a se asigura progresul culturii siguranței și aplicarea sa în fiecare aspect al angajării umane. Teza de doctorat a demonstrat modul în care aspectele bunăstării sociale, organizaționale și personale, sunt inexorabil interconectate.

Managementul siguranței și sănătății are scopul de a se asigura că numărul de accidente și incidente este menținut cât mai scăzut posibil. Acest lucru duce inevitabil la o abordare reactivă bazată pe răspunsul la ceea ce merge prost sau la ceea ce este identificat ca un risc – mai degrabă

decât a se asigura că totul merge bine. Din perspectiva noastră, scopul managementului siguranței este de a se asigura că totul merge bine cât mai mult posibil, în sensul că munca de zi cu zi își atinge obiectivele. Aceasta înseamnă că siguranța ar trebui apreciată prin numărul de cazuri în care lucrurile merg bine. Pentru a face acest lucru, managementul siguranței și sănătății nu poate fi doar reactiv, ci trebuie să fie proactiv, în ceea ce privește modul în care acțiunile reușesc, prin performanța zilnică acceptabilă, mai degrabă decât în ceea ce privește modul în care pot eșua.

Teza de doctorat reprezintă o analiză bine documentată, a multiplelor interacțiuni dintre mediu, munca fermierilor și natura umană. Aceasta aduce o contribuție oportună, o viziune integrată, noi interpretări și narațiuni care pot permite progresul în domeniul securității și sănătății acestor lucrători. Mai mult decât atât, un număr din ce în ce mai mare de cercetări, au demonstrat că obținerea bunăstării lucrătorilor este un câștig care poate crește profiturile sau pur și simplu poate face sustenabilitatea viabilă.

În întreprinderile din orice domeniu, sănătatea și siguranța trebuie să fie mai importante decât strategia și tactica, facilitarea și încorporarea comportamentelor și mentalităților cheie fiind elementul esențial. Această cercetare poate fi de asemenea, un ghid individual pentru fiecare fermier, manager sau angajat care caută să își maximizeze potențialul de muncă și bunăstare.

Contribuții personale

1. Contribuții teoretice cu caracter de sinteză

Teza de doctorat contribuie la adăugarea de cunoștințe relevante unui domeniu în permanentă schimbare, cea a riscurilor pentru securitatea și sănătatea umană, prin identificarea factorilor majori de risc psihosociali ai perioadei actuale, în sectorul agricol.

Elaborarea tezei de doctorat s-a bazat pe:

- Identificarea și studierea celor mai importante lucrări teoretice care au ca subiect managementul riscurilor psihosociale;
- Prezentarea nivelului actual al cercetării în cadrul literaturii de specialitate, evidențiind cele mai importante opinii, dar și metode de interpretare a riscurilor psihosociale;
- O privire critică asupra sensurilor de bază ale riscului;
- Rezumarea numeroaselor accepțiuni și definiții ale riscurilor psihosociale, oferind mai multe puncte de vedere pentru înțelegerea conceptuală;
- Evidențierea unor caracteristici ale managementului riscurilor psihosociale, plecând de la analiza definițiilor existente;
- Analizarea unor concepte specifice, ca bază a cercetării empirice a riscurilor psihosociale;

- Stabilirea efectelor riscurilor psihosociale din domeniul agricol și a posibilelor soluții de atenuare a acestora;
- Identificarea celor mai importante tendințe și provocări cu care se confruntă fermierii din România;
- Cercetarea strategiilor europene din domeniul agricol și conturarea direcțiilor de acțiune în reducerea riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri;

2. Contribuții teoretice în domeniul managementului riscurilor psihosociale

Teza de doctorat poate servi ca euristică și poate inspira concepte și principii teoretice, pentru încadrarea viitoarelor proiecte de cercetare în domeniul managementului riscurilor psihosociale. Cercetarea a avut în vedere oferirea unei înțelegeri îmbunătățite a managementului riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri, conturarea mai multor cadre de analiză a factorilor de risc și determinarea parametrilor necesari a fi selectați și studiați în acest context specific. În acest sens teza de doctorat contribuie la:

- Analiza critică și adecvată a literaturii de specialitate, cu privire la managementul riscurilor psihosociale din domeniul agricol, a consecințelor acestora asupra securității și sănătății fermierilor, în raport cu schimbările de mediu, economice și societale actuale;
- Studiarea managementului riscurilor psihosociale din perspectivă interdisciplinară, stabilind legături între acestea și managementul securității și sănătății în muncă, managementul riscului și a ramurilor conexe sociologice și psihologice;
- Evidențierea principalelor particularități ale managementului riscurilor psihosociale din domeniul agricol;
- Reliefa și analizarea influențelor mediului de lucru din agricultură, asupra managementului riscurilor psihosociale, identificarea principalelor metode de diminuare sau combatere a acestora;
- Analizarea relației de interdependență dintre managementul riscurilor psihosociale și măsurile de asigurare a securității și sănătății în muncă;
- Studiarea prevederilor legislative în vigoare;
- Sublinierea particularităților managementului riscurilor psihosociale, în cadrul legislativ al asigurării securității și sănătății în muncă a lucrătorilor.

3. Contribuții experimentale

Teza de doctorat aliniază teoriile existente în sfera științifică, cu situațiile concrete și problemele existente în sectorul agricol, printr-un design original de cercetare. Cercetarea întreprinsă în cadrul tezei de doctorat răspunde nevoilor de cunoaștere ale prezentului, răspunsurile la întrebările de cercetare asupra riscurilor psihosociale din domeniul agricol, contribuind la

relevanța societală a cercetării. Aceasta a implicat aplicarea unui chestionar, pentru identificarea relațiilor cauză-efect și aprofundarea înțelegerii modelelor de comportament ale fermierilor, în unele situații specifice mediului și contextului muncii lor.

Teza de doctorat extinde baza de cunoștințe și poate informa în legătură cu atitudini, judecăți și decizii ale fermierilor în fața unor riscuri sistemice, organizaționale și individuale, a înțelegerii percepțiilor acestora în legătură cu factorii de risc psihosociali ai prezentului. În acest context teza de doctorat contribuie la:

- Schițarea unei perspective cuprinzătoare asupra factorilor de risc psihosocial, din domeniul agricol;
- Stabilirea obiectivelor generale, operaționale, specifice și derivate, formularea și demonstrarea ipotezelor de lucru, ca principal fundament al cercetării empirice întreprinse;
- Elaborarea și aplicarea chestionarului ca instrument de cercetare;
- Analizarea, interpretarea și valorificarea informațiilor rezultate, cu ajutorul softului IBM SPSS;
- Evaluarea, reprezentarea și compararea riscurilor psihosociale pentru fermieri
- Proiectarea registrului riscurilor psihosociale și întocmirea matricei nivelurilor de risc psihosocial pentru fermieri.

4. Contribuții la optimizarea cadrului normativ al managementului riscurilor psihosociale

Cercetarea realizată prin intermediul tezei de doctorat a relevat faptul că o serie de factori socio-economici și de reglementare acționează în mod concertat, crescând riscurile pentru sănătatea și siguranța fermierilor într-o proporție substanțială. Teza de doctorat contribuie la îmbunătățirea cunoștințelor în acest domeniu, prin descrierea situațiilor de expunere, identificarea cauzelor și efectelor și pentru conceperea de soluții preventive. Sunt furnizate dovezi, argumente și informații privind expunerea la factori de risc psihosocial, acestea fiind menite să sprijine deciziile politice.

În scopul optimizării cadrului normativ al managementului riscurilor psihosociale teza de doctorat contribuie la:

- Conturarea limitelor normative și legislative actuale de evaluare și diminuare a riscurilor psihosociale;
- Conturarea direcțiilor viitoare de acțiune ce au ca principal obiectiv consolidarea, dezvoltarea și eficientizarea practicilor manageriale în domeniul riscurilor psihosociale;
- Informarea părților interesate, în urma analizei datelor culese prin intermediul studiului empiric;

- Oferirea de date concrete în vederea elaborării strategiilor de asigurare a securității și sănătății în muncă a lucrătorilor din domeniul agricol.

5. Contribuții la dezvoltarea cercetării științifice

Considerentele științifice au fost deosebit de importante în elaborarea tezei de doctorat, aceasta bazându-se pe modele de cercetare relevante și actuale. Teza de doctorat surprinde și analizează percepțiile fermierilor din România, asupra provocărilor reale cu care se confruntă în mediul lor de muncă. Spectrul cercetării, modul în care au fost planificate cunoștințele, a urmărit o tipologie variată și deosebit de utilă pentru cercetarea riscurilor psihosociale în domeniul agricol. Modul de analiză a riscurilor psihosociale propus, se referă la reconcilierea așteptărilor conceptuale, cu realitățile unui domeniu foarte puțin cercetat. Contribuțiile la dezvoltarea cercetării științifice s-au materializat prin:

- Întocmirea rapoartelor de cercetare pe parcursul programului de studii doctorale;
- Elaborarea formei finale a tezei de doctorat;
- Realizarea și publicarea de articole ce au ca temă evaluarea și managementul riscurilor psihosociale, precum și susținerea lor în cadrul conferințelor naționale și internaționale.

Direcții viitoare de cercetare

Cercetarea rămâne deschisă pentru noi metode de evaluare a riscurilor psihosociale, pentru investigarea cunoștințelor, perspectivelor și atitudinilor altor lucrători, atât din domeniul agricol cât și din alte domenii de activitate. Proiectele pot fi colaborative, participative sau transdisciplinare, pentru a antrena preocuparea societală a dezvoltării acestui tip de riscuri, cunoștințele fiind utile pentru a face față provocărilor tot mai mari ale mediului de risc actual și viitor.

Sunt necesare cât mai multe studii, pentru propunerea de mijloace adecvate și actualizate de diseminare a informațiilor privind riscurile, pentru conștientizarea acestora și implicarea lucrătorilor în prevenirea lor, pentru a motiva și ghida eforturile de prevenire. Cercetările trebuie să propună cât mai multe metode, modele și indicatori de evaluare a riscurilor psihosociale, care să reflecte cât mai bine problematica acestora și măsurile de atenuare.

Bibliografie

1. Ackoff, S., Bahrenburg, A., Shute, L. L. (2017). Building a future with farmers, II: Results and recommendations from the National Young Farm Survey. Hudson, NY: *National Young Farmers Coalition*.

2. Adams G.A., Webster J.R. (2013), Emotional regulation as a mediator between interpersonal mistreatment and distress. *Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.*;
3. Adams, D.A., Thomas, K.R., Jajosky, R.A. et al. (2017). Summary of notifiable infectious diseases and conditions – United States, MMWR. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 64, p.120.
4. Adams, M. (2020), What the pandemic reveals about globalisation, supply chain risk and adapting to climate change. *Stockholm Environment Institute*. Disponibil la <https://www.sei.org/perspectives/pandemic-globalization-supply-chain-risk-and-climate-change-adaptation>
5. Andersson L.M., Pearson C.M. (1999), Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Acad. Manag. Rev.*;24:452–471, p.457.
6. Andrieu, E. et al. (2020), *Job Resilience, Skill Demand and the COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from Online Job Posting*, OCDE, Paris.
7. Aronsson, G., Gustafsson, K. (2005). Disease present: prevalence, presence pressure factors, and an outline of a research model. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* , 47 (9), 958.
8. Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 29, 3–30.
9. Bakker, A. B., de Vries J. D. (2021) Job Demands–Resources theory and self-regulation: new explanations and remedies for job burnout, *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 34:1, 1-21.
10. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
11. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Multiple levels in job demands-resources theory: Implications for employee well-being and performance. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of wellbeing*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
12. Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200.p.187.
13. Barnish, M, Tørnes, M., Nelson-Horne B., (2018). How much evidence is there that political factors are related to population health outcomes? An internationally comparative systematic review. *BMJ Open*.
14. Beck, U. (1999), *What is Globalisation?* Cambridge: Polity Press.p.21.
15. Beck, U., (1992), *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*, Sage.
16. Becot, F. (2020). *Linking farm households' social needs, social policy, and farm persistence to better understand and support family farms in the 21st century*. The Ohio State University, Columbus OH

17. Beer, P., Mulder, R. H. (2020), The Effects of Technological Developments on Work and Their Implications for Continuous Vocational Education and Training: A Systematic Review, *Front. Psychol.*, disponibil la <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00918>
18. Berg-Beckhoff G, Nielsen G, Ladekjær E. (2017), Use of information communication technology and stress, burnout, and mental health in older, middle-aged, and younger workers — results from a systematic review. *Int J Occup Environ Health*, 2017; 23(2): 160-171.
19. Bhatia S. (2019), Predicting risk perception: New insights from data science. *Management Science*. Advance online publication.
20. Biggs, A., Brough, P., Drummond, S. (2017). Lazarus and Folkman's psychological stress and coping theory. In C. L. Cooper & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *The handbook of stress and health: A guide to research and practice* (pp. 351–364). Wiley Blackwell.
21. Blais A.R., Weber E.U. (2006), A domain-specific risk-taking (DOSPERT) scale for adult populations. *Judgment and Decision Making*.;1(1):33–47.
22. Blanton, R. G., Peksen, D. (2017). Dying for globalisation? The impact of economic globalisation on industrial accidents. *Social Science Quarterly*. 98 (5): 1487–1502..
23. Borle P, et.all. (2021), The social and health implications of digital work intensification. Associations between exposure to information and communication technologies, health and work ability in different socio-economic strat. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*; 94(3): 377-390.
24. Bos et al., (2018), The quantified animal: precision livestock farming and the ethical implications of objectification, *Food Ethics*, 2 (1), pp. 77-92,
25. Braun, B., Anderson, E. (2019). It's constantly something: Stressful lives of farmers and farm families. Delmarva Farmer. http://extension.umd.edu/sites/extension.umd.edu/files/_images/uploaded/Health%20and%20Wellness%20Insert.pdf
26. Braun, B., Pippidis, M. (2019). *Farm and farm family risk and resilience: What is at stake? What will it take?* College Park: University of Maryland Extension.
27. Braun, B., Pippidis, M. (2020). *Farm and farm family risk and resilience: A guide for Extension educational programming*. University of Maryland Extension and University of Delaware Cooperative Extension, <https://www.udel.edu/content/dam/udelImages/canr/pdfs/extension/economic-personal-development/Farm-and-Farm-Family-Risk-and-Resilience-Guide-1-1720.pdf>
28. Braverman, H. (1998). Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century. New York, NY: *Monthly Review Press*.

29. Brewster, C., Holland P.. (2019). Work or Employment in the 21st Century: Its Impact on the Employment Relationship. In *The Research Agenda for the Future of Work*, edited by A. Wilkinson and M. Barry . 19–33. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
30. Brown, P., Gale, N.. (2018), Developing a sociology of risk work in client-facing contexts: An editorial. *Health, Risk and Society*. 20 (1–2): 1–12.
31. Bruce, J. M., Lynch, S. G. (2011). Personality traits in multiple sclerosis: association with mood and anxiety disorders. *J. Psychosom. Res.* 70, 479–485. doi: 10.1016
32. Campbell-Sills, L, Cohan, SL, Stein, MB. (2006), Relationship of resilience to personality, coping, and psychiatric symptoms in young adults. *Behav Res Ther.* 44:585–99
33. Ceschi, A., Sartori, R., Dickert, S., Costantini, A. (2016). Grit or honesty-humility? New insights into the moderating role of personality between the health impairment process and counterproductive work behavior. *Front. Psychol.* 7:1799.
34. Chen C. (2016), The role of resilience and coping styles in subjective well-being among Chinese University students. *Asia Pac Educ Res.*;25:1–11
35. Chen, Y, L,i S, Xia, Q, He, C (2017) The Relationship between Job Demands and Employees' Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Effect of Psychological Detachment and Job Anxiety. *Front. Psychol.* 8:1890.
36. Chernilo, D. (2021). One globalisation or many? Risk society in the age of anthropocene. *Journal of Sociology.* 57 (1): 12–26.
37. Connor KM, Davidson JR. (2003), Development of a new resilience scale: the Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depress Anxiety.*;18:76–82
38. Cooper C.L., Quick, J. C., Schabracq, M. J., (2015), *International Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, 3rd Edition, Wiley-Blackwell.
39. Cooper, C., Dewe, P. (2008). Welfare - absenteeism, presentism, costs and challenges. *Occupational Medicine* (London), 58 (8), 522–4.
40. Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J. (2019). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), p.280.
41. Cottini, E. (2012a). Health at work and low pay: A European perspective. *The Manchester School*, 80(1),75–98.
42. Coupaud, M. (2017). Determinants of health at work in the EU15: Elaboration of synthetic indicators of working conditions and their impacts on the physical and mental health of workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(1), 93–126.
43. Cresswell, T. (2020). Mobility: The lifeblood of modernity and the virus that threatens to undo it. Mobile Lives Forum, disponibil la <https://en.forumviesmobiles.org/2020/03/18/mobility-lifeblood-modernity-and-virus-threatens-undo-it-13266>.

44. Cumming, G.S., Peterson, G.D. (2017), Unifying research on social–ecological resilience and collapse *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 32 (9) pp. 695-713.
45. Dalton, M., Kahn L., Mueller A. (2020), Do Online Job Postings Capture Job Vacancies? An Analysis of Matched Online Postings and Vacancy Survey Data.
46. Danes, S.M. (2014). *Understanding and building resilience*. University of Minnesota Cooperative Extension.
47. Danna, K.,Griffin, R.. (1999). Health and Well-Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Management*. 25. 357-384.
48. Darnhofer, I., Lamine, C., Strauss, A., Navarrete, M. (2016). The resilience of family farms: Towards a relational approach. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 44. 111-122
49. Davis-Brown, K., Salamon, S. (1987). Farm families in crisis: An application of stress theory to farm family research. *Family Relations*, 36(4), 368-373.
50. De la Fuente J. et all. (2021), Cross-Sectional Study of Resilience, Positivity and Coping Strategies as Predictors of Engagement-Burnout in Undergraduate Students: Implications for Prevention and Treatment in Mental Well-Being, *Front Psychiatry*. 2021.12.
51. Dingel, J., Neiman, B. (2020), How many jobs can be done at home?, *Journal of Public Economics* , Vol. 189, p. 104-235.
52. Douglas M. (1992). *Risk and blame: Essays in cultural theory*. Routledge;
53. Eaton, A., Heckscher, C. (2021). COVIDs Impacts on the Field of Labour and Employment Relations. *Journal of Management Studies*. 58 (1): 273–277.
54. Ellinger, P., Featherstone, A., Boehlje, M. (2016). Leverage of U.S. farmers: A deeper perspective. *Choices*, 31 (1), 1-7.
55. Esfahani, T.. (2015). The Relationship between Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Productivity, *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 9(7), p.1128.
56. Farioli, A., Mattioli, S., Quagliari, A., Curti, S., Violante, F. S., Coggon, D. (2014). Musculoskeletal pain in Europe: Role of personal, occupational, and social risk factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 40(1), 36–46.
57. Fetsch, R. J. (2012). *Managing stress during tough times*, Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University Extension. Disponibil la <http://extension.colostate.edu/docs/pubs/consumer/10255.pdf>
58. Folkman S, Moskowitz JT. (2004), Coping: pitfalls and promise. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 55:745–74.
59. Folkman, S, Lazarus, RS. (1985), If it changes it must be a process: study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. *J Pers Soc Psychol.*; 48:150–70

60. Forde, C. et al. (2017). *The Social Protection of Workers in the Platform Economy*. Disponibil la [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes /STUD/2017/614184/ IPOL _STU\(2017\)614184 EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes /STUD/2017/614184/ IPOL _STU(2017)614184 EN.pdf).
61. Foucault, M., Galasso V., (2020), Working during COVID-19: Cross-Country Evidence from Real-Time Survey Data, *Employment and Migration* , Nr. 246, OECD Publishing, Paris.
62. Francis, A. (2016). *New Technology at Work*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
63. Francis, L., De Priest, K, Wilson, M, Gross, D. (2018), Toxic Stress, and Social Determinants of Health: Screening and Care Coordination, *Online J Issues Nurs, Child Poverty Epub*, Vol 23 No0, 3, Man.02. p.6.
64. Fraser, C. E., Smith, K. B., Judd, F., Humphreys, J. S., Fragar, L. J., & Henderson, A. (2005). Farming and mental health problems and mental illness. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 51(4), 340–349.
65. Freeman, S. A., Schwab, C. V., Jiang, Q. (2008). Quantifying stressors among Iowa farmers. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health*, 14(4), 431–439
66. French, JRP, Caplan, RD and Harrison, RV (1982). *Mechanisms of stress and tension at work*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
67. Fullerton, C., Downey, W. S., Gunderson, M., Thompson, N. (2016). *Decision making on multigenerational farms*, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
68. Gamberale, F. (1990), Perception of effort in manual materials handling. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 16 (Suppl.1), p.63.
69. Ganster D.C, Perrewé P. L. (2010) *New Developments in Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches to Job Stress*, Emerald Group.
70. Garcia, M-G., Graf, M., Läubli, T. (2017). Lower limb pain among workers: A cross-sectional analysis of the fifth European Working Conditions Survey. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 90(7), 575–585
71. García-Herrero, S., Lopez-Garcia, J. R., Herrera, S., Fontaneda, I., Báscones, S. M., Mariscal, M. A. (2017). The Influence of Recognition and Social Support on European Health Professionals' Occupational Stress: A Demands-Control-Social Support-Recognition Bayesian Network Model, *Biomed Res Int*, Pub Med.gov.
72. Gibson D. (2014), Managing Risk in Information Systems: Print Bundle (Information Systems Security & Assurance), *Managing Risk in Information Systems*, Jones & Bartlett.
73. Giorgi, G, et al. (2020), COVID-19-related mental health effects in the workplace: a narrative review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17(21).

74. Glassner, B. (2018),. *The culture of fear: Why Americans are afraid of the wrong things*, Basic Books.
75. Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Work engagement and workaholism: Comparing the self-employed and salaried employees. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(1), 83–96.
76. Graham, C., Laffan, K., Pinto, S. (2018). Well-being in metrics and policy. *Science*, 362(6412), 287–288.
77. Grinshpun, S.A., Buttner, M.P., Mainelis, G., and Willeke, K. (2015). Sampling for airborne microorganisms. In: *Manual of Environmental Microbiology* (ed. M.P. Buttner). Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology Press, p.90.
78. Guidi J, Lucente M, Sonino N, Fava GA. (2021), Allostatic load and its impact on health: a systematic review. *Psychother Psychosom.*;90(1):11–27.
79. Gunbayi, I. (2019), Perceptions on stressors originating from interpersonal relations at work setting: a case study, *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1(1), p.55.
80. Guzel, A. E., Arslan, U., Acaravci A.. (2021). “The impact of economic, social, and political globalization and democracy on life expectancy in low-income countries: Are sustainable development goals contradictory?. *Environment Development and Sustainability*. 1–18.
81. Haber M.G, Cohen, J.L, Lucas,T, Baltes, B.B. (2007), The relationship between self-reported received and perceived social support: a meta-analytic review. *Am J Community Psychol.*; 39(1–2):133–44.
82. Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 60, 159–170.
83. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., and Demerouti, E. (2005). How dentists cope with their job demands and stay engaged: the moderating role of job resources. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 113, 479–487.
84. Hale, T. et al. (2020), Variation in government responses to COVID-19, <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/covid-19-government-response-tracker>.
85. Hansen, C.D, Andersen, JH (2008), Getting sick at work - what personal circumstances, attitudes and work-related factors are associated with the present of the disease? *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 67, 956–64
86. Hauke, A, Flintrop, J, Brun, E (2011), The impact of work-associated psychosocial stressors on the onset of musculoskeletal disorders in certain regions of the body: a review and meta-analysis of 54 longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health and Organizations*, 25 (3): p. 250

87. Hegewisch, A., Childres, C., Hartmann, H (2019) Women, Automation and the Future of Work. Disponibil la https://iwpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/C476Automation-and-Futureof-Work_ADA-Compliant.pdf
88. Herrera, B., Gerster-Bentaya, M., Knierim, A. (2018). Farm-level factors influencing farmers satisfaction with their work. In 30th *International Conference of Agricultural Economist*. Vancouver.
89. Hills, T.T. (2019), The dark side of information proliferation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(3):323–330
90. Hirsch, J. K., Cukrowicz, K. C. (2014). Suicide in rural areas: An updated review of the literature. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*. 38(2). 65-78.
91. Holte, K. A., Follo, G., Kjestveit, K., Stræte, E. P. (2018). Agriculture in the future: new technologies, new organizations and new risk to health and safety at work? In: *Proceedings of the 20th Congress of the International Ergonomic Association* (pp. 404-413). Springer, Cham, Switzerland.
92. Holzmann, R., Jørgenson, S., (2000), Social risk management: A new conceptual framework for social protection, and beyond. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8(4):529–556.
93. Hou, T, Zhang, T, Cai, W, et al. (2020), Social support and mental health among health care workers during coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak: a moderated mediation model. *PLoS One*.;15(5):e0233831.
94. Howley, P., Dillon, E., Heanue, K., Meredith, D. (2017). Worth the risk? The behavioural path to well-being. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 68(2), 534-552.
95. Huber et al., (2015), Factors affecting farm growth intentions of family farms in mountain regions: empirical evidence for Central Switzerland, *Land Use Policy*, 47, pp. 188-197.
96. Hunt, A., Samman, E. (2019) Gender and the gig economy Critical steps for evidence-based policy. https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2019/01/aponid_2170911279081.pdf
97. Hurrell, J. J., Jr., Nelson, D. L., & Simmons, B. L. (1998). Measuring job stressors and strains: Where we have been, where we are, and where we need to go. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 368–389.
98. Inwood, S., Knudson, A., Becot, F. A., Braun, B., Goetz, S. J., Kolodinsky, J. M., Albrecht, D. (2018). Health insurance is part of national farm policy. *Agriculture and Applied Economics Association Choices*.
99. Jagiello, R.D., Hills T.T., (2018), Bad news has wings: Dread risk mediates social amplification in risk communication, *Risk Analysis*, 38(10):2193–2207.

100. Kalleberg, A. L, Vallas S. P. (2018), Probing Precarious Work: Theory, Research and Politics. *Precarious Work*. 31: 1–30.
101. Kallioniemi, M,K, Simola A, Kaseva J, Kymäläinen HR. (2016), Stress and burnout among Finnish dairy farmers. *J Agromedicine*. 21(3):259–68
102. Karapinar, P. B., Camgoz, S. M., (2017), Well-Being at Work: A Comprehensive Review About Its Predictors and Outcomes, *Handbook of Research on Organizational Culture and Diversity in the Modern Workforce*.
103. Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign. *Administr. Sci. Q.* 24, 285–308.
104. Karasek, R., Brisson, C., Kawakami, N., Houtman, I., Bongers, P., and Amick, B. (1998). The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. *J. Occupat. Health Psychol.* 3, 322–355.
105. Karasek, R., et. all.. (1998). The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. *J. Occupat. Health Psychol.* 3, 322–355.
106. Karasek, R., Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: stress, productivity and the reconstruction of professional life*. New York: Basic Books.
107. Keyserling, W.M., (1986), Postural analysis of the trunk and shoulders in simulated real time. *Ergonomics* 29 (4), p.570.
108. Kivimäki, M., Head, J., Ferrie, JE, Hemingway, H., Shipley, MJ & Vahtera, J. (2005). Working while ill as a risk factor for serious coronary events: the Whitehall II study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95 (1), 98–102.
109. Klerkx, L., Rose, D. (2020). Approaching Game-Changing Technologies in Agriculture 4.0: How do we manage diversity and accountability in food transition paths? Global food security.
110. Klitzman, S., Stellman J., (1989), The impact of the physical environment on the psychological well-being of office workers, *Social Science & Medicine*, 29(6) 733-742.
111. Klumb P.L., Voelkle M.C., Siegler S. (2017), How negative social interactions at work seep into the home: A prosocial and an antisocial pathway. *J. Organ. Behav.*
112. Kong, F. Z., Zhao, L., Zhang, X. B., Tsai, C. H., & Lin, D. D. (2019). "Farmers' work-life quality and entrepreneurship will in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10.
113. Labrague LJ, De los Santos JAA. (2020), COVID-19 anxiety among front-line nurses: predictive role of organisational support, personal resilience and social support. *J Nurs Manag.* 28:1653–61.

114. Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Psychological stress in the workplace, in *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality: Handbook on Job Stress* (Special Issue), Vol. 6, ed. P. L. Perrewe (San Rafael, CA: Select Press), 1–13.
115. Lazarus, R. S., Folkman, S. (1987). Transactional theory and research on emotions and coping. *European Journal of Personality*, 1, 141-169.
116. Lazarus, R.S., Folkman, S. (1984), *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. New York: Springer
117. Lazarus, RS (1999). *Stress and emotion*. London: Free Association Books.
118. Lee Y., Cho D. (2020), The effects of job demands, job resources, and personal resources on the psychological well-being of middle-aged workers in the United States: Assessing latent profile differences. *Int. J. Educ. Vocat. Guid.*; 20:501–521
119. Lee, P. S. N., Leung, L., Lo, V., Xiong, C., Wu, T. (2011). Internet communication versus face-to-face interaction in quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 100, 375–389.
120. Leiss, W. (1995). Book Review: Towards a New Modernity. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*. 19 (4): 544–547, p. 544.
121. LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 764 –775.
122. Li, C.; Luo, R.D. (2017), Aging, grandparenting and rural out-migration: A study based on the micro perspective of family decisions. *Comp. Econ. Soc. Syst.*, 2, 135–146.
123. Li, Y., Hills T., Hertwig, R., (2020), A brief history of risk,. Oct; 203: 104344. *Cognition*, PMID: PMC7278655
124. Liu, C.H, Zhang, E, Wong, GTF, Hyun, S, Hahm, H.C. (2020), Factors associated with depression, anxiety, and PTSD symptomatology during the COVID-19 pandemic: clinical implications for U.S. young adult mental health. *Psychiatry Res.* 290:113172. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113172
125. Lund, C. et al., (2018), Social determinants of mental disorders and the Sustainable Development Goals: A systematic review of reviews, *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 5(4) 357–369
126. Lynch, J., Chelton, C. (2019), Evaluation of exposure to chemical agents, in S. Z. Mansdorf Ed., *Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3rd Edition, Wiley, p.78.
127. Mansdorf, S. Z., (2019), *Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3rd Edition, Wiley,
128. Mansouri, F., Sefidgarbaei, F.. (2021). Risk society and COVID-19. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 112 (1): 36–37.
129. Mark, G. M., Smith, A. P. (2008), *Stress models: A review and suggested new direction*, Nottingham University Press, 3, pp.125.

130. Marotz-Baden, R., Matteis, C. (1994). Daughters-in-law and stress in two generation farm families. *Family Relations*, 43(2), 132–137
131. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P. (2001). *Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. p. 397.
132. Maye et al., (2018). Present realities' and the need for a 'lived experience' perspective in Brexit Agri-food governance *Space and Polity*, 22 (2).
133. Mazure, C.M, Druss, B.G. (1995), A Historical Perspective on Stress and Psychiatric Illness. In Does Stress Cause Psychiatric Illness? Mazure, C.M., Ed.; *American Psychiatric Association: Washington, DC, USA*, pp. 1–41.
134. McCubbin, H., McCubbin, M.A., Thompson, A.I., Han, S.Y., & Allen, C.T. (1997). Families under stress: What makes them resilient? *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*. 89(3). 2-11.
135. McGuinness, Grimwood, (2017), Migrant workers in agriculture. House of commons briefing paper 7987 Disponibil la: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7987/CBP-7987.pdf>
136. Melamed, S., Shirom, A., Toker, S., Berliner, S. Shapira, I. (2006). Burnout and risk of cardiovascular disease: evidence, possible causal pathways and promising research directions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132 (3), 327–53.
137. Meltzer H., Bebbington P., Brugha T., Farrell M., Jenkins R. (2013). The relationship between personal debt and specific common mental disorders. *European Journal of Public Health*. 23(1): 108-13. Disponibil la <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22434207>
138. Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. The Guilford Press.
139. Miller, C. C. (2019), Why women, but not men, are judged for a messy house. *New York Times*. Disponibil la <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/11/upshot/why-women-but-not-men-are-judged-for-a-messy-house.html>.
140. Miranda, P.M., et al. (2019). A framework to assess the resilience of farming systems. *Science Direct, Agricultural Systems*, Volume 176, disponibil la <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308521X19300046>
141. Montano, D. (2016). Supervisor behaviour and its associations with employees' health in Europe. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 89(2), 28298
142. Morrison, K.A. (2008), Differentiating between physically violent and nonviolent stalkers: An examination of Canadian cases. *J. Forensic Sci.*;53:742–751.

143. Morrissette, A.M., Kisamore, J.L. (2020). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Role Stress and Organizational Commitment: the Moderating Effects of Occupational Type and Culture. *Occup Health Sci*.
144. Mosseri, S, Cooper, R, Foley, M. (2020), The future of work and gender: Insight paper, WGEA Commissioned Research Paper, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
145. Muschalla, B., and Linden, M. (2014). Workplace phobia, workplace problems, and work ability among primary care patients with chronic mental disorders. *J. Am. Board Fam. Med.* 27, 486–494.
146. Nedelkoska, L., Quintini, G. (2018), Automation, skills use and training, OECD Social, Employment, and Migration Working Papers.
147. Niedhammer, I., Sultan-Taïeb, H., Chastang, J.-F., Vermeulen, G., Parent-Thirion, A. (2014). Fractions of cardiovascular diseases and mental disorders attributable to psychosocial work factors in 31 countries in Europe. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 87(4), 403–411.
148. Nigel, K.N., Burns, C., Lyons, G. (2019). Financial conditions in the U.S. agricultural sector: Historical comparisons. *USDA Economic Research Service*.
149. Notelaers, Guy, Törnroos, Maria, Salin, Denise (2019), Effort-Reward Imbalance: A Risk Factor for Exposure to Workplace Bullying, *Front. Psychol*.
150. Ollier-Malaterre, A., Jacobs, J. A., Rothbard, N. P. (2019), Technology, Work, and Family: Digital Cultural Capital and Boundary Management, *Annual Review of Sociology*.
151. Palmer S, Cooper C., Thomas K, (2001), Model of organisational stress for use within an occupational health education/promotion or wellbeing programme – A short communication, *Health Education Journal*, Vol. 60, No.4.
152. Parker, S. K., Van den Broeck, A., Holman, D. (2017), Work design influences: a synthesis of multilevel factors that affect the design of jobs. *Acad. Manage. Ann.* 11, 267–308.
153. Parsons, S, Kruijt-Wil, A., Fox, E., (2016), A Cognitive Model of Psychological Resilience, *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, Issue 3, 296-310.
154. Patel, R. Stuffed and Starved: The Hidden Battle for the World Food System; (2012), Melville House Publishing: Brooklyn, NY, USA,.
155. Perez, G. M. (2019), Ergonomics: Achieving System Balance Through Ergonomic Analysis And Control, in *Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3rd Edition, Wiley, p.56.
156. Peterson, C., Stone, D. M., Marsh, S. M., Schumacher, P. K., Tiesman, H. M., McIntosh, W. L., Luo, F. (2018). Suicide rates by major occupational group—17 states, 2012 and 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 67, 1253–1260. Disponibil pe www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/67/wr/mm6745a1.htm#suggestedcitation

157. Peterson, Chris L. (2021). *Identifying and Managing Risk at Work*. Taylor & Francis.
<https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/books/9781000479393>
158. Philip, J., Cherian, V., (2020). Factors affecting the psychological well-being of health care workers during an epidemic: A thematic review. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*. 42 (4): 323–333.
159. Pinker, S. (2011), *The better angels of nature: The decline of violence in history and its causes*, Penguin.
160. Putz-Anderson, V., Galinsky, T.L. (1993). Psychophysically determined work durations for limiting shoulder girdle fatigue from elevated manual work. *Int. J. Ind. Ergon.* 11 (1),
161. Quinlan, M. (2020)., Five challenges to humanity: Learning from pattern/repeat failures in past disasters?, *The Economic and Labour Relations Review* 31 (3):1–23.
162. Rayner S., Cantor R. (1987), How fair is safe enough? The cultural approach to societal technology choice. *Risk Analysis*.;7(1):3–9.
163. Reio, T. G., Jr., Ghosh, R. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility: Implications for human resource development research and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20(3), p.250.
164. Rejeski, W. J., Mihalko, S. L. (2001). Physical activity and quality of life in older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 56(suppl_2), 23–35. P.23.
165. Renström, E. A., Bäck, H., (2021), Emotions During the Covid-19 Pandemic: Fear, Anxiety, and Anger as Mediators Between Threats and Policy Support and Political Actions, *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol*, volume 51, issue 8, P861-877.
166. Rosmann, M. R. (2010). The agrarian imperative. *Journal of Agromedicine*, 15, 71–75
167. Rugulies, R., Aust, B., Madsen, I. E. (2017). Effort–reward imbalance at work and risk of depressive disorders. a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Scand. J. Work, Environ. Health* 43, 294–306.
168. Sadiq, N., (2019), *Establishing an occupational health & safety management system based on ISO 45001*, IT Governance Publishing, p.205.
169. Safstrom, M., and Hartig, T. (2013). Psychological detachment in the relationship between job stressors and strain. *Behav. Sci.* 3, 418–433.
170. Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands–Resources model: A how to’ guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46, 120–132.
171. Schrecker, T. (2020), Globalization and health: Political grand challenges. *Review of International Political Economy*. 27 (1): 26–47.

172. Schulte, P., Vainio, H. (2010). Well-being at work: Overview and perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 36(5), 422–429.p.422.
173. Schwab, K. (2017). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. London: Portfolio Penguin.
174. Segal E. A., Gerdes K. E., Steiner, Sue, (2019), *An Introduction to the Profession of Social Work*, 5th Edition, Cengage Learning. p.56.
175. Shanafelt, T, Ripp, J, Trockel, M.(2020). Understanding and addressing sources of anxiety among health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA*.
176. Shepard, J. M. (1977). Technology, alienation, and job satisfaction. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 3, 1–21.
177. Shern, D. L., Blanch, A. K., Steverman, S. M. (2016). Toxic stress, behavioral health, and the next major era in public health, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 86(2), p.120.
178. Shestakofsky, B. (2017), *Working Algorithms: Software Automation and the Future of Work, Work and Occupations*.
179. Shkarupeta, E., et. all., (2021), Technological Development of Innovation Ecosystems in Conditions of Digital and Human-Centric Economy, *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, volume 181, disponibil la <https://www.atlantispress.com/proceedings/sdt-20/125958560>
180. Shrestha, et al. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on globalisation. *One Health*.
181. Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(1), 27–41.
182. Siegrist, J. (2017), *The Handbook of Stress and Health: A Guide to Research and Practice*, First Edition, , Book Editor(s):Cary L. Cooper, James Campbell Quick, Wiley Online Library,
183. Siegrist, J., Li, J. (2016). Associations of extrinsic and intrinsic components of work stress with health: a systematic review of evidence on the effort-reward imbalance model. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 13:432.
184. Siegrist, J.,Dragano, N. (2008). Psychosocial stress and disease risk in occupational life. Results of international studies on the demand-control and the effort-reward imbalance models. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, 51(3), 305–312.
185. Skinner, N., Brewer, N. (2002). The dynamics of threat and challenge appraisals prior to stressful achievement events. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 83, 678–692.
186. Smith, P. M., J. Oudyk, G. Potter, C. Mustard, and Members of the Ad Hoc Pandemic Survey Group. (2020). Labour market attachment, workplace infection control procedures and mental health: A cross-sectional survey of Canadian non-healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Annals of Work Exposures and Health* 65 (3): 266–276.

187. Sostero, M. et al. (2020), Teleworkability and the COVID-19 crisis: a new digital divide?, Seville:European Commission, 2020, JRC121193, <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/sites/jrcsh/files/jrc121193.pdf>.
188. Spencer, D. A. (2018), Fear and hope in an age of mass automation: debating the future of work, New Technology, Work and Employment.
189. Standing, G. (2016) *The Corruption of Capitalism : Why rentiers thrive and work does not pay.* Biteback Publishing. disponibil la https://books.google.com.au/books/about/The_Corruption_of_Capitalism.
190. Stansfeld, S., Candy, B. (2006), Psychosocial Work Environment and Mental Health — A Meta-Analytic Review, *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 32 443–462.
191. Sun, L. (2019). Perceived organizational support: a literature review. *Int J Hum Resour Stud* 9:21.
192. Sunstein C.R. (2005), Cambridge University Press;. *Laws of fear: Beyond the precautionary principle.*
193. Swenneke G. and all, (2018), (TNO), Management of psychosocial risk in European workplaces - evidence from the second European survey of enterprises on new and emerging risk (ESENER-2), European Risk Observatory Report, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.
194. Taylor, A. (2018), *The Automation Charade*, disponibil la <https://logicmag.io/05-theautomation-charade/>.
195. Theorell, T. (2001). Stress and health-from a work perspective. In J. Dunham (Ed.), *Stress in the workplace: Past, present and future* (pp. 34–51). Whurr Publishers.
196. Thoits, P. (2010). Stress and health: Major findings and policy implications. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 51, S41–S53.
197. Toch, M., Bambra, C., Lunau, T., Van Der Wel, K. A., Witvliet, M. I., Dragano, N., & Eikemo, T. A. (2014). All part of the job? The contribution of the psychosocial and physical work environment to health inequalities in Europe and the European health divide. *International Journal of Health Services*, 44(2), 285–305
198. Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167–176.
199. Toulan, O. (2020). Globalisation after COVID-19: What’s in Store? disponibil la <https://www.imd.org/research-knowledge/articles/Globalization-after-COVID-19-Whats-in-store>.

200. Trudeau, A-R. T., Bartholow, B., Luo, F. (2018). Suicide rates by major occupational group 17 states, 2012 and 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 67(45), 1253–1260.
201. Tsutsumi, A., & Kawakami, N. (2004). A review of empirical studies on the model of effort–reward imbalance at work: Reducing occupational stress by implementing a new theory. *Social Science & Medicine*, 59(11), 2335–2359.p.2335.
202. Tucker, S, M. (2005). Development of the family resilience assessment scale to identify family resilience constructs. Dissertation. University of Florida. Disponibil pe: <https://ufdc.ufl.edu/UFE0012882/00001>
203. Tummers, Lars G., Bakker, Arnold B.(2021), Leadership and Job Demands-Resources Theory: A Systematic Review, *Front. Psychol.*, 30 September 2021
204. Ulvenblad, P.,Cederholm B., J. (2018). A leadership development programme for agricultural entrepreneurs in Sweden. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 24(4), 327–343.
205. Vander Weele, T. J., Fulks, J., Plake, J. F., Lee, M. T. (2020). National well-being measures before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in online samples. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
206. Walker, C., Peterson, C. L. (2020). “Universal health coverage and primary health care: The experience of patients. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 1–6.
207. Walsh, F. (2016b). Strengthening family resilience. Third edition. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
208. Wang H. et all. (2022), Coping profiles among teachers: Implications for emotions, job satisfaction, burnout, and quitting intentions, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Volume 68, January, 2022.
209. Wike, R., Stokes, B. (2018) In *Advanced and Emerging Economies Alike, Worries About Job Automation*.
210. Wilder-Smith, A., Freedman, D. O. (2020). Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community containment: Pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak. *Journal of Travel Medicine*, 27(2).
211. Wilkinson, D.S. (1982). *Biological causes of occupational dermatoses*. In: *Occupational and Industrial Dermatology* (ed. H.I. Maibach and G.A. Gellin). Chicago, IL: Year Book Medical Publishers.
212. Williams, S., Braun, B. (2019). Loneliness and social isolation: A private concern, a public issue. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 111(1), 7–14

213. Windon, S., Robotham, D. (2021), The Relationship Between Farmers' Quality of Life and Their Leadership Competencies, *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, Volume 2, Issue 2, 2021.
214. Wood, A. J. et al. (2019) Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy', *Work, Employment and Society*.
215. Wood, J. L. (2014), Understanding gang membership: The significance of group processes, *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *SAGE Journals*.
216. Wookjae, H, Jae, M L, Narang , P , , (2020), Financial-related psychological factors affect life satisfaction of farmers, *Journal of Rural Studies*. Volume 80, December 2020, Pages 185-194
217. Wu et al. (2020), Psychological resilience and positive coping styles among Chinese undergraduate students: a cross-sectional study *BMC Psychology*
218. Younger, T., Heidi L R., (2021), Farmer Mental Health Interventions: A Systematic Review, *Int J Environ Res Public Health*,;19(1):244.
219. Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Skinner, E. A., (2016), *The Development of Coping: Implications for Psychopathology and Resilience*, Volume Four. Risk, Resilience, and Intervention, Wiley Online Library, disponibil la <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/9781119125556>. Devpsy 410
220. Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., Theocharous, A.L. (2014), Job Involvement, Commitment, Satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from Hotel Employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management*.

STUDII, RAPOARTE ȘI BAZE DE DATE ON-LINE

1. ACGIH (2017). Threshold Limit Values for Chemical Substances and Physical Agents & Biological Exposure Indices. Cincinnati OH: American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists.
2. American Psychological Association. The Road to Resilience.<https://www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience>.
3. CDC (2017). Highly Pathogenic Asian Avian Influenza A (H5N1) in People. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov/flu/avianflu/h5n1_people.htm
4. CE, (2020), Eurostat - Agriculture, forestry and fishery statistics — 2020 edition [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/12069644/KS-FK-20-001 ENN.pdf/a7439b01-671b-80ce-85e4-4d803c44340a?t=1608139005821](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/12069644/KS-FK-20-001_ENN.pdf/a7439b01-671b-80ce-85e4-4d803c44340a?t=1608139005821)
5. CE, (2021), Direct payments to agricultural producers - graphs and figures, Financial year 2020.
6. CE, (2021). Evaluation of the impact of the CAP on generational renewal, local development and jobs in rural areas

7. CE, (2021). Indicative figures on the distribution of aid, by size-class of aid, financial year 2020, Direct-aid-indicative-figures-2020_en.pdf.
8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2018). Agricultural safety. <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/aginjury/>
9. CDC (2017). CDC Yellow Book 2018: Health Information for International Travel. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, p.56.
10. EC (2021), EU agricultural outlook for markets, income and environment, 2021-2031. European Commission, DG Agriculture and Rural Development, Brussels.
11. EC, (2019), Informarea nr. 7 Schimbările structurale și reînnoirea generațiilor https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/foodfarmingfisheries/key_policies/documents/cap-briefs-7-structural-change_en.pdf.
12. EU-OSHA (2017), Protecting Workers in the Online Platform Economy an Overview of Regulatory and Policy Developments in the EU.
13. EU-OSHA (2020), Occupational Exoskeletons: Wearable Robotic Devices to Prevent Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders in the Workplace of the Future. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/occupationalexoskeletons-wearable-robotic-devices-and-preventing-work-related>
14. EU-OSHA (2021h), The Future of Working in a Virtual Environment and OSH. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.
15. EU-OSHA, (2020a). Review of the future of agriculture and occupational safety and health (OSH): a forward-looking analysis of new and emerging OSH risk. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/future-agriculture-and-forestry-implications-managing-worker-safety-and-health/view>
16. EU-OSHA, (2016), Contexts and arrangements for occupational safety and health in micro and small enterprises in the EU.SESAME project, European Risk Observatory,<https://osha.europa.eu/en/tools-and-publications/publications/contexts-and-arrangements-occupational-safety-and-health-micro/view>
17. EU-OSHA, (2019c), The Fourth Industrial Revolution and Social Innovation in the Workplace.<https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/fourth-industrial-revolution-and-social-innovationworkplace/view>
18. EU-OSHA, (2020f), Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders: Why Are They Still So Prevalent? Evidence from a Literature Review. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work; disponibil la <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/work-related-musculoskeletal-disorders-why-are-theystill-so-prevalent-evidence/view>

19. EU-OSHA, (2021f), Teleworking during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Risk and Prevention Strategies. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, disponibile a <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/teleworking-during-covid-19-pandemic-risk-andprevention-strategies/view>
- Pesole, A., et. all., (2018). Platform workers in Europe evidence from the COLLEEM survey. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Commission.
20. Eurofound (2019), Working conditions and workers' health, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
21. Eurofound, (2021), Psychosocial Risk. <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/topic/psychosocial-risk>.
22. European Parliament resolution of 10 July 2020 on the EU's public health strategy post-COVID-19 (2020/2691(RSP), disponibile a https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0205_EN.html
23. FAOSTAT, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/OEA>, Employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing - ILO modelled estimate
24. HSE – Management standards, Step 3: Evaluate the risk – Explore problems and develop solutions disponibile a <http://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/step3/index.htm>
25. ILO (2020), “A safe and healthy return to work during the COVID-19 pandemic: Policy Brief” (2020)
26. ILO Monitor. (2021), COVID-19 and the World of Work. Seventh edition. Updated Estimates and Analysis. Geneva: International Labour Office, disponibile a https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms_767028.pdf
27. ILO, (2012). Workplace Stress: A Collective Challenge, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), Management of psychosocial risk at work: An analysis of the findings of the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risk (ESENER)
28. ILO, (2016), Workplace Stress: A Collective Challenge European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), Management of psychosocial risk at work: An analysis of the findings of the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risk (ESENER).
29. ILO, (2020), Safe and Healthy working environments free from violence and harassment
30. McKinsey Global Institute (2020), The future of work in Europe: automation, workforce transitions and the shifting geography of employment, disponibile a <https://www.mckinsey.com/featuredinsights/future-of-work/the-future-of-work-in-europe>
31. McKinsey Global Institute, (2019), The future of women at work Transitions in the age of automation. Disponibile a www.mckinsey.com/mgi.

32. OECD (2020), "E-commerce in the time of COVID-19", OECD Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19), OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/3a2b78e8-en>.
33. OECD (2020), OECD Employment Outlook 2020: Worker Security and the COVID-19 Crisis, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/1686c758-en>.
34. OECD (2021), Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19), An assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on job and skills demand using online job vacancy data, <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/an-assessment-of-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-job-and-skills-demand-using-online-job-vacancy-data-20fff09e/>
35. OSHA (2021) Musculoskeletal disorders: association with psychosocial risk factors at work. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
36. OSHA, ESENER (2019) , What does it tell us about safety and health in Europe's workplaces? Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg: 2020, <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/esener-2019-policy-brief/view>
37. SURE (2020), Farm research project https://www.surefarmproject.eu/wordpress/wpcontent/uploads/2020/04/D3.6_Policy-brief-on-future-farm-demographics.pdf.
38. Whoqol Group (1995). The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the World Health Organization. *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(10), 1403–1409., p. 1405.
39. World Economic Forum, (2020) "The Global Risk Report." Insight Report 15th Ed. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risk-report-2020>.
40. World Health Organization, (2020). World Health Organization coronavirus press briefing. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-20-mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=1eafbff_0
41. World Health Organization. (2017). WHOQOL: Measuring quality of life. Disponibil la https://www.who.int/mental_health/media/68.pdf
42. TEMPO online, Intreprinderi active, pe activitati ale economiei nationale la nivel de diviziune CAEN Rev.2 si clase de marime dupa numarul de salariatii, 01 Agricultura, vanatoare si servicii anexe,
43. <http://statistici.insse.ro:8077/tempo-online/#/pages/tables/inssetable>
44. <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/369851513586667729/Thinking-CAP-World-Bank-Report-on-the-EU.pdf>
45. <http://www.ansvsa.ro/sanatate-bunastare-si-nutritie-animala/focare-de-pesta-porcina-africana>
46. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/index.htm>
47. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/12069644/KS-FK-20-001ENN.pdf/a7439b01-671b-80ce-85e4-4d803c44340a?t=1608139005821>

48. https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/funding/docs/eu4health_factsheet_en.pdf
49. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/about-eu-osha/what-we-do/european-risk-observatory>
50. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/emerging-risk>
51. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/legislation/guidelines/framework-agreement-on-work-related-stress>
52. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/legislation/guidelines/framework-agreement-on-harassment-and-violence-at-work>
53. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2019/10/24/economy-ofwellbeing-the-council-adopts-conclusions/>
54. <https://www.madr.ro/transparenta-institutionala/raport-activitate-madr.html>
55. <https://www.mhe-sme.org/european-parliament-pushes-for-the-eus-long-term-action-on-mental-health/>
56. <https://www.mhe-sme.org/open-letter-act-now-to-boost-mental-health-policy/>
57. https://www.what-europe-does-for-me.eu/data/pdf/focus/focus09_en.pdf

**LISTA LUCRARILOR ȘTIINȚIFICE PUBLICATE ȘI PREZENTATE LA
MANIFESTĂRI ȘTIINȚIFICE**

Articole publicate BDI

- [1] Gabrea, Ramona-Elena, Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, Popescu, Delia-Mioara, Tucmeanu, Alin-Iulian, (2017) . "The Project Team: Features, Effectiveness and Leadership". In S. Hugues & N. Cristache (eds.), Risk in Contemporary Economy (pp.250-260), Iași, România: LUMEN Proceedings, <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rce2017.1.21>
- [2] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019). Cooperation in Agriculture between Scepticism and Necessity, Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Economics and Administrative Sciences, 4(1), 56-66.
- [3] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2021). The Multiplication Of Psychosocial Risk Factors For Agricultural Entrepreneurs, Management Intercultural, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 47, pages 69-75, December.
- [4] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2022), Dynamic Assessment Of Workers Safety And Health Risk, SEA - Practical Application of Science, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 29, pages 97-101, September.
- [5] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2022), Effects Of Structural Changes On Employment Relations, Management Intercultural, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 48, pages 35-41, July. 22
- [6] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2022), Ensuring a Positive Occupational Health And Safety Culture At The Organizational Level, Management Intercultural, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 49, pages 59-63.

Participări conferințe științifice

- [1] Gabrea, Ramona-Elena, Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, Popescu, Delia-Mioara, Tucmeanu, Alin-Iulian, (2017) . "The Project Team: Features, Effectiveness and Leadership," 18th edition of the Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy", RCE 2017, June9-10,2017, Galati, România.

- [2] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019), Cooperation in Agriculture between Scepticism and Necessity, 6th Central and Eastern European LUMEN Conference, NASHS, Chișinău, September 19-21, 2019.
- [3] Lăscaie, Cătălin Ionuț, Popescu, Delia Mioara, (2019), Agricultural systems in a changing world, 6th Central and Eastern European LUMEN Conference, NASHS, Chisinau, September 19-21, 2019.
- [4] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019), The Importance Of the Demographic Structure In The Regional Development, International Conference “Knowledge economy – challenges of the 21st century”, Universitatea Constantin Brancoveanu, Pitești, România.
- [5] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019), The Decision Making Process In Agriculture, International Conference of Cross Cultural Competence, 11-23 November 2019, Iași, România.

Curriculum vitae Europass



Informații personale

Nume / Prenume **LĂSCAIE CĂTĂLIN IONUȚ**
Adresă Nr. 1002, com. Lungulețu, jud. Dâmbovița, România
Telefon Mobil: (+4) 0769 10 12 56
(+4) 0752 23 00 22
E-mail v.lossky@yahoo.com
Naționalitate Română
Data nașterii 12.10.1983
Sex Masculin

Experiența profesională

Perioada	2022-Prezent
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Presedinte – Camera de Diplomatie Comerciala Bilaterala Romania-Grecia
Perioada	2020-Prezent
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Consilier Judetean- Consiliul Judetean Dambovita
Perioada	2021 - Prezent
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Manager general
Numele și adresa angajatorului	SC ȚARA NOASTRĂ SRL
Perioada	Iunie 2013 - Noiembrie 2020
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Manager
Numele și adresa angajatorului	Centrul Județean de Cultură Dâmbovița, Târgoviște, str. Al. Ioan Cuza, nr. 15
Perioada	Septembrie 2012 - Iunie 2013
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Director
Numele și adresa angajatorului	Serviciul Public Județean de Turism, Tineret și Sport Dâmbovița - Târgoviște , Piața Tricolorului, nr. 1
Perioada	2015 - 2020
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Membru în Comitetul Județean
Numele și adresa angajatorului	Crucea Roșie Dâmbovița, Târgoviște, str. Al. Ioan Cuza, nr. 1
Perioada	2016 - Prezent
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Președinte
Numele și adresa angajatorului	Cooperativa Agricolă “Produce în Dâmbovița”, Lungulețu, nr. 960, jud. Dâmbovița
Perioada	Iulie 2012 - Noiembrie 2020
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Membru în Consiliul de Administrație

Numele și adresa angajatorului	SC Carpatmontana Serv SA, Târgoviște, str. Nicolae Iorga, nr. 3
Perioada	1 Ianuarie 2012 - 30 August 2012
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Manager
Numele și adresa angajatorului	Întreprinderea Individuală Lăscăie Aurora
Perioada	2009 - 2018
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Administrator
Numele și adresa angajatorului	SC Lumea Fructelor și Legumelor SRL, com. Lungulețu, nr. 960, jud. Dâmbovița
Perioada	2009 - 2014
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Administrator
Numele și adresa angajatorului	SC Lungu Grup SRL
Perioada	2008 - 2021
Funcția sau postul ocupat	Administrator
Numele și adresa angajatorului	SC Bonano SRL
Educație și formare	
Calificarea / diploma obținută	Doctorand
Disciplinele principale studiate / competențe profesionale dobândite	Management
Numele și tipul instituției de învățământ / furnizorului de formare	Universitatea "Valahia" din Târgoviște
Calificarea / diploma obținută	Student
Disciplinele principale studiate / competențe profesionale dobândite	Inginerie economică
Numele și tipul instituției de învățământ / furnizorului de formare	Universitatea de Științe Agronomice și Medicină Veterinară, București
Calificarea / diploma obținută	Masterand
Disciplinele principale studiate / competențe profesionale dobândite	Managementul informațiilor
Numele și tipul instituției de învățământ / furnizorului de formare	Universitatea "Valahia" din Târgoviște
Calificarea / diploma obținută	Diplomă de master
Disciplinele principale studiate / competențe profesionale dobândite	Teologie pastorală
Numele și tipul instituției de învățământ / furnizorului de formare	Facultatea de Teologie Ortodoxă - Universitatea "Valahia" din Târgoviște
Perioada	2003 - 2007
Calificarea / diploma obținută	Diplomă de licență

Numele și tipul instituției de învățământ / furnizorului de formare	Facultatea de Teologie Ortodoxă - Universitatea "Valahia" din Târgoviște
Perioada	1998 - 2003
Calificarea / diploma obținută	Diplomă de bacalaureat
Numele și tipul instituției de învățământ / furnizorului de formare	Seminarul Teologic Ortodox "Sfântul Ioan Gură de Aur" din Târgoviște
Alte studii / activități	Voluntar - contract de voluntariat - la Fundația "United Europe" din București, ianuarie 2011 - septembrie 2012 Diplomă - Manager cultural - atestat de Ministerul Culturii Diplomă - Manager de proiect
Aptitudini și competențe personale	
Limba maternă	Română
Limbi străine cunoscute	
+Autoevaluare	
Nivel european (*)	
Engleză	
Franceză	
Competențe și aptitudini organizatorice	- Spirit de echipă; - Abilități organizatorice și de comunicare; - Stăpânire de sine, responsabilitate, inițiativă, auto-organizare; - Disponibilitatea de a lucra peste orele de program și de a face deplasări de serviciu în alte locații.
Competențe și aptitudini de utilizare a calculatorului	- Cunoștințe PC de bază: Microsoft Office; - Abilități de navigare pe Internet.
Alte competențe și aptitudini	Corectitudine, seriozitate, capacitate de adaptare la nou.
Permis de conducere	Categoria B.

Înțelegere				Vorbire				Scriere	
Ascultare		Citire		Participare la conversație		Discurs oral		Exprimare scrisă	
A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar
A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar	A1	Utilizator elementar

(*) Nivelul Cadrelui European Comun de Referință Pentru Limbi Străine

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
"VALAHIA" UNIVERSITY OF TÂRGOVIȘTE
IOSUD – DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND
HUMANITIES
FIELD: MANAGEMENT**

SUMMARY OF THE PHD THESIS

**PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN ROMANIA**

**SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:
Prof. univ. dr. Delia Mioara POPESCU**

**PHD STUDENT:
Cătălin Ionuț LĂSCAIE**

**Targoviste
2022**

CONTENT

The importance, actuality and motivation of the theme approached _____	5
The state of knowledge in the field of psychosocial risk _____	52
The structure of the doctoral thesis _____	53
The methodological specificity of the research _____	54
Research objectives _____	55
Research hypotheses _____	56
Correlation analysis and hypothesis testing _____	57
Final conclusions _____	59
Personal contributions _____	63
1. Theoretical contributions with a synthesis character _____	63
2. Theoretical contributions in the field of psychosocial risk management _____	63
3. Experimental contributions _____	64
4. Contributions to the optimization of the normative framework of psychosocial risk management _____	65
5. Contributions to the development of scientific research _____	65
Future research directions _____	66

CONTENTS OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/3

LIST OF FIGURES/4

LIST OF TABLES/10

INTRODUCTION/12

CHAPTER 1. STAGE OF KNOWLEDGE IN THE FIELD OF PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK/17

1.1. Conceptualization and meaning of risk/ 17

1.2. Increase in systemic risk/ 19

1.2.1. The risk of climate change / 21

1.2.2. Technological risk/ 23

1.2.3. The risk associated with the current socio-economic context/ 26

1.2.4. Risk framework for security and safety at work/29

1.3. The need to research psychosocial risk/ 32

1.3.1. Psychosocial risk factors in the work environment/ 34

1.3.2. The influence of stress on work productivity/ 38

1.3.3. Addressing psychosocial risk at the level of the European Union/ 41

1.3.4. Directions and trends in the management of psychosocial risk at the level of the European Union/ 46

1.4. Theories and research models of psychosocial risk/ 47

1.4.1. The effort-reward imbalance model at work/ 51

1.4.2. Labor demand theory - resources/ 54

1.4.3. The Health and Safety Executive model, for stress analysis at the workplace/ 57

1.4.4. General framework of the health consequences of stress at work/60

CHAPTER 2. PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK MANAGEMENT IN AGRICULTURE/ 67

2.1. The agrarian imperative/67

2.2. Framework of psychosocial risk and resilience of farmers/69

2.2.1. Political level/environment/73

2.2.2. Level of government institutions/75

2.2.3. Community level /77

2.2.4. Organizational level/78

2.2.5. Individual level/84

2.3. Current risk and stress predictors for farmers, at the level of the European Union/87

2.3.1. The effects of structural changes on agriculture in the European Union/87

2.3.2. Aging of the agricultural workforce /92

2.3.3. The Covid 19 pandemic and the resource crisis/ 94

2.3.4. The impact of new technologies on occupational safety and health in agriculture/97

2.4. Determinants of Farmers' Job Satisfaction and Quality of Life/99

CHAPTER 3. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH OF CURRENT PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK FOR FARMERS IN ROMANIA/102

- 3.1. The scientific background, motivation and relevance of the research topic/102
- 3.2. Research objectives/103
- 3.3. Research hypotheses/104
- 3.4. Methodology of empirical research of psychosocial risk for farmers/ 105
- 3.5. Description of sample composition/107
- 3.6. Analysis and interpretation of results/110
 - 3.6.1. Physical, chemical and biological risk/110
 - 3.6.2. Psychosocial risk factors/111
 - 3.6.2.1. Exceptional stressors/111
 - 3.6.2.2. Extrinsic work stress factors/115
 - 3.6.2.3. Stress factors intrinsic to work/117
 - 3.6.3. Determinants of Farmer Resilience/135
 - 3.6.3.1. Coping strategies/135
 - 3.6.3.2. Work-family balance/138
 - 3.6.3.3. Satisfaction in work and life/140
 - 3.6.4. The influence of stress on farmers' health/142
 - 3.6.4.1. Self-perceived health status/142
 - 3.6.4.2. Symptoms of stress/144
 - 3.6.4.3. Stress-related diseases/146
- 3.7. Correlation analysis and hypothesis testing/148

CHAPTER 4. PROPOSAL OF A REFERENCE FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK FOR FARMERS IN ROMANIA/196

- 4.1. Current predictors of work stress for Romanian farmers /196
 - 4.1.1. Assessment of psychosocial risk specific to farmers/204
 - 4.1.2. Compliance with occupational health and safety rules/ 207
- 4.2. Assessment, representation and comparison of psychosocial risk for farmers/209
- 4.3. Designing the register of psychosocial risk for farmers/210
- 4.4. Matrix of psychosocial risk levels/214

CONCLUSIONS/217

PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS/222

- 1. Theoretical contributions with a synthesis character /222
- 2. Theoretical contributions in the field of risk management psychosocial/222
- 3. Experimental contributions/223
- 4. Contributions to the optimization of the normative framework of psychosocial risk management /224
- 5. Contributions to the development of scientific research/224

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF RESEARCH/225

BIBLIOGRAPHY/226

ANNEXES/247

KEYWORDS: psychosocial risk management, assessment of psychosocial risk, psychosocial risk for farmers

The importance, actuality and motivation of the theme approached

The agricultural world is one of risk and the psychosocial environment of work in agriculture is part of a complex, changing world. The integration of agriculture into the market economy has led to an increasing vulnerability of the agricultural sector. Trends in global and local markets directly influence the agrarian population. Assets can be severely and quickly affected by war, extreme weather conditions, disease or lack of liquidity.

Agriculture involves a wide range of machinery, animals, plants and products, which are worked with both indoors and outdoors, in varied geographical and climatic conditions. There are farmers who are not aware of their obligations, rights and responsibilities, the field facing the biggest challenges related to the organization of the workforce, geographical isolation and various cultural attitudes.

Health and safety is a fundamental requirement of a sustainable agribusiness and should be considered an essential part of agribusiness management. Risk taking is a common problem in agriculture and the self-employed are particularly vulnerable.

Farmers' exposure to risk has increased over time and unanticipated events continue to occur with considerable impact on them, so managing psychosocial risk is more important than ever. It is the responsibility of researchers and policy makers to understand the complexity of the issues facing farmers today. Given this context, a constant assessment of the risk relevant to farmers' activities is necessary. Ideally, new initiatives that seek to promote and support holistic risk management should be evidence-based on how farmers cope with multiple risk.

Psychosocial risk vary enormously at the individual level, being affected by material and social resources, personality and cultural factors. The effects of stress are difficult to measure, being chronic or acute in nature, generating dissatisfaction and anomie, from low to severe mental illness, violence and suicide.

In recent decades, profound economic, social and political changes have led to a considerable (and still ongoing) transformation of the working environment in Romania. The agricultural sector and rural life, comprising a wide variety of distinct activities, have seen a number of changes in recent years.

The PhD thesis explores and develops the theoretical, methodological and practical foundations of the study of psychosocial risk, from a new and complex perspective, provides a necessary link between health and safety research and agriculture.

It is important to health and safety management researchers and practitioners alike, it provides a theoretical and empirical perspective, drawing on both the existing literature and its own

research, it succeeds in bringing more clarity to a conceptual area until now somewhat confusing, although very important.

European and national legislation requires employers to protect the safety and health of workers, including managing psychosocial risk. In this sense, both employees and employers must take responsibility for managing psychosocial risk at work. Employers have obligations and are responsible for carrying out adequate and sufficient risk assessments to mitigate any possible negative effects on the health and safety of employees. At the same time, it is imperative to maintain the health of the workforce and ensure the health of society in general.

The relevance of the research undertaken resides in the approach and highlighting of psychosocial risk factors for farmers. The work contributes to the clarification of issues of general interest, having a large number of beneficiaries. The obtained results add value to the research carried out in the field of risk for the health and safety of workers, the proposed approach paving the way for future research. For a detailed evaluation of farmers' perceptions of psychosocial risk and the impact on their well-being, qualitative and quantitative research methods were used that allowed the achievement of the proposed objectives and the demonstration of the established hypotheses.

The state of knowledge in the field of psychosocial risk

Work gives people purpose in life, helps shape and develop identity, and satisfies a wide range of human needs. The reality of everyday professional life has major implications that turn this reality into a rather addictive comfort zone. To achieve and maintain the professional activity requires a lot of effort, to acquire the necessary skills, a lot of repetitive work and a strict discipline of time and attention. As a result, there is a tendency to perceive this activity as a part of each person's identity. External pressure on this activity is perceived as a danger that can cause all kinds of stress reactions. Such pressure can generate unpleasant emotions, which most people prefer not to face, there is a tendency to fight against such dangers, resulting in feelings associated with the concept of stress, which actually involves an unconscious and irrational response .

Highlighting trends and adjacent factors that impact workplaces can lead to awareness of how technological, societal, political, economic and environmental changes affect worker safety and health. In general terms, occupational safety and security risk involve actions or activities related to the workplace, including the choice of inaction, that may lead to a loss or an undesirable outcome. Almost every human activity carries some risk, but some activities are much riskier than others.

Psychosocial risk (PSR) are currently classified in the category of emerging risk for

occupational safety and health. This risk category refers to the likelihood that a person will be affected, or have adverse health effects, if exposed to a psychosocial hazard ⁵. They arise from the interactions between the work environment, job content, work organization, capabilities, culture, extra-job considerations of workers and can influence their health, work performance and job satisfaction ⁶. These interactions include a multitude of occupational stressors.

Occupational health and safety requirements are driven by moral, legal and economic considerations and play an essential role for both workers and employers. Risk management systems attempt to systematize how organizational goals are met and help ensure a sustainable organization. Occupational health and safety management has in the past largely focused on hazard, but today a more comprehensive approach is being attempted. In the field of safety and health, legislative regulations represent the minimum acceptable level. These regulations represent a standard level of safety that is specifically defined, checked by inspections and corrected by fines.

This level is the minimum acceptable for an organization in terms of safety culture and valuing the well-being of their workers. Decisions, however, must consider not only what is necessary, but also what should be done to provide a safer workplace, to minimize the risk associated with the activity. Thus organizations should consider the best practices and adapt them for their organization.

The way organizations deal with workplace risk, and especially psychosocial risk, may differ from the context in which organizations operate.

The need to improve health and safety does not just stem from ethical considerations, it is driven equally by the national economy and culture, the directions, barriers and policies of organisations, the size and sector in which they operate, the concerns of stakeholders and national regulatory requirements.

The structure of the doctoral thesis

Chapter 1 of the doctoral thesis includes a conceptualization of the meaning of risk in scientific research, of new systemic risk for security and human health. The amplification of systemic risk produced by climate change, technological development, globalization and the effects of the pandemic, brings to attention the need for continuous research into psychosocial risk, from the current work environment and the negative influence of stress on work productivity.

Socio-political and technological influences on the characteristics of work and associated

⁵ILO, (2012). *Workplace Stress: A Collective Challenge*, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), *Management of psychosocial risk at work: An analysis of the findings of the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risk (ESENER)*, Accessed 3.02.2021.

⁶Eurofound, (2021). *Psychosocial Risk*. available at: <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/topic/psychosocial-risk>. Accessed 05.02.2022.

risk, the internationalization of health risk, new risk and vulnerabilities of the workforce and labor relations were detailed.

Within the chapter, a presentation of the most influential psychosocial risk research theories and models was made: the Effort-Reward Imbalance Model at the workplace, the Work Demands-Resources Theory and the Workplace Stress Indicator Tool of Health and Safety Executive, the general framework of the health consequences of stress at work, all of which constitute the theoretical framework that was the basis of the research undertaken in the doctoral thesis .

Chapter 2 of the doctoral thesis highlights the latest aspects related to the management of psychosocial risk at the level of the European Union and compliance with the rules of safety and health at work, being a description of the approach to psychosocial risk, directions and trends in risk management psychosocial.

The chapter brings to the forefront of the research, the agrarian imperative, a fundamental aspect of the framework of psychosocial risk and resilience of farmers. This multilevel analysis framework addresses the political and environmental level, the level of institutions intended to support the activity of farmers, the community level, the farm level, the interpersonal level and the individual level, and a series of determinants of job satisfaction and the quality of life of farmers. The risk of the psychosocial work environment in agriculture at the European Union level are highlighted, starting from the effects of structural changes on agriculture, the aging of the workforce, the COVID-19 pandemic and the resource crisis, the impact of new technologies on the safety and health of agricultural workers.

Chapter 3 of the doctoral thesis presents the results of the empirical research of the current psychosocial risk for farmers in Romania . The general objectives of the research carried out through the doctoral thesis included the identification of psychosocial risk factors for farmers, the examination of the impact of psychosocial risk factors on individual health and job satisfaction for farmers, the identification of strategies used by them to deal with psychosocial risk.

Chapter 4 of the doctoral thesis proposes a referential framework for the assessment and management of psychosocial risk for farmers. Starting from the analysis of the current predictors of work stress for farmers in Romania and the need to comply with their occupational health and safety rules, the evaluation, representation and comparison of psychosocial risk, the design of the psychosocial risk register and the matrix of psychosocial risk levels for farmers are carried out

The methodological specificity of the research

The empirical research carried out as part of the doctoral thesis was based on a descriptive survey and targeted farmers with legal personality in Romania. Its purpose was to gather

information on certain aspects and phenomena currently existing in this field. Topics of interest for research are issues related to working conditions, excessive work load, with tasks, additional roles against the background of continuous and multiple social changes, simultaneously with the reduction of resources, control over the way of working and labor relations. Various sources of dissatisfaction were tested, which can highlight an increase in the degree of stress at work, reduced social support, work-family balance, as well as some aspects that moderate stress at work.

The structuring of the questions followed the taxonomy established by The Health and Safety Executive's Psychosocial Risk Analysis Model (HSE) , being adapted to the specific circumstances of the studied field. So the evaluation of the general working conditions of farmers was followed in Romania and the highlighting of possible stress factors .

The HSE approach suggests using a survey as a useful source of information to consider whether stress is a potential problem for the workforce. The survey is only the beginning of the risk assessment process and a broad indicator of the existing situation. This may provide a starting point, not a clear diagnosis of all possible sources of work-related stress.

Individual perceptions play an important role in predicting health status under stressful conditions. Farmers' opinions represented a useful indicator of self-perceived health status and potential psychosocial risk for them.

The empirical research carried out in the doctoral thesis aimed to obtain a clearer picture of the working conditions, of the potential psychosocial risk factors for farmers. This was realized through the design of a questionnaire , comprising 35 questions , called Psychosocial Risk Assessment Questionnaire for Romanian Farmers.

The structure of the questions sought to highlight the risk factors associated with the current content and context of farmers' work : physical, chemical, biological risk , exceptional stress factors during or as a result of the COVID -19 pandemic, other exceptional stress factors specific to agricultural work , stress factors originating from the extrinsic and intrinsic demands of the farmers' work, stress factors related to control over time and working methods, the support received from the authorities and the community, labor relations, those arising from the exercise of the role, those related to perception of changes, work-family balance, job satisfaction. On the other hand, the questionnaire sought to highlight farmers' reactions to stressful situations, possible stress-related symptoms or diseases, and a self-report of their health status.

Research objectives

The research carried out as part of the doctoral thesis, analyzed a series of conditions and requirements specific to the work of farmers, as well as how these problems can affect their physical

and mental health.

The formulation of objectives is an essential component of any research. The objectives of the research carried out within the doctoral thesis represent its basic purpose. The fundamental objective of the research was to examine the impact of psychosocial risk factors on individual health and job satisfaction for Romanian farmers.

As derived objectives, the research sought to analyze the influences of the current requirements of farmers' work, related to the level of stress, to investigate the relationship between the control exercised by farmers over their own activities and the level of stress, to determine the relationship between the level of stress and the institutional and community support given to farmers from Romania.

Research hypotheses

objectives was followed by the creation of empirical hypotheses, and these will be subjected to systematic testing to be proven or disproved. The hypotheses postulated in the research indicate the expectations regarding the variables constructed following the application of the questionnaire. The variables used for testing and verifying the hypotheses are based on the theoretical foundation of the doctoral thesis, being defined during the research, the proposed hypotheses were tested and verified through them.

The research hypotheses were formulated, starting from the need for them to reflect the objective reality, the essence, inter-conditioning and causality of the facts, phenomena and processes that constitute psychosocial risk factors in the activity of farmers.

In accordance with the derived objectives, the following hypotheses were proposed to be demonstrated:

I.1. Farmers' current work demands are positively associated with their stress levels.

I.2. The control exercised over one's own activity is negatively associated with the stress level of farmers.

I.3. Institutional and community support given to farmers is negatively associated with their level of stress.

Derived objectives and correlation with research hypotheses

Derived objectives	Hypotheses
---------------------------	-------------------

O.1 . Analysis of the influences of the current demands of the farmers' work, related to the level of stress	I.1 . Farmers' current work demands are positively associated with their stress levels
O.2 . Investigating the relationship between the control exercised by farmers over their own activities and the level of stress	I.2. The control exercised over one's own activity is negatively associated with their stress level
O.3. Determining the relationship between the level of stress and the institutional and community support given to farmers	I.3. Institutional and community support given to farmers is negatively associated with their level of stress

Correlation analysis and hypothesis testing

In order to prove the hypotheses, the research of the interdependence links between the variables put into discussion with the help of the questionnaire was pursued. Since human attitudes and modes of reaction cannot be directly observed, several sets of questions have been constructed, formulated in such a way as to reflect reality as closely as possible. The questionnaire items were designed to measure certain attributes (requirements, attitudes, factors, behaviors) of farmers.

The answers obtained from the processing of the questionnaires received from the farmers were materialized in a large database. As a way to ensure a minimum number of hypothetical factors that can be explained, as well as a way to explore the data for the purpose of possible reduction, exploratory factor analysis was used.

To build a smaller data set, the initial variables were grouped on the main dimensions of the work environment considered stressors by HSE standards ⁷. With the help of the SPSS program, the items related to work requirements/tasks, control over the way of working, support received from the community, support received from the authorities, labor relations, clarity of the held role, the way change is managed, were selected. satisfaction related to aspects of the job, as well as how to react to stressful situations, self-assessment of stress-specific symptoms and self-assessment of health status.

Conclusions after testing the hypotheses

Using Pearson correlations it was checked the extent to which farmers are affected by certain dimensions of risky jobs. Positive and negative, high, moderate and low correlations were recorded

⁷<http://www.hse.gov.uk> www.hse.gov.uk /stress/standards/index.htm

between the analyzed dimensions.

As a result of the obtained results, Hypothesis 1 was confirmed, current work demands being positively correlated with increasing farmers' stress. The COVID-19 pandemic has increased the general work demands of farmers and stressors have intensified ($r=829$). The acceleration of recent changes related to the work of farmers, leads to increased requirements of their work ($r=582$), and the increase in the extrinsic requirements of the work of farmers, increase their psychosocial risk factors ($r=711$). With the increase in the extrinsic demands of farmers' work, they also increase their stress-related illnesses ($r=221$), and the increase in the intrinsic demands of farmers' work, are also increasing their stress symptoms ($r=529$).

As for Hypothesis 2, it was also confirmed, the reduced control over one's own activity being negatively correlated with farmers' stress. Low control over working time and manner, during or as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, led to increased stress factors for farmers ($r=505$). The increase in the extrinsic requirements of farmers' work, decreased their control over their time and way of working ($r= - 415$). Multiple and frequent changes affect the work of farmers, who have little control over their time and way of working ($r=641$). At the same time, the increase in the imbalance between work and family increased the factors generating stress ($r=591$). The decrease in the farmers' control over their time and way of working increases the number of stress-related diseases ($r= - 788$).

The obtained results also confirmed Hypothesis 3, the lack of support given to farmers contributes to increasing their stress. The low support given by the authorities and the community to farmers is negatively correlated with the stress factors generated by the COVID-19 pandemic ($r= - 456$). Despite the increase in changes related to farmers' work, the support offered to them by the authorities decreased ($r= - 515$). Along with the reduced support of the authorities, the psychosocial risk factors related to work increase for farmers ($r= - 449$). Simultaneously with the increase in the extrinsic requirements of farmers' work, the support received from the authorities and the community decreased ($r= - 705$), the decrease in support from the authorities contributes to a low health status of farmers ($r= - 644$), and the low support from authorities and the community, the satisfaction of farmers related to work decreases ($r= - 705$).

Farmers' work is affected by high demands, little control over the time and way of working, and the lack of support from the authorities and the community in carrying out the work, which causes symptoms and diseases related to psychological stress and leads to the deterioration of their health. Comparing the obtained results, it can be appreciated that the central hypothesis of the Requirements - Control - Support Model (DCSM) is confirmed, which states that social support is vital for employees when they face increased demands at work. The DCSM hypothesis states that jobs characterized by high demands, low control and social isolation or lack of social support cause

psychological stress and lead to the deterioration of workers' health ⁸.

Final conclusions

The world of work has changed in many ways and we need to learn how to process this metamorphosis. The future of work must give everyone the chance to show up at work to fulfill their role, enjoying support, purpose, clarity, balance, health and safety. Ensuring the health and safety of employees must remain a priority, and it is imperative that business leaders introduce or adapt their strategies to manage the impact of the crisis and prepare for the future.

We are at an inflection point in how work is managed, planned and even lived. Technological waves, globalization, pandemic crisis and geo-political crises are forcing business leaders to redesign their businesses. Organizations are necessarily rethinking jobs and people are rethinking their careers, not just learning new skills, but learning new roles, relationships and ways to measure progress.

The survey, carried out during the doctoral research, was designed to cover areas that are known to be potential causes of stress for farmers in Romania. Running the survey alone will not solve the problems, but it is important that the results are used in combination with other data sources as part of an improvement process. The analysis tool designed by the author of the research is useful because it expresses the opinions and experience of the farmers, the results obtained representing quantifiable evidence on the basis of which an action plan can be built. The research undertaken started from the idea that any source of data on psychosocial risk can become part of a puzzle, and when more and more pieces are fitted together, a more complete picture can be obtained .

Farmer stress presents a particular challenge to researchers because agriculture operates in an unusual organizational context, one that lacks the frameworks within which traditional stress management techniques operate. For these reasons, the doctoral thesis wanted to identify the attributes of those who work on farms, evaluate the negative sources of stress, the ability of farmers to respond to ordinary and exceptional stress factors, in order to recover and prosper.

The questionnaire created by the author of the PhD thesis followed the established Health and Safety Executive (HSE) taxonomy, the JDCS model, the ERI model as well as other workplace stress research models. The research revealed the factors in the field of activity of the farmers, which generate stress, the demands of the job, the lack of control over the way of work, the lack of support from the authorities and the multiple changes.

⁸Karasek, RA (1979), Job demands, decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign, *Administrative Science Quarterly* , p.285

The PhD thesis provides a good indication of how farmers view their working environment and important areas of stress. Through a complex approach, the influence of a wide range of psychosocial risk factors, general or specific to the work of farmers, which often combine or interact, was analyzed. The research provides a measure of exposure to psychosocial work conditions that may have stress-related outcomes for farmers in Romania.

The research undertaken is consistent with the process of regulating worker health and safety risk and the results can be used to make a real difference by managing the causes of stress for farmers. There are risk hotspots, due to both extrinsic and intrinsic factors of the farmers' work, which are evaluated and highlighted through the risk matrix. Concurrently, the consequences of these risk on farmers' health, commitment and well-being were investigated. Understanding farmers' perceptions of their working environment informs areas for improvement.

Employers have a duty to ensure that the risk arising from the work activity are adequately controlled. The socio-ecological model of farmer risk and resilience shows that beyond the first three levels, individual, interpersonal and farm, it is the community, organizational and policy/environmental levels that affect farmers' stress levels. In the interconnection of these levels, any action, decision taken at one level affects the other levels.

Research on stress among farmers must therefore be seen beyond individual stress management, or farm risk management, to the broader systems, environments and policies that affect farmers. This approach starts from the consideration that individual stress management is necessary but not sufficient. A multi-level approach can provide a framework for considering stressor prevention and mitigation and stress reduction options.

The research undertaken through the PhD thesis provides a starting point for action, a way of organizing responses and reporting evidence of impact.

Farmers are affected by stressors extrinsic and intrinsic to their work, from the economic, environmental, social and institutional domains. They are challenged to resist, adapt and/or transform in response to increasingly complex impacts from all the four domains. The interconnectedness, dynamics of change and uncertainties arising from each challenge area can lead to exceptional stressors on farmers. For the agricultural community, exceptional stressors become a problem that requires community solutions, including public policy.

Recent changes in agriculture have often conflicted with farmers' expectations and increased stress levels in immeasurable ways. This was particularly the case for the work-related and extrinsic dimensions of stress, including price fluctuations, increased demand for documents, increased workload, and changes in agricultural regulations. Increases in agricultural commodity prices, accompanied by substantial fluctuations in energy and fertilizer prices, have led to concerns that agricultural production practices may no longer keep pace with demand. Farmers are facing

increasing working hours, especially in smaller businesses trying to offset inflationary costs with a reduced workforce.

These have caused a qualitative escalation of aspects of the activity, which farming communities feel powerless to control or influence, and represent a major area for policy interventions.

Despite the general perception that farming is a healthy occupation, farmers face numerous risk factors, leading to multiple diseases, high levels of stress and relatively low levels of well-being. The demanding nature of farm work forces farmers to prioritize farm productivity over personal health care.

Common stressors include balancing the farm business and personal life, dealing with health issues, managing farm and family finances. Exceptional stressors include unusual weather phenomena, increased prices of raw materials, commercial problems related to the capitalization of productions, changes in legal regulations, the effects of the pandemic, etc. The negative effects of stress threaten farmers and their families, hence the need for farmers to learn about risk reduction while building resilience. How farmers, families and their businesses manage stressful demands and changes will determine their outcomes or impacts. The management of demands or changes is influenced both by the perceived meaning of demands and changes and by the internal and external resources or capital available to farmers. Responses to stressors and agricultural practices among farmers and family members are usually considered to be personal in nature. They move into the public arena when the impact goes beyond the family to agricultural businesses, communities, organizations and policies.

Farmers have to meet a lot of administrative requirements, manage more and more tasks related to documents required by state institutions, which reduces their degree of autonomy in the way of work, workload and generates work-related stress. Causes of farmer stress include completing paperwork and meeting regulatory requirements, difficulty understanding forms, and problems arising from the effects of new legislation and regulations.

At the level of the responsible institutions, the mental, emotional, behavioral reactions of the agricultural population, related to socio-economic needs, are not well understood. Support agencies need to provide a range of responsive and proactive services but often this does not happen in practice. In concrete terms, support must be multidimensional, reflecting the wide range of farmers' needs and their impact among farming communities.

The agricultural regulatory framework is a critical issue among farmers, who consider it to be restrictive rather than protective. The different administrative systems and regulations related to agriculture are considered by farmers to be ill-conceived, implying conflicting demands. On the other hand regulations change far too frequently, before farmers have time to adapt they are faced

with an information vacuum from agricultural authorities, followed by a rapid demand for compliance that I see almost as a threat. These aspects bring a degree of uncertainty and constitute stress factors.

Thus compliance requirements, combined with declining farm incomes, lead many farmers to believe that the benefits of agriculture continue to fall below its burdens.

Another issue that causes some degree of personal distress to farmers is how they feel they are perceived by the public, in that they receive too little respect for the work they do. This is partly because food is too cheap and they are not getting a fair price for their work. This has a negative effect on their morale and sense of self, which is closely linked to their professional identity.

Agricultural support institutions are particularly criticized for their response to crises, with farmers feeling that they are not supported fairly. Some have personal, family and community resources for resilience and adaptation to change to get through the economic crisis, for others the changes are overwhelming, forcing them to give up the business. Due to the complex dynamics, characteristics of agribusiness and family interdependence, farmers may face greater challenges in terms of financial and emotional disruptions that can reduce work and, by extension, life satisfaction.

Thus, not only the health and well-being of farmers and their businesses are at stake, but also the well-being of farming communities and the future prosperity of agriculture.

The research undertaken opens up new themes that need reconsideration and in-depth research to ensure the advancement of safety culture and its application in every aspect of human employment. The PhD thesis demonstrated how aspects of social, organizational and personal well-being are inexorably interconnected.

Safety and health management aims to ensure that the number of accidents and incidents is kept as low as possible. This inevitably leads to a reactive approach based on responding to what goes wrong or what is identified as a risk – rather than ensuring everything goes right. From our perspective, the purpose of safety management is to ensure that everything goes as smoothly as possible, in the sense that day-to-day work achieves its objectives. This means that safety should be judged by the number of times things go well. To do this, safety and health management cannot be merely reactive, but must be proactive, in terms of how actions succeed through acceptable day-to-day performance, rather than in terms of how they can fail.

The doctoral thesis represents a well-documented analysis of the multiple interactions between the environment, the work of farmers and human nature. It brings timely input, an integrated view, new interpretations and narratives that can enable progress in the safety and health of these workers. Moreover, a growing body of research has shown that achieving worker well-being is a gain that can increase profits or simply make sustainability viable.

In businesses in any field, health and safety must be more important than strategy and tactics, with the facilitation and embedding of key behaviors and mindsets being the essential element. This research can also be an individual guide for every farmer, manager or employee seeking to maximize their potential for work and well-being.

Personal contributions

1. Theoretical contributions with a synthesis character

The doctoral thesis contributes to the addition of relevant knowledge to a constantly changing field, that of risk to human security and health, by identifying the major psychosocial risk factors of the current period, in the agricultural sector.

The development of the doctoral thesis was based on:

- Identifying and studying the most important theoretical works that have as their subject the management of psychosocial risk;
- Presenting the current level of research in the specialized literature, highlighting the most important opinions, but also methods of interpreting psychosocial risk;
- A critical look at the basic meanings of risk;
- Summarizing the many meanings and definitions of psychosocial risk, providing multiple viewpoints for conceptual understanding;
- Highlighting some characteristics of psychosocial risk management, starting from the analysis of existing definitions;
- Analyzing specific concepts, as a basis for empirical research of psychosocial risk;
- Establishing the effects of psychosocial risk in the agricultural field and possible solutions to mitigate them;
- Identifying the most important trends and challenges faced by Romanian women;
- Researching European strategies in the agricultural field and outlining the directions of action in reducing psychosocial risk for farmers;

2. Theoretical contributions in the field of psychosocial risk management

The PhD thesis can serve as a heuristic and inspire theoretical concepts and principles to frame future research projects in the field of psychosocial risk management. The research aimed to provide an improved understanding of psychosocial risk management for farmers, outline several risk factor analysis frameworks and determine the parameters needed to be selected and studied in this specific context. In this sense, the doctoral thesis contributes to:

- The critical and appropriate analysis of the specialized literature, regarding the management of psychosocial risk in the agricultural field, of their consequences on the safety and health of farmers, in relation to the current environmental, economic and societal changes;
- Studying the management of psychosocial risk from an interdisciplinary perspective, establishing links between them and occupational health and safety management, risk management and related sociological and psychological branches;
- Highlighting the main peculiarities of psychosocial risk management in the agricultural field;
- Relieving and analyzing the influences of the working environment in agriculture, on the management of psychosocial risk, identifying the main methods of reducing or combating them;
- Analyzing the interdependence relationship between psychosocial risk management and measures to ensure safety and health at work;
- Studying the legislative provisions in force;
- Emphasizing the particularities of psychosocial risk management, within the legislative framework of ensuring occupational safety and health of workers.

3. Experimental contributions

The doctoral thesis aligns the existing theories in the scientific sphere with the concrete situations and problems existing in the agricultural sector, through an original research design. The research undertaken within the doctoral thesis responds to the knowledge needs of the present, the answers to the research questions on psychosocial risk in the agricultural field, contributing to the societal relevance of the research. This involved the application of a questionnaire to identify cause-effect relationships and deepen the understanding of farmers' behavior patterns, in some situations specific to the environment and context of their work.

The doctoral thesis expands the knowledge base and can inform about the attitudes, judgments and decisions of farmers in the face of systemic, organizational and individual risk, of understanding their perceptions in relation to the psychosocial risk factors of the present. In this context, the doctoral thesis contributes to:

- Outline a comprehensive perspective on psychosocial risk factors, in the agricultural field ;
- Establishing general, operational, specific and derived objectives, formulating and demonstrating working hypotheses, as the main foundation of the empirical research undertaken;
- Developing and applying the questionnaire as a research tool;
- Analyzing, interpreting and exploiting the resulting information, using IBM SPSS software;

- Assessing, representing and comparing psychosocial risk for farmers
- Designing the register of psychosocial risk and drawing up the matrix of psychosocial risk levels for farmers .

4. Contributions to the optimization of the normative framework of psychosocial risk management

The PhD thesis research revealed that a range of socio-economic and regulatory factors act in concert to substantially increase the risk to the health and safety of farmers. The doctoral thesis contributes to the improvement of knowledge in this field, by describing exposure situations, identifying causes and effects and designing preventive solutions. Evidence, arguments and information are provided regarding exposure to psychosocial risk factors, which are intended to support political decisions.

In order to optimize the normative framework of psychosocial risk management, the doctoral thesis contributes to :

- Outline the current normative and legislative limits for the assessment and reduction of psychosocial risk;
- Outlining the future directions of action with the main objective of consolidating, developing and streamlining managerial practices in the field of psychosocial risk;
- Informing the interested parties, following the analysis of the data collected through the empirical study;
- Providing concrete data in order to develop strategies to ensure the safety and health at work of agricultural workers.

5. Contributions to the development of scientific research

Scientific considerations were particularly important in the development of the doctoral thesis, which was based on relevant and current research models. The doctoral thesis captures and analyzes the perceptions of farmers in Romania, on the real challenges they face in their work environment. The spectrum of the research, the way in which the knowledge was planned, followed a varied and particularly useful typology for the research of psychosocial risk in the agricultural field. The proposed method of psychosocial risk analysis refers to the reconciliation of conceptual expectations with the realities of a very little researched field. Contributions to the development of scientific research materialized through:

- Preparing research reports during the doctoral study program;
- Elaboration of the final form of the doctoral thesis;
- Creating and publishing articles on the assessment and management of psychosocial risk, as well as supporting them in national and international conferences.

Future research directions

Research remains open for new methods of psychosocial risk assessment, to investigate the knowledge, perspectives and attitudes of other workers, both in agriculture and in other fields of activity. Projects can be collaborative, participatory or transdisciplinary, to engage the societal concern of disclosing this type of risk, the knowledge being useful to face their growing challenges of the current and future risk environment.

As many studies as possible are needed to propose appropriate and up-to-date means of disseminating information on risk, to raise their awareness and involve workers in their prevention, to motivate and guide prevention efforts. Research must propose as many methods, models and indicators for the assessment of psychosocial risk as possible, which reflect their problems and mitigating measures as well as possible.

Bibliography

1. Ackoff, S., Bahrenburg, A., Shute, L. L. (2017). Building a future with farmers, II: Results and recommendations from the National Young Farm Survey. Hudson, NY: *National Young Farmers Coalition*.
2. Adams G.A., Webster J.R. (2013), Emotional regulation as a mediator between interpersonal mistreatment and distress. *Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol.*;
3. Adams, D.A., Thomas, K.R., Jajosky, R.A. et al. (2017). Summary of notifiable infectious diseases and conditions – United States, MMWR. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 64, p.120.
4. Adams, M. (2020), What the pandemic reveals about globalisation, supply chain risk and adapting to climate change. *Stockholm Environment Institute*. Disponibil la <https://www.sei.org/perspectives/pandemic-globalization-supply-chain-risk-and-climate-change-adaptation>
5. Andersson L.M., Pearson C.M. (1999), Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Acad. Manag. Rev.*;24:452–471, p.457.
6. Andrieu, E. et al. (2020), *Job Resilience, Skill Demand and the COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from Online Job Posting*, OCDE, Paris.
7. Aronsson, G., Gustafsson, K. (2005). Disease present: prevalence, presence pressure factors, and an outline of a research model. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* , 47 (9), 958.
8. Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *J. Econ. Perspect.* 29, 3–30.

9. Bakker, A. B., de Vries J. D. (2021) Job Demands–Resources theory and self-regulation: new explanations and remedies for job burnout, *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 34:1, 1-21.
10. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.
11. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Multiple levels in job demands-resources theory: Implications for employee well-being and performance. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of wellbeing*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
12. Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 187–200.p.187.
13. Barnish, M, Tørnes, M., Nelson-Horne B., (2018). How much evidence is there that political factors are related to population health outcomes? An internationally comparative systematic review. *BMJ Open*.
14. Beck, U. (1999), *What is Globalisation?* Cambridge: Polity Press.p.21.
15. Beck, U., (1992), *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*, Sage.
16. Becot, F. (2020). *Linking farm households' social needs, social policy, and farm persistence to better understand and support family farms in the 21st century*. The Ohio State University, Columbus OH
17. Beer, P., Mulder, R. H. (2020), The Effects of Technological Developments on Work and Their Implications for Continuous Vocational Education and Training: A Systematic Review, *Front. Psychol.*, disponibil la <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00918>
18. Berg-Beckhoff G, Nielsen G, Ladekjær E. (2017), Use of information communication technology and stress, burnout, and mental health in older, middle-aged, and younger workers — results from a systematic review. *Int J Occup Environ Health*, 2017; 23(2): 160-171.
19. Bhatia S. (2019), Predicting risk perception: New insights from data science. *Management Science*. Advance online publication.
20. Biggs, A., Brough, P., Drummond, S. (2017). Lazarus and Folkman's psychological stress and coping theory. In C. L. Cooper & J. C. Quick (Eds.), *The handbook of stress and health: A guide to research and practice* (pp. 351–364). Wiley Blackwell.
21. Blais A.R., Weber E.U. (2006), A domain-specific risk-taking (DOSPERT) scale for adult populations. *Judgment and Decision Making*.;1(1):33–47.
22. Blanton, R. G., Peksen, D. (2017). Dying for globalisation? The impact of economic globalisation on industrial accidents. *Social Science Quarterly*. 98 (5): 1487–1502..
23. Borle P, et.all. (2021), The social and health implications of digital work intensification. Associations between exposure to information and communication technologies, health and

- work ability in different socio-economic strat. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*; 94(3): 377-390.
24. Bos et al., (2018), The quantified animal: precision livestock farming and the ethical implications of objectification, *Food Ethics*, 2 (1), pp. 77-92,
 25. Braun, B., Anderson, E. (2019). It's constantly something: Stressful lives of farmers and farm families. Delmarva Farmer. http://extension.umd.edu/sites/extension.umd.edu/files/_images/uploaded/Health%20and%20Wellness%20Insert.pdf
 26. Braun, B., Pippidis, M. (2019). *Farm and farm family risk and resilience: What is at stake? What will it take?* College Park: University of Maryland Extension.
 27. Braun, B., Pippidis, M. (2020). *Farm and farm family risk and resilience: A guide for Extension educational programming.* University of Maryland Extension and University of Delaware Cooperative Extension, <https://www.udel.edu/content/dam/udelImages/canr/pdfs/extension/economic-personal-development/Farm-and-Farm-Family-Risk-and-Resilience-Guide-1-1720.pdf>
 28. Braverman, H. (1998). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century.* New York, NY: *Monthly Review Press.*
 29. Brewster, C., Holland P.. (2019). Work or Employment in the 21st Century: Its Impact on the Employment Relationship. In *The Research Agenda for the Future of Work*, edited by A. Wilkinson and M. Barry . 19–33. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
 30. Brown, P., Gale, N.. (2018), Developing a sociology of risk work in client-facing contexts: An editorial. *Health, Risk and Society.* 20 (1–2): 1–12.
 31. Bruce, J. M., Lynch, S. G. (2011). Personality traits in multiple sclerosis: association with mood and anxiety disorders. *J. Psychosom. Res.* 70, 479–485. doi: 10.1016
 32. Campbell-Sills, L, Cohan, SL, Stein, MB. (2006), Relationship of resilience to personality, coping, and psychiatric symptoms in young adults. *Behav Res Ther.* 44:585–99
 33. Ceschi, A., Sartori, R., Dickert, S., Costantini, A. (2016). Grit or honesty-humility? New insights into the moderating role of personality between the health impairment process and counterproductive work behavior. *Front. Psychol.* 7:1799.
 34. Chen C. (2016), The role of resilience and coping styles in subjective well-being among Chinese University students. *Asia Pac Educ Res.*;25:1–11
 35. Chen, Y, Li S, Xia, Q, He, C (2017) The Relationship between Job Demands and Employees' Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Effect of Psychological Detachment and Job Anxiety. *Front. Psychol.* 8:1890.
 36. Chernilo, D. (2021). One globalisation or many? Risk society in the age of anthropocene. *Journal of Sociology.* 57 (1): 12–26.

37. Connor KM, Davidson JR. (2003), Development of a new resilience scale: the Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depress Anxiety*;18:76–82
38. Cooper C.L., Quick, J. C., Schabracq, M. J., (2015), *International Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, 3rd Edition, Wiley-Blackwell.
39. Cooper, C., Dewe, P. (2008). Welfare - absenteeism, presentism, costs and challenges. *Occupational Medicine* (London), 58 (8), 522–4.
40. Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J. (2019). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(3), p.280.
41. Cottini, E. (2012a). Health at work and low pay: A European perspective. *The Manchester School*, 80(1),75–98.
42. Coupaud, M. (2017). Determinants of health at work in the EU15: Elaboration of synthetic indicators of working conditions and their impacts on the physical and mental health of workers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(1), 93–126.
43. Cresswell, T. (2020). Mobility: The lifeblood of modernity and the virus that threatens to undo it. Mobile Lives Forum, disponible la <https://en.forumviesmobiles.org/2020/03/18/mobility-lifeblood-modernity-and-virus-threatens-undo-it-13266>.
44. Cumming, G.S., Peterson, G.D. (2017), Unifying research on social–ecological resilience and collapse *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 32 (9) pp. 695-713.
45. Dalton, M., Kahn L., Mueller A. (2020), Do Online Job Postings Capture Job Vacancies? An Analysis of Matched Online Postings and Vacancy Survey Data.
46. Danes, S.M. (2014). *Understanding and building resilience*. University of Minnesota Cooperative Extension.
47. Danna, K.,Griffin, R.. (1999). Health and Well-Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Management*. 25. 357-384.
48. Darnhofer, I., Lamine, C., Strauss, A., Navarrete, M. (2016). The resilience of family farms: Towards a relational approach. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 44. 111-122
49. Davis-Brown, K., Salamon, S. (1987). Farm families in crisis: An application of stress theory to farm family research. *Family Relations*, 36(4), 368-373.
50. De la Fuente J. et all. (2021), Cross-Sectional Study of Resilience, Positivity and Coping Strategies as Predictors of Engagement-Burnout in Undergraduate Students: Implications for Prevention and Treatment in Mental Well-Being, *Front Psychiatry*. 2021.12.
51. Dingel, J., Neiman, B. (2020), How many jobs can be done at home?, *Journal of Public Economics* , Vol. 189, p. 104-235.
52. Douglas M. (1992). *Risk and blame: Essays in cultural theory*. Routledge;

53. Eaton, A., Heckscher, C. (2021). COVIDs Impacts on the Field of Labour and Employment Relations. *Journal of Management Studies*. 58 (1): 273–277.
54. Ellinger, P., Featherstone, A., Boehlje, M. (2016). Leverage of U.S. farmers: A deeper perspective. *Choices*, 31 (1), 1-7.
55. Esfahani, T.. (2015). The Relationship between Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Productivity, *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 9(7), p.1128.
56. Farioli, A., Mattioli, S., Quagliari, A., Curti, S., Violante, F. S., Coggon, D. (2014). Musculoskeletal pain in Europe: Role of personal, occupational, and social risk factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 40(1), 36–46.
57. Fetsch, R. J. (2012). *Managing stress during tough times*, Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University Extension. Disponibil la <http://extension.colostate.edu/docs/pubs/consumer/10255.pdf>
58. Folkman S, Moskowitz JT. (2004), Coping: pitfalls and promise. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 55:745–74.
59. Folkman, S, Lazarus, RS. (1985), If it changes it must be a process: study of emotion and coping during three stages of a college examination. *J Pers Soc Psychol.*; 48:150–70
60. Forde, C. et al. (2017). *The Social Protection of Workers in the Platform Economy*. Disponibil la [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes /STUD/2017/614184/ IPOL _STU\(2017\)614184 EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes /STUD/2017/614184/ IPOL _STU(2017)614184 EN.pdf) .
61. Foucault, M., Galasso V., (2020), Working during COVID-19: Cross-Country Evidence from Real-Time Survey Data, *Employment and Migration* , Nr. 246, OECD Publishing, Paris.
62. Francis, A. (2016). *New Technology at Work*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
63. Francis, L., De Priest, K, Wilson, M, Gross, D. (2018), Toxic Stress, and Social Determinants of Health: Screening and Care Coordination, *Online J Issues Nurs, Child Poverty Epub*, Vol 23 No0, 3, Man.02. p.6.
64. Fraser, C. E., Smith, K. B., Judd, F., Humphreys, J. S., Fragar, L. J., & Henderson, A. (2005). Farming and mental health problems and mental illness. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 51(4), 340–349.
65. Freeman, S. A., Schwab, C. V., Jiang, Q. (2008). Quantifying stressors among Iowa farmers. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health*, 14(4), 431–439
66. French, JRP, Caplan, RD and Harrison, RV (1982). *Mechanisms of stress and tension at work*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

67. Fullerton, C., Downey, W. S., Gunderson, M., Thompson, N. (2016). *Decision making on multigenerational farms*, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
68. Gamberale, F. (1990), Perception of effort in manual materials handling. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 16 (Suppl.1), p.63.
69. Ganster D.C, Perrewé P. L. (2010) *New Developments in Theoretical and Conceptual Approaches to Job Stress*, Emerald Group.
70. Garcia, M-G., Graf, M., Läubli, T. (2017). Lower limb pain among workers: A cross-sectional analysis of the fifth European Working Conditions Survey. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 90(7), 575–585
71. García-Herrero, S., Lopez-Garcia, J. R., Herrera, S., Fontaneda, I., Bäscones, S. M., Mariscal, M. A. (2017). The Influence of Recognition and Social Support on European Health Professionals' Occupational Stress: A Demands-Control-Social Support-Recognition Bayesian Network Model, *Biomed Res Int*, Pub Med.gov.
72. Gibson D. (2014), *Managing Risk in Information Systems: Print Bundle (Information Systems Security & Assurance)*, *Managing Risk in Information Systems*, Jones & Bartlett.
73. Giorgi, G, et al. (2020), COVID-19-related mental health effects in the workplace: a narrative review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17(21).
74. Glassner, B. (2018),. *The culture of fear: Why Americans are afraid of the wrong things*, Basic Books.
75. Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Work engagement and workaholism: Comparing the self-employed and salaried employees. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5(1), 83–96.
76. Graham, C., Laffan, K., Pinto, S. (2018). Well-being in metrics and policy. *Science*, 362(6412), 287–288.
77. Grinshpun, S.A., Buttner, M.P., Mainelis, G., and Willeke, K. (2015). Sampling for airborne microorganisms. In: *Manual of Environmental Microbiology* (ed. M.P. Buttner). Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology Press, p.90.
78. Guidi J, Lucente M, Sonino N, Fava GA. (2021), Allostatic load and its impact on health: a systematic review. *Psychother Psychosom.*;90(1):11–27.
79. Gunbayi, I. (2019), Perceptions on stressors originating from interpersonal relations at work setting: a case study, *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1(1), p.55.
80. Guzel, A. E., Arslan, U., Acaravci A.. (2021). “The impact of economic, social, and political globalization and democracy on life expectancy in low-income countries: Are sustainable development goals contradictory?. *Environment Development and Sustainability*. 1–18.

81. Haber M.G, Cohen, J.L, Lucas,T, Baltes, B.B. (2007), The relationship between self-reported received and perceived social support: a meta-analytic review. *Am J Community Psychol.*; 39(1–2):133–44.
82. Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 60, 159–170.
83. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., and Demerouti, E. (2005). How dentists cope with their job demands and stay engaged: the moderating role of job resources. *Eur. J. Oral Sci.* 113, 479–487.
84. Hale, T. et al. (2020), Variation in government responses to COVID-19, <https://www.bsg.ox.ac.uk/research/research-projects/covid-19-government-response-tracker>.
85. Hansen, C.D, Andersen, JH (2008), Getting sick at work - what personal circumstances, attitudes and work-related factors are associated with the present of the disease? *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 67, 956–64
86. Hauke, A, Flintrop, J, Brun, E (2011), The impact of work-associated psychosocial stressors on the onset of musculoskeletal disorders in certain regions of the body: a review and meta-analysis of 54 longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health and Organizations*, 25 (3): p. 250
87. Hegewisch, A., Childres, C., Hartmann, H (2019) Women, Automation and the Future of Work. Disponibil la https://iwpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/C476Automation-and-Futureof-Work_ADA-Compliant.pdf
88. Herrera, B., Gerster-Bentaya, M., Knierim, A. (2018). Farm-level factors influencing farmers satisfaction with their work. In 30th *International Conference of Agricultural Economist*. Vancouver.
89. Hills, T.T. (2019), The dark side of information proliferation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 14(3):323–330
90. Hirsch, J. K., Cukrowicz, K. C. (2014). Suicide in rural areas: An updated review of the literature. *Journal of Rural Mental Health*. 38(2). 65-78.
91. Holte, K. A., Follo, G., Kjestveit, K., Stræte, E. P. (2018). Agriculture in the future: new technologies, new organizations and new risk to health and safety at work? In: *Proceedings of the 20th Congress of the International Ergonomic Association* (pp. 404-413). Springer, Cham, Switzerland.
92. Holzmann, R., Jørgenson, S., (2000), Social risk management: A new conceptual framework for social protection, and beyond. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8(4):529–556.

93. Hou, T, Zhang, T, Cai, W, et al. (2020), Social support and mental health among health care workers during coronavirus disease 2019 outbreak: a moderated mediation model. *PLoS One.*;15(5):e0233831.
94. Howley, P., Dillon, E., Heanue, K., Meredith, D. (2017). Worth the risk? The behavioural path to well-being. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 68(2), 534-552.
95. Huber et al., (2015), Factors affecting farm growth intentions of family farms in mountain regions: empirical evidence for Central Switzerland, *Land Use Policy*, 47, pp. 188-197.
96. Hunt, A., Samman, E. (2019) Gender and the gig economy Critical steps for evidence-based policy. https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2019/01/aponid_2170911279081.pdf
97. Hurrell, J. J., Jr., Nelson, D. L., & Simmons, B. L. (1998). Measuring job stressors and strains: Where we have been, where we are, and where we need to go. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3(4), 368–389.
98. Inwood, S., Knudson, A., Becot, F. A., Braun, B., Goetz, S. J., Kolodinsky, J. M., Albrecht, D. (2018). Health insurance is part of national farm policy. *Agriculture and Applied Economics Association Choices*.
99. Jagiello, R.D., Hills T.T., (2018), Bad news has wings: Dread risk mediates social amplification in risk communication, *Risk Analysis*, 38(10):2193–2207.
100. Kalleberg, A. L, Vallas S. P. (2018), Probing Precarious Work: Theory, Research and Politics. *Precarious Work*. 31: 1–30.
101. Kallioniemi, M. K, Simola A, Kaseva J, Kymäläinen HR. (2016), Stress and burnout among Finnish dairy farmers. *J Agromedicine*. 21(3):259–68
102. Karapinar, P. B., Camgoz, S. M., (2017), Well-Being at Work: A Comprehensive Review About Its Predictors and Outcomes, *Handbook of Research on Organizational Culture and Diversity in the Modern Workforce*.
103. Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign. *Administr. Sci. Q.* 24, 285–308.
104. Karasek, R., Brisson, C., Kawakami, N., Houtman, I., Bongers, P., and Amick, B. (1998). The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. *J. Occupat. Health Psychol.* 3, 322–355.
105. Karasek, R., et. all.. (1998). The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ): an instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychosocial job characteristics. *J. Occupat. Health Psychol.* 3, 322–355.
106. Karasek, R., Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: stress, productivity and the reconstruction of professional life*. New York: Basic Books.

107. Keyserling, W.M., (1986), Postural analysis of the trunk and shoulders in simulated real time. *Ergonomics* 29 (4), p.570.
108. Kivimäki, M., Head, J., Ferrie, JE, Hemingway, H., Shipley, MJ & Vahtera, J. (2005). Working while ill as a risk factor for serious coronary events: the Whitehall II study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95 (1), 98–102.
109. Klerkx, L., Rose, D. (2020). Approaching Game-Changing Technologies in Agriculture 4.0: How do we manage diversity and accountability in food transition paths? Global food security.
110. Klitzman, S., Stellman J., (1989), The impact of the physical environment on the psychological well-being of office workers, *Social Science & Medicine*, 29(6) 733-742.
111. Klumb P.L., Voelkle M.C., Siegler S. (2017), How negative social interactions at work seep into the home: A prosocial and an antisocial pathway. *J. Organ. Behav.*
112. Kong, F. Z., Zhao, L., Zhang, X. B., Tsai, C. H., & Lin, D. D. (2019). "Farmers' work-life quality and entrepreneurship will in China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10.
113. Labrague LJ, De los Santos JAA. (2020), COVID-19 anxiety among front-line nurses: predictive role of organisational support, personal resilience and social support. *J Nurs Manag.* 28:1653–61.
114. Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Psychological stress in the workplace, in *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality: Handbook on Job Stress* (Special Issue), Vol. 6, ed. P. L. Perrewe (San Rafael, CA: Select Press), 1–13.
115. Lazarus, R. S., Folkman, S. (1987). Transactional theory and research on emotions and coping. *European Journal of Personality*, 1, 141-169.
116. Lazarus, R.S., Folkman, S. (1984), *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. New York: Springer
117. Lazarus, RS (1999). *Stress and emotion*. London: Free Association Books.
118. Lee Y., Cho D. (2020), The effects of job demands, job resources, and personal resources on the psychological well-being of middle-aged workers in the United States: Assessing latent profile differences. *Int. J. Educ. Vocat. Guid.*; 20:501–521
119. Lee, P. S. N., Leung, L., Lo, V., Xiong, C., Wu, T. (2011). Internet communication versus face-to-face interaction in quality of life. *Social Indicators Research*, 100, 375–389.
120. Leiss, W. (1995). Book Review: Towards a New Modernity. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*. 19 (4): 544–547, p. 544.
121. LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent

- relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 764–775.
122. Li, C.; Luo, R.D. (2017), Aging, grandparenting and rural out-migration: A study based on the micro perspective of family decisions. *Comp. Econ. Soc. Syst.*, 2, 135–146.
 123. Li, Y., Hills T., Hertwig, R., (2020), A brief history of risk,. Oct; 203: 104344. *Cognition*, PMID: PMC7278655
 124. Liu, C.H, Zhang, E, Wong, GTF, Hyun, S, Hahm, H.C. (2020), Factors associated with depression, anxiety, and PTSD symptomatology during the COVID-19 pandemic: clinical implications for U.S. young adult mental health. *Psychiatry Res.* 290:113172. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113172
 125. Lund, C. et al., (2018), Social determinants of mental disorders and the Sustainable Development Goals: A systematic review of reviews, *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 5(4) 357–369
 126. Lynch, J., Chelton, C. (2019), Evaluation of exposure to chemical agents, in S. Z. Mansdorf Ed., *Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3rd Edition, Wiley, p.78.
 127. Mansdorf, S. Z., (2019), *Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3rd Edition, Wiley,
 128. Mansouri, F., Sefidgarbaei, F.. (2021). Risk society and COVID-19. *Canadian Journal of Public Health.* 112 (1): 36–37.
 129. Mark, G. M., Smith, A. P. (2008), Stress models: A review and suggested new direction, Nottingham University Press, 3, pp.125.
 130. Marotz-Baden, R., Matteis, C. (1994). Daughters-in-law and stress in two generation farm families. *Family Relations*, 43(2), 132–137
 131. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P. (2001). *Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422. p. 397.
 132. Maye et al., (2018). Present realities' and the need for a 'lived experience' perspective in Brexit Agri-food governance Space and Polity, 22 (2).
 133. Mazure, C.M, Druss, B.G. (1995), A Historical Perspective on Stress and Psychiatric Illness. In Does Stress Cause Psychiatric Illness? Mazure, C.M., Ed.; *American Psychiatric Association*: Washington, DC, USA, pp. 1–41.
 134. McCubbin, H., McCubbin, M.A., Thompson, A.I., Han, S.Y., & Allen, C.T. (1997). Families under stress: What makes them resilient? *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences.* 89(3). 2-11.
 135. McGuinness, Grimwood, (2017), Migrant workers in agriculture. House of commons briefing paper 7987 Disponibil la: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7987/CBP-7987.pdf>

136. Melamed, S., Shirom, A., Toker, S., Berliner, S. Shapira, I. (2006). Burnout and risk of cardiovascular disease: evidence, possible causal pathways and promising research directions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132 (3), 327–53.
137. Meltzer H., Bebbington P., Brugha T., Farrell M., Jenkins R. (2013). The relationship between personal debt and specific common mental disorders. *European Journal of Public Health*. 23(1): 108-13. Disponibil la <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22434207>
138. Mikulincer, M., Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. The Guilford Press.
139. Miller, C. C. (2019), Why women, but not men, are judged for a messy house. New York Times. Disponibil la <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/11/upshot/why-women-but-not-men-are-judged-for-a-messy-house.html>.
140. Miranda, P.M., et al. (2019). A framework to assess the resilience of farming systems. *Science Direct, Agricultural Systems*, Volume 176, disponibil la <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308521X19300046>
141. Montano, D. (2016). Supervisor behaviour and its associations with employees' health in Europe. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 89(2), 28298
142. Morrison, K.A. (2008), Differentiating between physically violent and nonviolent stalkers: An examination of Canadian cases. *J. Forensic Sci.*;53:742–751.
143. Morrissette, A.M., Kisamore, J.L. (2020). A Meta-Analysis of the Relationship between Role Stress and Organizational Commitment: the Moderating Effects of Occupational Type and Culture. *Occup Health Sci*.
144. Mosseri, S, Cooper, R, Foley, M. (2020), The future of work and gender: Insight paper, WGEA Commissioned Research Paper, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
145. Muschalla, B., and Linden, M. (2014). Workplace phobia, workplace problems, and work ability among primary care patients with chronic mental disorders. *J. Am. Board Fam. Med.* 27, 486–494.
146. Nedelkoska, L., Quintini, G. (2018), Automation, skills use and training, OECD Social, Employment, and Migration Working Papers.
147. Niedhammer, I., Sultan-Taïeb, H., Chastang, J.-F., Vermeulen, G., Parent-Thirion, A. (2014). Fractions of cardiovascular diseases and mental disorders attributable to psychosocial work factors in 31 countries in Europe. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 87(4), 403–411.

148. Nigel, K.N., Burns, C., Lyons, G. (2019). Financial conditions in the U.S. agricultural sector: Historical comparisons. *USDA Economic Research Service*.
149. Notelaers, Guy, Törnroos, Maria, Salin, Denise (2019), Effort-Reward Imbalance: A Risk Factor for Exposure to Workplace Bullying, *Front. Psychol.*
150. Ollier-Malaterre, A., Jacobs, J. A., Rothbard, N. P. (2019), Technology, Work, and Family: Digital Cultural Capital and Boundary Management, *Annual Review of Sociology*.
151. Palmer S, Cooper C., Thomas K, (2001), Model of organisational stress for use within an occupational health education/promotion or wellbeing programme – A short communication, *Health Education Journal*, Vol. 60, No.4.
152. Parker, S. K., Van den Broeck, A., Holman, D. (2017), Work design influences: a synthesis of multilevel factors that affect the design of jobs. *Acad. Manage. Ann.* 11, 267–308.
153. Parsons, S, Kruijt-Wil, A., Fox, E., (2016), A Cognitive Model of Psychological Resilience, *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology*, Issue 3, 296-310.
154. Patel, R. Stuffed and Starved: The Hidden Battle for the World Food System; (2012), Melville House Publishing: Brooklyn, NY, USA,.
155. Perez, G. M. (2019), Ergonomics: Achieving System Balance Through Ergonomic Analysis And Control, in *Handbook of Occupational Safety and Health*, 3rd Edition, Wiley, p.56.
156. Peterson, C., Stone, D. M., Marsh, S. M., Schumacher, P. K., Tiesman, H. M., McIntosh, W. L., Luo, F. (2018). Suicide rates by major occupational group—17 states, 2012 and 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 67, 1253–1260. Disponibil pe www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/67/wr/mm6745a1.htm#suggestedcitation
157. Peterson, Chris L. (2021). *Identifying and Managing Risk at Work*. Taylor & Francis. <https://bookshelf.vitalsource.com/books/9781000479393>
158. Philip, J., Cherian, V., (2020). Factors affecting the psychological well-being of health care workers during an epidemic: A thematic review. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*. 42 (4): 323–333.
159. Pinker, S. (2011), *The better angels of nature: The decline of violence in history and its causes*, Penguin.
160. Putz-Anderson, V., Galinsky, T.L. (1993). Psychophysically determined work durations for limiting shoulder girdle fatigue from elevated manual work. *Int. J. Ind. Ergon.* 11 (1),
161. Quinlan, M. (2020)., Five challenges to humanity: Learning from pattern/repeat failures in past disasters?, *The Economic and Labour Relations Review* 31 (3):1–23.

162. Rayner S., Cantor R. (1987), How fair is safe enough? The cultural approach to societal technology choice. *Risk Analysis*.;7(1):3–9.
163. Reio, T. G., Jr., Ghosh, R. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility: Implications for human resource development research and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 20(3), p.250.
164. Rejeski, W. J., Mihalko, S. L. (2001). Physical activity and quality of life in older adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 56(suppl_2), 23–35. P.23.
165. Renström, E. A., Bäck, H., (2021), Emotions During the Covid-19 Pandemic: Fear, Anxiety, and Anger as Mediators Between Threats and Policy Support and Political Actions, *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol*, volume 51, issue 8, P861-877.
166. Rosmann, M. R. (2010). The agrarian imperative. *Journal of Agromedicine*, 15, 71–75
167. Rugulies, R., Aust, B., Madsen, I. E. (2017). Effort–reward imbalance at work and risk of depressive disorders. a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Scand. J. Work, Environ. Health* 43, 294–306.
168. Sadiq, N., (2019), *Establishing an occupational health & safety management system based on ISO 45001*, IT Governance Publishing, p.205.
169. Safstrom, M., and Hartig, T. (2013). Psychological detachment in the relationship between job stressors and strain. *Behav. Sci.* 3, 418–433.
170. Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46, 120–132.
171. Schrecker, T. (2020), Globalization and health: Political grand challenges. *Review of International Political Economy*. 27 (1): 26–47.
172. Schulte, P., Vainio, H. (2010). Well-being at work: Overview and perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 36(5), 422–429.p.422.
173. Schwab, K. (2017). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. London: Portfolio Penguin.
174. Segal E. A., Gerdes K. E., Steiner, Sue, (2019), *An Introduction to the Profession of Social Work*, 5th Edition, Cengage Learning. p.56.
175. Shanafelt, T, Ripp, J, Trockel, M.(2020). Understanding and addressing sources of anxiety among health care professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA*.
176. Shepard, J. M. (1977). Technology, alienation, and job satisfaction. *Ann. Rev. Sociol.* 3, 1–21.

177. Shern, D. L., Blanch, A. K., Steverman, S. M. (2016). Toxic stress, behavioral health, and the next major era in public health, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 86(2), p.120.
178. Shestakofsky, B. (2017), Working Algorithms: Software Automation and the Future of Work, *Work and Occupations*.
179. Shkarupeta, E., et. all., (2021), Technological Development of Innovation Ecosystems in Conditions of Digital and Human-Centric Economy, *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, volume 181, disponibil la <https://www.atlantispress.com/proceedings/sdt-20/125958560>
180. Shrestha, et al. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on globalisation. *One Health*.
181. Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(1), 27–41.
182. Siegrist, J. (2017), *The Handbook of Stress and Health: A Guide to Research and Practice*, First Edition, , Book Editor(s):Cary L. Cooper, James Campbell Quick, Wiley Online Library,
183. Siegrist, J., Li, J. (2016). Associations of extrinsic and intrinsic components of work stress with health: a systematic review of evidence on the effort-reward imbalance model. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 13:432.
184. Siegrist, J., Dragano, N. (2008). Psychosocial stress and disease risk in occupational life. Results of international studies on the demand-control and the effort-reward imbalance models. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, 51(3), 305–312.
185. Skinner, N., Brewer, N. (2002). The dynamics of threat and challenge appraisals prior to stressful achievement events. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 83, 678–692.
186. Smith, P. M., J. Oudyk, G. Potter, C. Mustard, and Members of the Ad Hoc Pandemic Survey Group. (2020). Labour market attachment, workplace infection control procedures and mental health: A cross-sectional survey of Canadian non-healthcare workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Annals of Work Exposures and Health* 65 (3): 266–276.
187. Sostero, M. et al. (2020), Teleworkability and the COVID-19 crisis: a new digital divide?, Seville:European Commission, 2020, JRC121193, <https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/sites/jrcsh/files/jrc121193.pdf>.
188. Spencer, D. A. (2018), Fear and hope in an age of mass automation: debating the future of work, *New Technology, Work and Employment*.

189. Standing, G. (2016) *The Corruption of Capitalism : Why rentiers thrive and work does not pay*. Biteback Publishing. disponibil la https://books.google.com.au/books/about/The_Corruption_of_Capitalism.
190. Stansfeld, S., Candy, B, (2006), Psychosocial Work Environment and Mental Health — A Meta-Analytic Review, *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 32 443–462.
191. Sun, L. (2019). Perceived organizational support: a literature review. *Int J Hum Resour Stud* 9:21.
192. Sunstein C.R. (2005), Cambridge University Press;. *Laws of fear: Beyond the precautionary principle*.
193. Swenneke G. and all, (2018), (TNO), Management of psychosocial risk in European workplaces - evidence from the second European survey of enterprises on new and emerging risk (ESENER-2), European Risk Observatory Report, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.
194. Taylor, A. (2018), *The Automation Charade*, disponibil la <https://logicmag.io/05-theautomation-charade/>.
195. Theorell, T. (2001). Stress and health-from a work perspective. In J. Dunham (Ed.), *Stress in the workplace: Past, present and future* (pp. 34–51). Whurr Publishers.
196. Thoits, P. (2010). Stress and health: Major findings and policy implications. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 51, S41–S53.
197. Toch, M., Bambra, C., Lunau, T., Van Der Wel, K. A., Witvliet, M. I., Dragano, N., & Eikemo, T. A. (2014). All part of the job? The contribution of the psychosocial and physical work environment to health inequalities in Europe and the European health divide. *International Journal of Health Services*, 44(2), 285–305
198. Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), 167–176.
199. Toulan, O. (2020). Globalisation after COVID-19: What’s in Store? disponibil la <https://www.imd.org/research-knowledge/articles/Globalization-after-COVID-19-Whats-in-store>.
200. Trudeau, A-R. T., Bartholow, B., Luo, F. (2018). Suicide rates by major occupational group 17 states, 2012 and 2015. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 67(45), 1253–1260.

201. Tsutsumi, A., & Kawakami, N. (2004). A review of empirical studies on the model of effort–reward imbalance at work: Reducing occupational stress by implementing a new theory. *Social Science & Medicine*, 59(11), 2335–2359.p.2335.
202. Tucker, S, M. (2005). Development of the family resilience assessment scale to identify family resilience constructs. Dissertation. University of Florida. Disponibil pe: <https://ufdc.ufl.edu/UFE0012882/00001>
203. Tummers, Lars G., Bakker, Arnold B.(2021), Leadership and Job Demands-Resources Theory: A Systematic Review, *Front. Psychol.*, 30 September 2021
204. Ulvenblad, P.,Cederholm B., J. (2018). A leadership development programme for agricultural entrepreneurs in Sweden. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, 24(4), 327–343.
205. Vander Weele, T. J., Fulks, J., Plake, J. F., Lee, M. T. (2020). National well-being measures before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in online samples. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
206. Walker, C., Peterson, C. L. (2020). “Universal health coverage and primary health care: The experience of patients. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 1–6.
207. Walsh, F. (2016b). *Strengthening family resilience*. Third edition. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
208. Wang H. et al. (2022), Coping profiles among teachers: Implications for emotions, job satisfaction, burnout, and quitting intentions, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Volume 68, January, 2022.
209. Wike, R., Stokes, B. (2018) In *Advanced and Emerging Economies Alike, Worries About Job Automation*.
210. Wilder-Smith, A., Freedman, D. O. (2020). Isolation, quarantine, social distancing and community containment: Pivotal role for old-style public health measures in the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) outbreak. *Journal of Travel Medicine*, 27(2).
211. Wilkinson, D.S. (1982). *Biological causes of occupational dermatoses*. In: *Occupational and Industrial Dermatology* (ed. H.I. Maibach and G.A. Gellin). Chicago, IL: Year Book Medical Publishers.
212. Williams, S., Braun, B. (2019). Loneliness and social isolation: A private concern, a public issue. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 111(1), 7–14
213. Windon, S., Robotham, D. (2021), The Relationship Between Farmers' Quality of Life and Their Leadership Competencies, *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, Volume 2, Issue 2, 2021.

214. Wood, A. J. et al. (2019) Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy', *Work, Employment and Society*.
215. Wood, J. L. (2014), Understanding gang membership: The significance of group processes, *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *SAGE Journals*.
216. Wookjae, H, Jae, M L, Narang , P, , (2020), Financial-related psychological factors affect life satisfaction of farmers, *Journal of Rural Studies*. Volume 80, December 2020, Pages 185-194
217. Wu et al. (2020), Psychological resilience and positive coping styles among Chinese undergraduate students: a cross-sectional study *BMC Psychology*
218. Younger, T., Heidi L R., (2021), Farmer Mental Health Interventions: A Systematic Review, *Int J Environ Res Public Health*,;19(1):244.
219. Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Skinner, E. A., (2016), *The Development of Coping: Implications for Psychopathology and Resilience*, Volume Four. Risk, Resilience, and Intervention, Wiley Online Library, disponibil la <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/9781119125556>. Devpsy 410
220. Zopiatis, A., Constanti, P., Theocharous, A.L. (2014), Job Involvement, Commitment, Satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from Hotel Employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management*.

ONLINE STUDIES, REPORTS AND DATABASES

1. ACGIH (2017). Threshold Limit Values for Chemical Substances and Physical Agents & Biological Exposure Indices. Cincinnati OH: American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists.
2. American Psychological Association. The Road to Resilience.<https://www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience>.
3. CDC (2017). Highly Pathogenic Asian Avian Influenza A (H5N1) in People. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov/flu/avianflu/h5n1_people.htm
4. CE, (2020), Eurostat - Agriculture, forestry and fishery statistics — 2020 edition [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/12069644/KS-FK-20-001 ENN.pdf/a7439b01-671b-80ce-85e4-4d803c44340a?t=1608139005821](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/12069644/KS-FK-20-001_ENN.pdf/a7439b01-671b-80ce-85e4-4d803c44340a?t=1608139005821)
5. CE, (2021), Direct payments to agricultural producers - graphs and figures, Financial year 2020.
6. CE, (2021). Evaluation of the impact of the CAP on generational renewal, local development and jobs in rural areas
7. CE, (2021). Indicative figures on the distribution of aid, by size-class of aid, financial year 2020, [Direct-aid-indicative-figures-2020_en.pdf](#).

8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2018). Agricultural safety. <https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/aginjury/>
9. CDC (2017). CDC Yellow Book 2018: Health Information for International Travel. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, p.56.
10. EC (2021), EU agricultural outlook for markets, income and environment, 2021-2031. European Commission, DG Agriculture and Rural Development, Brussels.
11. EC, (2019), Informarea nr. 7 Schimbările structurale și reînnoirea generațiilor https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/foodfarmingfisheries/key_policies/documents/cap-briefs-7-structural-change_en.pdf.
12. EU-OSHA (2017), Protecting Workers in the Online Platform Economy an Overview of Regulatory and Policy Developments in the EU.
13. EU-OSHA (2020), Occupational Exoskeletons: Wearable Robotic Devices to Prevent Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders in the Workplace of the Future. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/occupationalexoskeletons-wearable-robotic-devices-and-preventing-work-related>
14. EU-OSHA (2021h), The Future of Working in a Virtual Environment and OSH European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.
15. EU-OSHA, (2020a). Review of the future of agriculture and occupational safety and health (OSH): a forward-looking analysis of new and emerging OSH risk. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/future-agriculture-and-forestry-implications-managing-worker-safety-and-health/view>
16. EU-OSHA, (2016), Contexts and arrangements for occupational safety and health in micro and small enterprises in the EU.SESAME project, European Risk Observatory, <https://osha.europa.eu/en/tools-and-publications/publications/contexts-and-arrangements-occupational-safety-and-health-micro/view>
17. EU-OSHA, (2019c), The Fourth Industrial Revolution and Social Innovation in the Workplace. <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/fourth-industrial-revolution-and-social-innovationworkplace/view>
18. EU-OSHA, (2020f), Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders: Why Are They Still So Prevalent? Evidence from a Literature Review. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work; disponibil la <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/work-related-musculoskeletal-disorders-why-are-theystill-so-prevalent-evidence/view>
19. EU-OSHA, (2021f), Teleworking during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Risk and Prevention Strategies. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, disponibil la <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/teleworking-during-covid-19-pandemic-risk->

andprevention-strategies/view

- Pesole, A., et. all., (2018). Platform workers in Europe evidence from the COLLEEM survey. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Commission.
20. Eurofound (2019), Working conditions and workers' health, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
 21. Eurofound, (2021), Psychosocial Risk. <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/topic/psychosocial-risk>.
 22. European Parliament resolution of 10 July 2020 on the EU's public health strategy post-COVID-19 (2020/2691(RSP), disponibil pe https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0205_EN.html
 23. FAOSTAT, <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/OEA>, Employment in agriculture, forestry and fishing - ILO modelled estimate
 24. HSE – Management standards, Step 3: Evaluate the risk – Explore problems and develop solutions disponibil la <http://www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/step3/index.htm>
 25. ILO (2020), “A safe and healthy return to work during the COVID-19 pandemic: Policy Brief” (2020)
 26. ILO Monitor. (2021), COVID-19 and the World of Work. Seventh edition. Updated Estimates and Analysis. Geneva: International Labour Office, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-dcomm/documents/briefingnote/wcms_767028.pdf
 27. ILO, (2012). Workplace Stress: A Collective Challenge, European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), Management of psychosocial risk at work: An analysis of the findings of the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risk (ESENER)
 28. ILO, (2016), Workplace Stress: A Collective Challenge European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (EU-OSHA), Management of psychosocial risk at work: An analysis of the findings of the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risk (ESENER).
 29. ILO, (2020), Safe and Healthy working environments free from violence and harassment
 30. McKinsey Global Institute (2020), The future of work in Europe: automation, workforce transitions and the shifting geography of employment, disponibil la <https://www.mckinsey.com/featuredinsights/future-of-work/the-future-of-work-in-europe>
 31. McKinsey Global Institute, (2019), The future of women at work Transitions in the age of automation. Disponibil la www.mckinsey.com/mgi.
 32. OECD (2020), “E-commerce in the time of COVID-19”, OECD Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19), OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/3a2b78e8-en>.
 33. OECD (2020), OECD Employment Outlook 2020: Worker Security and the COVID-19 Crisis, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/1686c758-en>.

34. OECD (2021), Policy Responses to Coronavirus (COVID-19), An assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on job and skills demand using online job vacancy data, <https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/an-assessment-of-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-job-and-skills-demand-using-online-job-vacancy-data-20fff09e/>
35. OSHA (2021) Musculoskeletal disorders: association with psychosocial risk factors at work. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
36. OSHA, ESENER (2019) , What does it tell us about safety and health in Europe’s workplaces? Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg: 2020, <https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/esener-2019-policy-brief/view>
37. SURE (2020), Farm research project https://www.surefarmproject.eu/wordpress/wpcontent/uploads/2020/04/D3.6_Policy-brief-on-future-farm-demographics.pdf.
38. Whoqol Group (1995). The World Health Organization quality of life assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the World Health Organization. *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(10), 1403–1409., p. 1405.
39. World Economic Forum, (2020) “The Global Risk Report.” Insight Report 15th Ed. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risk-report-2020>.
40. World Health Organization, (2020). World Health Organization coronavirus press briefing. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audio-emergencies-coronavirus-press-conference-full-20-mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=1eafbff_0
41. World Health Organization. (2017). WHOQOL: Measuring quality of life. Disponibil la https://www.who.int/mental_health/media/68.pdf
42. TEMPO online, Intreprinderi active, pe activitati ale economiei nationale la nivel de diviziune CAEN Rev.2 si clase de marime dupa numarul de salariatii, 01 Agricultura, vanatoare si servicii anexe,
43. <http://statistici.insse.ro:8077/tempo-online/#/pages/tables/inssetable>
44. <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/369851513586667729/Thinking-CAP-World-Bank-Report-on-the-EU.pdf>
45. <http://www.ansvsa.ro/sanatate-bunastare-si-nutritie-animala/focare-de-pesta-porcina-africana>
46. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/www.hse.gov.uk/stress/standards/index.htm>
47. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3217494/12069644/KS-FK-20-001ENN.pdf/a7439b01-671b-80ce-85e4-4d803c44340a?t=1608139005821>
48. https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/funding/docs/eu4health_factsheet_en.pdf
49. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/about-eu-osha/what-we-do/european-risk-observatory>
50. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/emerging-risk>
51. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/legislation/guidelines/framework-agreement-on-work-related-stress>

52. <https://osha.europa.eu/ro/legislation/guidelines/framework-agreement-on-harassment-and-violence-at-work>
53. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2019/10/24/economy-ofwellbeing-the-council-adopts-conclusions/>
54. <https://www.madr.ro/transparenta-institutionala/raport-activitate-madr.html>
55. <https://www.mhe-sme.org/european-parliament-pushes-for-the-eus-long-term-action-on-mental-health/>
56. <https://www.mhe-sme.org/open-letter-act-now-to-boost-mental-health-policy/>
57. https://www.what-europe-does-for-me.eu/data/pdf/focus/focus09_en.pdf

“VALAHIA” UNIVERSITY OF TÂRGOVIȘTE
 IOSUD Valahia - DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND HUMANITIES
 FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
 FIELD MANAGEMENT
 Drd. LĂSCAIE Cătălin Ionuț

LIST OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS PUBLISHED AND PRESENTED AT SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

BDI published articles

- [1] Gabrea, Ramona-Elena, Lăascaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, Popescu, Delia-Mioara, Tucmeanu, Alin-Iulian, (2017) . "The Project Team: Features, Effectiveness and Leadership". In S. Hugues & N. Cristache (eds.), Risk in Contemporary Economy (pp.250-260), Iași, România: LUMEN Proceedings, <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rce2017.1.21>
- [2] Lăascaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019). Cooperation in Agriculture between Scepticism and Necessity, Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Economics and Administrative Sciences, 4(1), 56-66.

- [3] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2021). The Multiplication Of Psychosocial Risk Factors For Agricultural Entrepreneurs, Management Intercultural, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 47, pages 69-75, December.
- [4] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2022), Dynamic Assessment Of Workers Safety And Health Risk, SEA - Practical Application of Science, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 29, pages 97-101, September.
- [5] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2022), Effects Of Structural Changes On Employment Relations, Management Intercultural, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 48, pages 35-41, July. 22
- [6] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2022), Ensuring a Positive Occupational Health And Safety Culture At The Organizational Level, Management Intercultural, Romanian Foundation for Business Intelligence, Editorial Department, issue 49, pages 59-63.

Participation in scientific conferences

- [1] Gabrea, Ramona-Elena, Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, Popescu, Delia-Mioara, Tucmeanu, Alin-Iulian, (2017) . "The Project Team: Features, Effectiveness and Leadership," 18th edition of the Conference "Risk in Contemporary Economy", RCE 2017, June9-10,2017, Galati, România.
- [2] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019), Cooperation in Agriculture between Scepticism and Necessity, 6th Central and Eastern European LUMEN Conference, NASHS, Chișinău, September 19-21, 2019.
- [3] Lăscaie, Cătălin Ionuț, Popescu, Delia Mioara, (2019), Agricultural systems in a changing world, 6th Central and Eastern European LUMEN Conference, NASHS, Chisinau, September 19-21, 2019.
- [4] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019), The Importance Of the Demographic Structure In The Regional Development, International Conference "Knowledge economy – challenges of the 21st century", Universitatea Constantin Brancoveanu, Pitești, România.
- [5] Lăscaie, Cătălin-Ionuț, (2019), The Decision Making Process In Agriculture, International Conference of Cross Cultural Competence, 11-23 November 2019, Iași, România.