Conclusions

HACCP implementation:

Supervisors efficiently in in-flight catering, food-hygiene/safety training is required for all food-handlers and physical and allergic hazards prepared and plated cold meat and fish, canapés and special meals. These food handling—

Sampling and recruitment:

Application/implementation of controls to minimise potential food-associated risks in ‘on-board’ food production/consumption. To-date, limited research has been undertaken in this field.

Aim

The aim of this study was to explore the extent of HACCP and food safety training for cabin crew within food safety/hygiene training programmes provided by airlines.

Methods

• Sampling and recruitment: A purposive sampling technique alongside a snowballing technique was adopted for sampling and recruitment of 26 respondents (including cabin crew managers, training managers, and supervisors) from 20 international airlines from UK, Africa, USA, Europe and Middle East.
• In depth interviews: Semi-structured interviews (n=20) were conducted with to understand the HACCP implementation within on-board food-handling. Fourteen individual interviews and six interviews (including two respondents) were conducted (from each of six airlines).
• Interview content: Interviews determined on-board food handling steps; inclusion of HACCP in food safety training and cabin crew food safety.
• Ethical considerations: Prior to implementation of this study all methods and relevant documentation including interview schedules, introductory letters, participant information sheet, consent form were approved by the Cardiff Met Healthcare and Food Research Ethics Committee (Approval reference 3850).
• Analysis of data: Interview transcriptions were coded using NVivo9. Data were analysed using a qualitative content analysis approach. This technique is a widely recognised qualitative analysis tool that facilitates categorisation/identification of themes within the data.

Results

• Respondent profile: The majority of respondents (69%) were male; 62% were aged between 41-47 years, and job roles included managers (42%), supervisors (42%) and cabin crew trainers (16%).
• Cabin crew on-board food-handling: Once on-board, meals and related items were reported become the responsibility of cabin crew. Figure 1 illustrates the generic steps of handling meals on-board (including critical control points — CCPs).
• HACCP implementation: Overall, inclusion of HACCP training in cabin crew food safety training was variable and insufficient. The majority (60%) of airlines reportedly did not include HACCP training for cabin crew at any level, with some study respondents unaware of HACCP acronym meaning: “what is HACCP?”. A quarter (25%) of airlines included HACCP concepts such as control points and documentation which were reportedly included in training, however, procedural implementation was reported not included 1 can say that it may be implicitly applied. Only 15% of airlines reportedly included explicit HACCP training for cabin crew.

Cabin crew food safety training

A Training Needs Analysis (TNA) is the first step of any training cycle and plays a significant role in training effectiveness and improvement. Most respondents (75%) from airlines with cabin crew food safety training (n=18) indicated “…analysing all cabin crew training needs” (A/CST1).

• Further findings indicate this may not the case when it comes to food safety training, as most of airlines reportedly with CCPST (78%), reportedly did not consider TNA for this type of training. This was indicated by many respondents, for example:

"… not specifically in the case of food safety training" (A/CST1)

• Respondents from two airlines (A9 and A12) explicitly acknowledged TNA in relation to cabin crew food safety training by reporting use of pre-training tests and documentation analysis (e.g. training records) to analyse such training needs — for example:

"before we start the training season we mark our target, what do we want to achieve, improve. Based on that, we make our training needs analysis" (A/CST1)

• Respondents indicated that most participating airlines did not analyse cabin crew food safety training needs, this may affect negatively the levels and effectiveness of food safety training for different cabin crew roles.
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