INTRODUCTION
Farming is going through technological advances, where the rural worker this time of increasing their journey to work, constantly exposing the farmer to hazards related to the handling of agricultural implements and can cause serious risks to health and leading to death due to misuse. Or sometimes, not the use of equipment during the application of toxic products and also the wrong handling of cargo with inadequate postures. (PALLETA et al., s/d)

Therefore, the regions with a shortage of studies applied in the context of agriculture, is the region in the west of Parana, thus it is intended that this work will help in investigations related to rural work, health and safety, the handling of PPE’s obtain data on the rate of farmers who have already received some training for the use of PPE in the west of Parana. To this end, the objective of this work was to check whether the farmers of this region make use of PPE’s. To this end, it was observed that the low level of education influences the low level of knowledge about individual protection equipment, if they make use of them and if the discomfort is one of the causes of non-use of these.

DEVELOPMENT
Agriculture is considered one of the professional activities of highest risk, according to the International Labour Organization. This is going through scientific and technological advances, where there are still situations where the man is forced to face unfavourable conditions in their working environment and exposing themselves to the risk of contracting diseases or suffer lamagens, often due to lack of knowledge or information. To promote the maintenance of health of the producer, is necessary the correct use of PPE’s. (COUTO, s/d; PALLETA et al., s/d)

This high level of risk may be due to psychosocial factors, high rate of illiteracy, incorrect employment, PPE, without the necessary skills of farmers about their use and handling of machinery. (ULBRICHT, 2003)

The NR 6 (1992), believes that individual protection equipment is any device or product, for use by the individual worker used for the protection of risks susceptible of threatening the safety of the worker. Where is the worker’s obligation to use this, which in turn should provide a comfortable working, maintaining the health and welfare, leading to an increase in income, reducing the risk of accidents and better quality of life of the worker. (REGULATORY STANDARDS; s/d; FIEDLER, 1995)

The PPE includes clothing and individual equipment, designed to protect people against risks, such as: respiratory protection, hearing protection, safety helmets, safety gloves, goggles and safety belts for safety, with respect to the terminology, requirements, methods testing and generalities. (IDA, 2003)

The ergonomics in agricultural activity can help in the process of improving the machine-man, in increasing productivity, improving the comfort of the worker, security and reduction of physical tension and reduce the risk of musculoskeletal injuries. However it is appropriate to both look at each post of rural work with an ergonomic point of view, in order to define the situations of risk and performance propose more rational, thus resulting in this as a facilitator to solve various problems related to agriculture sector. (Neill et al., s/d; ALBUGUERGUE, 1999)

The works Physiotherapy of the work on prevention, maintenance and recovery of workers’ health, with regard to improving the quality of life of this, with a consequent increase in welfare, performance and productivity. (BAU, 2002)

METHODOLOGY
This search has been a qualitative, quantitative, with epidemiological characteristics, history of cross section. It was general objective check whether farmers make use of PPE’s work in the agricultural region in the west of Parana.

The investigations were carried out in Rural Show - Coopavel (2008), in the city of Cascavel. We interviewed the sample was composed of 100 employees, and addressed the use of PPE during agricultural work.

Data were collected in the period from 28/02/2008 to 01/02/2008, after signing the end of free informed consent. Have been applied by individual interview a structured questionnaire with three (3) closed questions. They have made the search working men aged between 18 and 70 years who were attending the show countryside, and what were the west of Parana. We excluded those who do not fullfil the criteria for inclusion.

The possible risks to the embarrassment were interviewed by answering the questionnaire, refuses to respond the same if this happened, it could drop to answer the questions without suffering any damage or losses. Farmers form informed that his identity would be kept confidential. The benefits were verify what the real conditions of health and safety of rural worker, and inform farmers on the subject.

The data were tabulated by the program Microsoft Excel 2003 and the images were transcribed for the program Microsoft Word 2007.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GRAPHIC 01 - Percent in educational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Until the 1st degree</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd degree incomplete</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd degree complete</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course higher</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author
In reviewing the graph 01, you can see that 33.70% of farmers have until the 1st degree, 13.25% of the 2nd degree incomplete, 35.91% the 3rd degree complete and 17.13% have higher.

According Fleming (s / d) in its study, farmers when interviewed on the level of schooling, 52% had 1st incomplete degree, 20% the 1st degree complete, 9% the 2nd incomplete degree, 14% the 2nd the university level, 3% were 3rd degree incomplete and 3% were 3rd degree complete, the results do not become similar, because in this study farmers have higher level of schooling.

GRAPHIC 2 - Percent of training for the use of PPE

Source: author

When asked about having received some training for the use of PPE, 87% said they were targeted and 13% say they have never received any type of training.

According Lima et al., (1996), in their study, 76.92% of farmers claimed to have received guidance and 23.08% claimed not to have received, results were similar to those described in other study, and in this study.

According Fleming (2003), in their search, 54.5% of farmers did not receive any kind of guidance or training and 45% of farmers said that at least once received guidelines.

GRAPHIC 3 - Percent of types of equipment used

Source: author

In reviewing the chart 03 you can see that 2.0% of farmers interviewed do not make use of PPE, 16.7% are the use of gloves, boots 22.4%, 13.8% mask, ear protector of 2, 6%, protective clothing, 17.2%, 0.6% apron, hat 23.0%, eye protection and 1.3%, 5% use other equipment.

According Leviske et al., (2007), in a survey conducted in Rural Show in the city of Cascavel, farmers when questioned about the use of PPE activity during its countryside, the gloves took the lead with 93%, 88% with masks, macacão with 78%, 67% boots, 59% hat, sunglasses to protect 58%, pants 47%, 41% Visor facial respirator 35% apron 35% and 21% blouse.

In a study conducted by Perry et al., (2006), farmers make use of four PPE's, including gloves, apron, goggles and masks for protection, during mixing, loading and application of praguicida, it becomes evident in other study, and in this that farmers are using the equipment, but not the gear.

According Andef (s / d), the PPE’s tools are working to protect the health of rural producer, and the worker must wear the equipment, which are the main, glove, Visor facial, respirator, jaleco, pants, cap, Coat and boot, moreover, is a requirement of the Brazilian legislation and non-compliance could lead to penalties and risk of labor actions.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In view of the data collected in this study, the use of PPE, it is clear that farmers do not make full use of these, although the majority have a good level of education and have received some kind of training about the correct use and importance of them.

Therefore, the PPE’s show is of fundamental importance in rural activity, if used properly, because they make work comfortable, maintaining the health and well being of workers, increasing productivity. The team of health professional including the physiotherapy is increasingly taking space, working on prevention, rescue and maintaining the health of the worker, providing consequently increase in welfare, performance and productivity.
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This study it is a quantitative and qualitative in nature, epidemiological, in which it was aimed to check whether farmers in the west of Paraná are the use of personal protection equipment (PPE's) in agricultural work. Questionnaires were applied to hundred workers (100) of the region. Being found that farmers don't use of PPE's, although the majority have a good level of education and have received some kind training on the importance and the correct use of them. In conclusion this way, that the PPE's are of fundamental importance in rural activity, because they are designed to protect risks that threaten their safety and health, but farmers must be well informed and educated by a professional in the area, to avoid possible accidents at work.
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