
SAFETY AT WORK ENVIRONMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Dr. Emmanuel, Tile Aime¹ and Ahmed, Aliyu Tanko²

¹Department of Business Management, College of Advanced & Professional Studies, Makurdi, Benue State – Nigeria.+2348032454779 Email: tileaime@gmail.com

²Department of Business Administration & Management, Federal Polytechnic, Nasarawa, Nasarawa State – Nigeria.+2348032409970 Email: babanmusa170@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study discusses the relevance of safety and security at the work environment and its impact on the performance of business organizations. The spate of industrialization to the western world brings a corresponding and continuous impact in terms of industrial accidents, exposure to contagious chemical diseases and sometime an external attack as a result of insurgence, kidnapping, assassins and many others which are detrimental to human life. The main objective of the study is to identify if there is casual relationship between safety and security at work and organizational performance. The study adopted survey design and sampling techniques to select some organizations for investigation. The questionnaire method of gathering data was applied and the study used partial least square structural equation model (PLSSEM), smartPLS 3.0 software for purpose of estimation. The study reveals a significant relationship between safety and security at work environment and the organizational performance. It concludes that the persistent implementation of measures of safety and security; workers training; safety participation and involvement of workers; and labor compliance to safety measures are valuables to the organization and can provide positive changes to the organization.

KEYWORDS: Security, Safety, Performance.

INTRODUCTION

The occupational safety has become a concern of all and sundry, essentially the business concerns and other organizations. The security and safety of employees at the work place is considered to be the paramount issue of the management to give attention, if the organization intends to achieve its goals or objectives. Adequate safety and security measures guarantee the freedom of employees and also protect them from organizational accidents, injuries and other attacks that cause a lot of damages to employees' lives and properties every year (Zhou and Jiang, 2015). Safety policies and programmes in place are geared towards protecting employees and other people affected by an organization's activities, products and services against hazards. To help reduce occupational injuries, companies strive to focus their resources to achieve the greatest reduction in injuries and damages to employees and properties to attain the optimal cost of production. Organizations would create a working environment in which everyone enjoys protection from disease or infirmity and has a sense of well being whilst also feeling safe from accident and injury. We do not live in an ideal society;

employees have suffered accidents and injury at work. Although, accident will still occur but in fact, some of them could be as a result of ill-considered actions or work practices. It is on the basis of this that managers and their staff are responsible for safety and security within the provisions of the law. So safety culture has been identified as a critical issue that set the tone for importance of safety within an organization (O'Toole, 2002).

The relevance of safety and security in organizations have become evident in many countries especially those that aim at maintaining or increasing high productivity and profitability at the expense of employees' health, safety and security thereby reducing employees' job performance. With increasing industrialization and its continuous impact in terms of industrial accidents and exposure to dangerous chemicals due to operations with attendant health implications, accidents, and sometime attack of insurgency, kidnappers, assassins and many other issues became concern (Pollitt, 2011).

In the word of Nixon, Lanz, Manapragada, Bruk-lee, Schantz and Rodriguez (2015) worker's frequently encountered with daily hazards which may includes: Physical, biological, and chemical hazards. According to them physical hazards range from environmental conditions that may result to falls, cuts, electrical shock and attack by an enemy. Biological hazards may range from exposure to blood-borne pathogens due to body contact. While chemical hazard include contact with hazardous agents ranging from carcinogens, Corrosive and toxic (Perry, parkey and Jagger 2003, Ford and wiggins, 2012).

The international Labor organization (2012) reveals that daily about 6,300 people die as a result of occupational accidents; moreover, 2.3 million people per year die due to work-related diseases, 317 million accidents occur on the job annually. The cost of this adversity is enormous and the economic burden of poor occupational health and safety practices is estimated at 4% of global Gross Domestic product each year.

Safety is a feeling of security; our work environment can provide a situation of less fear of danger or injury. Most organization should create a conducive working environment in which every worker enjoys a protection from heath challenges and other various threats to life. So that workers enjoys a sense of wellbeing and also feel safe from accident and injury and other form of insecurity at work. It is the responsibility of the management of the organization to incorporate a balanced approach which reduces risks and protect workers and even visitors from danger. It is said that accident will still occur but in fact most accidents are the result of ill- considered actions or working practices. In view of the above, managers and staff are both responsible for health safety and security within the specified law. There is the requirement for an employer to provide a reasonably safe system of work. Formally just a common law duty is now incorporated into health and safety at work Act 1974.

Where a safety system provides for: Reasonably safe work-fellows, training of employers, effective arrangements with regards to provision and use of safety apparatus, proper co-ordination, and suitable working condition among others. Section 2 of the Act provides that it is the duty of an employer to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable the health, safety and welfare at work of all his employees.

Careful review on this subject matter attests to the fact that there is relatively scare literature in this area. It also revealed that majority of the articles reviewed were very helpful like Boden, Spieler and Wagnar (2016), Mashi, Subramaniam and Jojari (2016), Iheanacho and Ebitu (2016), though there was no empirical estimation to determine the genuineness of the outcome. Besides, most have methodological problem which affect the outcome of the conclusion and recommendations.

In view of foregoing therefore, the inadequacy of the reviewed studies determine the need to reinvestigate the relevance of safety and security at work environment and its impact on the performance of business organizations in Nigeria.

The main objective of the study is to identify if there is causal relationship between safety and security at work and organizational performance. So to achieve the stated objective, the following hypotheses were stated for consideration:

H_01 There exist no significant relationship between measures of security and safety in place and employees' output.

H_02 There is no significant relationship between safety training of workers and employees' job performance in terms of volume of production.

H_03 There is no significant relationship between safety participation and involvement of workers and job performance in terms of turnover of outputs.

H_04 There is no significant relationship between labour compliance to safety measures and performance of work in terms of productivity.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.

2.1 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW.

The "Safety procedures are means to achieve the desired security objectives" (Zhang, Li & Zuo, 2015). In other words, it is defined as "the safety-related actions or behaviors that workers exhibit in almost all types of work to promote their safety and that of others" (Burke & Signal, 2010). Beus, McCord and Zohar (2016) defined safety performance behavior "as any workplace behaviors that affect the likelihood of physical harm to persons". Safety is a feeling of security, where one can work without fear of danger or injury. A work place which neglects security and safety risk

prosecution, may lose staff, and may increase costs and reduced profitability. This may be detrimental to the well being of such organization. Safety refers to our general well being. It means that we may enjoy freedom from disease or infirmity and have a sense of mental, physical and social well being. Employee safety compliance and participation are the main components of safety performance behavior used in Griffin and Neal (2000) model that described the actual behaviors that workers exhibit in the workplace (Griffin & Neal, 2000). Safety compliance is defined as “generally mandated” behaviors (Neal, Griffin & Hart, 2000) which they drawn from the two main components of general job performance from the work of Borman and Motowidlo (1993)—task performance and contextual performance—safety compliance was used as task performance and therefore refers to the core activities that workers carry out to preserve safety at work. These behaviors includes following standard work procedures or wearing personal protective equipment (Neal & Griffin, 2006).

Workers safety participation, on the other hand is defined as behaviors “frequently voluntary” (Neal, Griffin & Hart, 2000). In other words, are behavior “that may not directly contribute to workplace safety, but that do help to develop an environment that supports safety” (Griffin & Neal, 2000) and can be associated to safety improvement. These safety behaviors include voluntarily participating in safety activities, attending safety meetings, or helping colleagues with safety-related matters (Neal & Griffin, 2006). Training is “refers to instruction and practice for acquiring skills and knowledge of rules, concepts, or attitudes necessary to function effectively in specified task situations” (Cohen, Colligan, Sinclair, Newman & Schuler, 1998). Safety training is an important risk prevention and control strategies to guarantee every employee’s safe in a good workplace conditions (Cohen, 1998). Safety training is defined as “instruction in hazard recognition and control measures, learning safe work practices and proper use of personal protective equipment, and acquiring knowledge of emergency procedures and preventive actions” (Cohen, 1998). Safety training has been recognized as an important organizational characteristic distinguishing organization with successful safety program (Zohar, 1980), and is an effective means for employees to enhance their skills and knowledge of safety in the organizations (Shea, De Cieri, Donohue, Cooper, & Sheehan, 2016).

2.2 THEORETICAL REVIEW

The theoretical framework for the study is based on two theories. That is: Social Exchange Theory (SET); (Blau, 1964) and Construal Level Theory (CLT), (Liberman & Trope, 1998). The SET “is one of the most influential conceptual paradigms for understanding workplace behavior” (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). The principles or tenets of this theory are the reciprocity of commitments between employees and employer over time (Blau, 1964). When an organizations exhibits a readiness to make workplace safe and healthy, the employee oblige by engaging in desirable behavior such as high compliance with work procedures and reducing undesirable behavior such as unsafe behavior (Neal & Griffin, 2006). In this paper, SET is theoretically applied to explain the direct relationships between safety training, workers involvement and safety behavior. When

organizations care for their workers safety, the workers are likely to develop tacit obligations to perform their duties, using behavior beneficial to the organizations. When the management offers adequate training to the workers, the staff would accordingly carried out their responsibilities efficiently and safely, which then results in better safety performance and optimal productivity.

On the other hand, Construal Level Theory (CLT) Liberman & Trope, (1998) in Mashi, Subramaniam and Jojari (2016), posits that employees have distinctive psychological links with events and objects grounded on perceived social and temporal distances, taking along a remarkable wrinkle to the discussion of individual safety behavior. According to this theory, people construe distant future events using abstract representations. In contrast, people who choose their behavior thinking only about immediate events using concrete term (Trope & Liberman, 2010). This theory (Liberman & Trope, 1998) is widely used in an effort to understand individual's decision over time in the area of psychology (e.g., Fujita, & Sasota, 2011). Drawing from CLT (Trope & Liberman, 2010), it suggests that consideration for future safety consequences can play an important roles theoretically in explaining the moderating effects on safety training, workers involvement and safety behavior in organizations. The study anchored on these theories as a result of their principles and tenets.

2.3 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Iheanacho and Ebitu (2016) investigated the effects of industrial safety and health on employees' job performance in selected cement companies in Cross River state. The study revolves around industrial safety\health strategies and productivity, together with relationships among employees, customers and management and how it affects turnover. The study adopted the Pearson moment correlation coefficient to test the hypotheses. The result of the study reveals that there is strategies and employees' job performance. It recommended that employees should ensure adequate industrial safety\health strategies management in order to protect the lives of its employees at work place thereby reducing employees' turnover and promoting staff performance.

Mashi, Subramaniam and Johari (2016) conducted a study on the effect of safety training and workers involvement on health care workers' safety behavior: The moderating role of consideration of future safety consequences. The study adopted partial least square structural equation modeling (PLSSEM), moreover, used SmartPLS 3.0 software to compute both the measurement and structural models. The findings show that safety training positively relates to safety compliance and safety participation. Moreover, consideration for safety consequence moderates the relationships between workers involvement and safety compliance. It suggests that hospital management should provide employees with safety training and involvement in the safety activities and consider individual consideration for safety consequences when making decisions on how to improve hospital safety.

Several other empirical tests were reviewed in an effort to understand safety performance across various work setting. For instance, Hayes, Perander, Smecko, and Trask (1998), Lee and Dalal (2016) explored how safety climate and culture were important in predicting workers safety performance in the organizations. In relation to their model, Griffin & Neal (2000) regarded safety knowledge and safety motivation as proximal factors that have a positive relationship with workers' safety behavior. Safety leadership was also found to have a positive relationship with workers' safety behavior (Smith, Eldridge, & DeJoy, 2016). Other study used individual characteristics such as personality and age differences (e.g., Siu, Phillips & Leung, 2003), level of education (; Gyekye & Salminen, 2009), and Fernández-Muñiz, B., Montes-Peón, J. M., & Vázquez-Ordás, C. J. (2007) among others.

Agbola (2012) conducted a study on "impact of health and safety management on employee safety at the Ghana ports and harbor authority"(GPHA). The purpose of this study was to examine the Safety and Health Management Systems (SHMS) implemented by the GPHA assessing the effectiveness of these measures in reducing accidents and death; and evaluate impact of accidents and work-related illnesses on the employee safety at work and performance. The results reveal an organization fraught with poor health and safety management practices, poor training in safety know-how, lack of information on dangerous chemicals and hazardous materials, lack of monitoring and enforcement of safety rules, unavailability of essential safety equipments, with adverse effects on employees and the organizational performance. He further recommended that, GPHA must increase education and create awareness of the importance of health and safety; ensure collection and storage of data for effective monitoring and evaluation of safety performance.

Another research carried out by Womoh,Owusu, &Addo, (2013), to examine the impact of health and safety policies on employees' performance in the Ghana's timber industry and a case study approach was adopted for the study. The main data collection instruments used were interviews and questionnaires as well as statistical tools such as Pearson correlation was adopted to assess the relationship between investment in health and safety and employees' performance. The data collected with these instruments as well as the calculated $r = 0.42$ showed that health and safety measures put up by the company positively correlates with employees' performance despite that the correlation is weak. There is also inverse relationship between reducing the number of accidents and injuries through health and safety promotions and employees performance. From the findings, it was concluded that organizations need to pay much attention to their health and safety measures since apart from the fact that in other jurisdictions it is backed by law and is mandatory, it is classified as an existence need for which other motivational factors meant to improve employees' performance revolves.

Looking at the effect on occupational health and safety policy on employees' performance, Lim

(2012) added that when workers understand the health and safety rules and procedures of their job and the tools use for working, it helps them to work effectively and efficiently resulting in better performance of employees. The Australian National Commission for Health and Safety (2002) wrote the benefit of promoting health and safety in organizations indicated that when employees are provided with safe working environment through the use of effective occupational health and safety management systems, it reduces employees absenteeism, and employee turnover and this has direct effect on increase in productivity, employee/customer relationship, subordinate/management relationship which the end result will increase profitability for the organization. Looking at a report by Safe Work, Victoria (2006) on health and safety of various organizations, they share similar view of the literature provided by Australian National Commission for Health and Safety.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a quantitative research method through the use of questionnaire. The choice of questionnaire method became inevitable because, it was difficult to obtain the statistical data of people that died or suffered injury as a result of: (1) Accidents that occur on the job environment per year, (2) The number of workers who died or suffered illness or sickness related to hazards at work environment, and also other various attacks, from the selected organizations. The survey designed and sampling techniques were employed to select three hundred staff from the selected organizations: Dangote Cement, Gboko plant; Benue Brewery, Makurdi; and Federal medical Centre, Makurdi. The selection of these organizations was done randomly using cluster sampling technique by the recommendations of Gay and Diehl (1992) five steps technique of selecting clusters with the total number of 300 staff. Out of the three hundred number questionnaires distributed, only 274 valid questionnaires returned.

The study used Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLSSEM), SmartPLS 3.0 software as already adopted by Ringle, Wende and Becker(2015), Mashi, Subramaniam and Johari (2016), Anderson and Gberbing (1988) to compute both the measurement and structural models. The choice of PLSSEM was based on the fact that it provides the likelihood of providing accurate computations of moderating effect because it accounts for error also, Helm, Eggert and Garneteld, (2010) used in their study. Four basic items of safety precaution were selected to help determine the investigation and these constitute the major variables of the study. These include: safety measures, safety training, and safety participation\involvement and safety compliance. The specification above follows the works of Vinod kumar and Bhasi (2010); Neal and Griffin (2004); and Probst, Graso, Estrada, and Greer (2013).

The above mentioned items were measured using a five-point likert-scale type to determine the strategies of management of the selected organizations for industrial health, safety, and security of workers at work environment and the performance of the organizations in relation to productivity.

The said Likert-scale ranges from 1= strongly agree to 5= strongly disagree.

4. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.

4.1 Respondents Profile.

The study used questionnaire as a method of gathering data for the study. The characteristics of the respondents are as follows:

- I. The majority of the respondents are men 204(74.5%)
- II. Women are only 70 (25.5%)
- III. The majority of the respondents are skilled labour 168 (61.4%)
- IV. The semi-skilled labour are only 106 (38.7)
- V. The majority of the respondents are subordinate workers 211(77.0%) while the rest are supervisors 63(23%)
- VI. The mean age and standard deviation of the respondents 35 years.
- VII. The mean years of experience and standard deviation of respondents are 21 years.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics.

The following table presents the descriptive statistics which explain the mean, standard deviation, composite reliability and cronbach's alpha of the study variables:

Table 4.1: statistics of the study variables.

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Composite Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha.
Safety training	4.36	0.960	0.880	0.698
Safety measures	1.61	0.532	0.777	0.586
Safety participation & involvement	2.09	1.125	0.931	0.746
Safety compliance	2.06	1.240	0.864	0.743

Source: Authors Compilation.

Table 4.1 above, shows the descriptive statistics in respect of the mean, standard deviation and the reliability of the variables used in study. The mean values of the variables ranges from 1.61 to 4.36 indicating a low gap from one mean value to another. This explained the relevance efficiency and the agreement that exist among all the variables used in study. The composite reliability values span from 0.777 to 0.931, indicating a high level of reliability for all the variables used in the study. Relatedly the Cronbach's Alpha values ranges from 0.586 to 0.746 explaining the same high level of reliability for all the variables under study. The value of standard deviation ranges from 0.532 to 1.240 demonstrating the low level of variability among the variables.

4.3 COMMON METHOD VARIANCE (CMV)

According to Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee and Podsakoff (2003) CMV in a study happen where two or more self-reported measures are acquired from the same respondents at the same point of time. The relationship between the construct can be influenced by CMV. This type of variance is attributed to the measurement method rather than the construct. This study adopted one-factor test principle component factor analysis. The following table explains the value of the CMV:

Table 4.2 Common Method Variance.

Variables	Coefficient	Std Error	Percentages
Safety training	0.8763386	0.0748707	87.63
Measures	0.6870904	0.0587021	68.70
Participation	1.357291	0.1159612	135
Compliance	1.455783	0.1243759	145

Source: Authors Compilation

The result shows the rotation that common method bias is an issue in the study. There is none single factor less than 50%. The least factor accounted for is 68.70%.

4.4. MEASUREMENT MODEL EVALUATION

The study used two types of validity to access measurement evaluation model. According to Gholami Sulaiman, Ramayah and Molla (2013) such validity are as follows:

(a).Convergent validity: This is assessed through the use of composite reliability, loadings and average variance estimated. Based on the results of the estimate the convergent validity table is illustrated below:

Table 4.3a: convergent validity.

The Variables	Items	Loadings	AVE	CR
Safety training	TRAIN2	0.956	0.876	0.880
	TRAIN3	0.963		
	TRAIN4	0.953		
Safety Measures	TRAIN5	0.924	0.687	0.777
	MEAS1	0.816		
	MEAS2	0.847		
Safety participation & involvement	MEAS3	0.869	0.762	0.931
	MEAS4	0.850		
	PART1	0.954		

	PART2	0.943		
Safety Compliance	PART3	0.949		
	COMP1	0.818	0.751	0.864
	COMP2	0.819		
	COMP3	0.822		
	COMP4	0.873		

Source: authors compilation

As indicated above table 4.3a (convergent validity) you can see that each variable attained loadings above 0.8, the Average Variance Estimated (AV) is above 0.6, and moreover Composite Reliability (CR) of all the variables are more than 0.7. These achievement is in agreement with the Hair,Hult, Ringle and Barsted (2014) recommendations.

(b). Discriminant Validity: This is determined by comparing the square roots of the AVE with the correlations among the Variables. As demonstrated in the table below the square root of the AVE (Value stated in bold print) is on the diagonals and were greater than the corresponding row and column values showing that the measures were discriminate (Fornell and Larcker 1981). As a result of the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion the following table was constructed:

Table 4.3b: Discriminant Validity: Fornell-Larcker Criterion

Variables	1	2	3	4
TRAIN	0.936			
MEAS	0.050	0.829		
PART	0.030	0.643	0.873	
COMP	0.003	0.007	0.021	0.867

Source: Constructed by the authors.

In view of the above table, the values in bold shows the average variance extracted in respect of the variables under study while the other values are the squared correlations estimated in respect of safety training (TRAIN), Safety measures (MEAS), Safety participation and involvement (PART), and Safety compliance (COMP).

(C) Heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT): Apart from the Fornell and Larcker (1981) Criterion there is another one known as Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) Criterion which seems to be more dependable, reliable and accepted for the purpose of assessment (Henseler, Dijkstra, Sarstedt, Ringle, Diamantopoulos, Straub and Calantone 2014). This criterion can be demonstrated under the following table:

Table 4.3c: Discriminant Validity: Heterotrait-Monotrait

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. TRAIN				
2. MEAS	0.048			
3. PART	0.30	0.82		
4. COMP	0.24	0.45	0.62	

Source: Authors Compilation

The HTMT criterion table above suggests that discriminant validity is achieved. Based on the above, the highest correlation is found at the neighborhood of safety participation and involvement of workers, which are 0.82 correlations. Not too far from the Henseler, Ringle and Sarstedt (2015) benchmark of 0.85 correlation.

4.5. STRUCTURAL MODEL.

Apart from the measurement model, we can also use the structural model to assess the relevance of safety and security at the work environment and its implications to management. The philosophy behind the choice of structural model is to assess the relationship between dependents variables and independent variables so that an inference can be drawn. In determining the relationship among the variables in the study, we evaluate available data to find the beta standardizes t and p values, standard error and so on. The study also used the significance level of $P < 0.05$. The following table shows the said estimate of the structural model analysis.

Table 4.4: Structural Model Analysis (Testing of Hypothesis).

Hypothesis	Variable	Beta coefficient	Std Error	t-Value	p-Value	Decision
Ho ₁	Safety measures	.5889966	.1549	3.80	0.000	Ho Rejected
Ho ₂	Safety training	.7284649	.2779	2.62	0.009	Ho Rejected
Ho ₃	Safety participation & involvement	.2271097	.2809	0.81	0.419	Ho Rejected
Ho ₄	Labour safety compliance	.0878099	.1762	0.50	0.618	Ho Rejected

Source: Authors Computation using Smartpls 3.0 software.

The result of the above table shows that among the variables, safety training has the highest beta coefficient of $\beta = .7284649$ with a P. Value of 0.009. The result further explains that safety training at the work environment is indispensable if the organization must succeed and also enhance its performance. The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted which confirms

that there is a significant relationship between safety training of workers and employees' job performance in terms of volume of production.

4.6 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.

The paper discusses the safety and security at the work environment and moreover its impact on the performance of business organizations resident in Benue State, Nigeria. The finding reveals that a significant relationship exists between safety and security at work environment and performance. As presented in table 4.4 above, the finding showed a significant positive relationship between measures of security and safety in place and employees' output in the organization ($\beta = 0.5889966$, $t=3.80$, $P= 0.000$). The result invalidates the null hypothesis and affirms the alternative hypothesis which says that "there exist significant relationship between measures of security and safety in place and employees' output". This finding is inconsistent to the findings of Blau (1964), Liberman & Trobe (1998) and that of Cropanzano & Mitchell (2005).

The study also find a significant positive relationship between safety training of workers and employees' job performance in terms of volume of production ($\beta = 0.7284649$, $t=2.6$, $P= 0.9$). With this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. The finding is in conformity with the social exchange theory, which explains the direct relationship between safety training, workers involvement and safety behavior. The finding espouses the views of Blau (1964), Neal & Griffin (2006), Henseler, Ringle&Sarstedt (2015). Who are of the opinion that when management provide training for their workers they are likely to develop the desire to perform their duties effectively and without fear.

The study reveals that there is a significant relationship between safety participation and involvement of workers and job performance in terms of turnover of outputs, in the organizations under review ($\beta = 0.2271097$, $t=0.81$, $P= 0.419$). This finding is in agreement with Fujita & Sasota, (2011), Trope & Liberman (2010), Camuffo, De Stefano & Paolino (2015), Mashi, Subramanian & Johari (2016). The safety participation and involvement of workers at the organizations under review is essentially frequently voluntarily because it helps to develop an environment that supports safety at work place.

The findings revealed that there is a minimal relationship between labour compliance to safety measures and performance. Though the relationship is significantly positive thus: $\beta = 0.0878099$, $t=0.50$, $P=0.618$. This finding is in line with the research done by Trope & Liberman (2010), Rooney (1992), Zhang & Zuo (2015) and Masso (2015). The study reveals that employee's positive participation and involvement can minimize the rate of accidents at work. Management practice can influence their safety compliance and participation which can reduce the rate of incidents of accidents.

5. CONCLUSION/ RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the above findings, which suggest that adequate measures of security and safety, safety training of workers, safety participation and involvement of workers and also labour compliance to safety measures enhance the performance of work in terms of productivity. One can understand that committed implementation of measures of safety and security, workers training, safety participation and involvement of workers and labor compliance to safety measures is an asset to the organization and it can provide positive changes to the organization. This conclusion is in consistent with the findings of Mashi, ;Subramaniam, & Johari, (2016); Lee, & Dalal, (2016); Iheanacho, &Ebitu, (2016) .Moreover, in consonant with Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Construal Level Theory (CLT).Irrespective of the amount of investment in this area (security & safety), it is not a waste. Strict adherence to the above can usher the organization the following benefits:

- Reduction of rate of employees' turnover, amount of litigation and compensation from workers.
- Reduction of lost of man labour hour, insurance premium, rate of injuries at work, abnormal waste of materials, among others.
- Above all, it will enhance good staff morale, greater efficiency, and compliance with the law, increased spate of volume of output.
- There will be an established confidence generally in the work environment that will provide the freedom to the workers to carry their work properly.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the above conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

- The organization should continue to review from time to time the standards for particular requirements of their work environment which are applicable to their individual situation and make adjustment to these safety specifications to their organizations.
- The organization should ensure that workers are operating in a safe working environment.
- Always conduct regular inspections at workplace to ensure that safety apparatus are in place and in good condition.
- Organize constantly, especially at a reasonable interval of six months an in-house safety and security training session for workers.
- Provide personal protective equipments for all workers.
- Develop, complement and enforce safe work procedures and rules and also award punity measures for offenders.
- Provide a system of safety and security operations that will accommodate all and sundry that each worker will participate, involved and complied with the safety measures in place.

REFERENCES:

- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423.
- Beus, J. M., McCord, M. A., & Zohar, D. (2016). Workplace safety: A review and research synthesis. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2041386615626243.1-30.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers.
- Boden, L.I; Spieler, E.A; & Wagner, G.R.(2016). The changing structure of work: Implications for workplace health and safety in the U.S. Paper prepared for the future of work symposium. U.S. Department of labour, December 9-11, 2015.1 -39.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowildlo, S. M. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include contextual performance. *Personnel Selection in Organizations San Francisco: Jossey Bass*, 71-96.
- Burke, M. L. & Signal, S. M. (2010). Workplace safety for a multilevel, interdisciplinary perspective. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 29, 1-47.
- Camuffo, A. , De Stefano, F. & Paolino. C. (2015). Safety reloaded: Lean operations and high involvement work practices for a sustainable workplace. *Journal of Ethics*, 1-15.
- Cohen, A., Colligan, M. J., Sinclair, R., Newman, J., & Schuler, R. (1998). *Assessing occupational safety and health training*. Cincinnati, Ohio: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 98-145.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of management*, 31(6), 874-900. 74
- Fernández-Muñiz, B., Montes-Peón, J.M., & Vázquez-Ordás, C. J. (2007). Safety culture: Analysis of the causal relationships between its key dimensions. *Journal of safety research*, 38(6), 627-641.
- Fernández-Muñiz, B., Montes-Peón, J. M., & Vázquez-Ordás, C. J. (2007). Safety management system: Development and validation of a multidimensional scale. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the process Industries*, 20(1), 52-68.
- Ford, M. T., & Wiggins, B. K. (2012). Occupational-level interactions between physical hazards and cognitive ability and skill requirements in predicting injury incidence rates. *Journal of Exposure Prevention*, 6, 32–36.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. (1981) 'Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error'. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48, 39–50.
- Fujita, K., & Sasota, J. A. (2011). The effects of construal levels on asymmetric temptation-goal cognitive associations. *Social Cognition*, 29(2), 125-146.
- Gholami, R., Sulaim Ramayah, an, A. B., T., & Molla, A. (2013). Senior Managers' Perception on Green Information Systems (IS) Adoption and Environmental Performance: Results from a Field Survey. *Information Management*, 50(7), 431–438.
- Griffin, M. A., & Neal, A. (2000). Perceptions of safety at work: a framework for linking safety climate to safety performance, knowledge, and motivation. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 5(3), 347-358.

- Gyekye, S. A., & Salminen, S. (2009). Educational status and organizational safety climate: Does educational attainment influence workers' perceptions of workplace safety? *Safety science*, 47(1), 20-28.
- Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. M. (2004). A beginner's guide to partial least squares analysis. *Understanding statistics*, 3(4), 283-297.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T.M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM).
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152.
- Hayes, B. E., Perander, J., Smecko, T., & Trask, J. (1998). Measuring perceptions of workplace safety: Development and validation of the work safety scale. *Journal of Safety research*, 29(3), 145-161.
- Health and Safety at work Act 1974.
- Helm, S., Eggert, A., & Garnefeld, I. (2010). Modeling the impact of corporate reputation on customer satisfaction and loyalty using partial least squares. In *Handbook of partial least squares*: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T. K., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Diamantopoulos, A., Straub, D. W., & Calantone, R. J. (2014). Common beliefs and reality about PLS comments on Rönkkö and Evermann (2013). *Organizational Research Methods*, 17 (2): 182- 209.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115-135.
- Iheanacho, M.U.; & Ebitu, E.T. (2016). Effects of industrial safety and health employees' job performance in selected cement companies in Cross River state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 4(3) 49-56.
- Labour Organization (2012) .Safety and health at work.
Online: http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/afety_and_health_at_work//ang... en/index.htm.
- Lee, S., & Dalal, R. S. (2016). Climate as situational strength: Safety climate strength as a cross-level moderator of the relationship between conscientiousness and safety behaviour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(1), 120-132.
- Liberman, N., & Trope, Y. (1998). The role of feasibility and desirability considerations in near and distant future decisions: A test of temporal construal theory. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(1), 5-18.
- Mashi, M. S., Subramaniam, C., & Johari, J. (2016). The effect of safety and training and workers involvement on healthcare workers' safety behavior: The moderating role of consideration of safety future consequences. *International Journal of Business Management* 1(2), 46-81.
- Masso, M. (2015). The determinants of employee participation in occupational health and safety management. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 21(1), 62-70. 78

- Neal, A., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Safety climate and safety at work. Predictors of work safety. *Work & Stress*, 13(1), 49-58.
- Neal, A., & Griffin, M. A. (2006). A study of the lagged relationships among safety climate, safety motivation, safety behavior, and accidents at the individual and group levels. *Journal of applied psychology*, 91(4), 946- 953.
- Neal, A., Griffin, M. A., & Hart, P. M. (2000). The impact of organizational climate on safety climate and individual behavior. *Safety science*, 34(1), 99-109.
- Nixon, A. E., Lanz, J. J., Manapragada, A., Bruk-Lee, V., Schantz, A., & Rodriguez, J. F. (2015). Nurse safety: How is safety climate related to affect and attitude? *Work & Stress*, 29(4), 401-419.
- O'Toole, M. (2002). The relationship between employees perceptions of safety and organizational culture. *Journal of Safety Research* 33: 231-243.
- Perry, J., Parker, G., & Jagger, J. (2003). EPINet report: 2002 percutaneous injury rates. *Advances in Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 268-278.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.M., Lee, J. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method variance in behavioral research – a critical review of the literature recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Pollitt, D. (2011). Corus forges new approach to safety and health. *Human resource management international digest*. 19(1), 7-9.
- Probst, T. M., Graso, M., Estrada, A. X., & Greer, S. (2013). Consideration of future safety consequences: A new predictor of employee safety. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 55, 124-134.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2015). SmartPLS 3. Hamburg: SmartPLS. Retrieved from <http://www.smartpls.com>. effectiveness of occupational health and safety training. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 38(3), 193-208.
- Rooney, P. M. (1992). Employee ownership and worker participation: effects on health and safety. *Economics Letters*, 39(3), 323-328.
- Shea, T., De Cieri, H., Donohue, R., Cooper, B., & Sheehan, C. (2016). Leading indicators of occupational health and safety: An employee and workplace level validation study. *Safety Science*, 85, 293-304.
- Siu, O. L., Phillips, D. R., & Leung, T. W. (2003). Age differences in safety attitudes and safety performance in Hong Kong construction workers. *Journal of Safety Research*, 34(2), 199-205.
- Smith, T. D., Eldridge, F., & DeJoy, D. M. (2016). Safety-specific transformational and passive leadership influences on firefighter safety climate perceptions and safety behavior outcomes. *Safety science*, 86, 92-97.
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological review*, 117(2), 440-463.
- Vinod kumar, M. N., & Bhasi, M. (2010). Safety management practices and safety behaviour:

Assessing the mediating role of safety knowledge and motivation. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 42(6), 2082-2093.

Zhang, J., Li, J., & Zuo, J. (2015). The Determinants for Safety Behaviors of Migrant Construction Workers. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Advancement of Construction Management and Real Estate*: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Zhou, F., & Jiang, C. (2015). Leader-member Exchange and Employees' Safety Behavior: The Moderating Effect of Safety Climate. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3, 5014-5021.

Zohar, D. (1980). Safety climate in industrial organizations: theoretical and applied implications. *Journal of applied psychology*, 65(1), 96-102.

Zohar, D. (2010). Thirty years of safety climate research: Reflections and future directions. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 42(5), 1517-1522.