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Abstract
This study was carried out in order to ascertain the commitment of management personnel towards the implementation of industrial safety regulations in Technical Institution workshops. To guide the study, two research questions was raise and one hypothesis formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance. The study adopted a survey research design, the population comprised of 30 chief executive and Heads of department drawn from different Technical Institutions in Delta State of Nigeria. Twenty-four item statements were developed to elicit information from the respondents. Mean statistic was used to answer the research questions, while t-test was used to test the hypothesis. The result of the analysis revealed that management personnel in Technical Institutions do not show commitment to the implementation of industrial safety regulations in Technical Institution workshops, rather they delegate safety responsibilities. Conclusion was drawn and some recommendations were made to include: A written safety policy statement that is signed by the chief Executive should be displayed to the knowledge of staff, students and visitor, chief executive should provide financial and human resources to safety implementation, among others.
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Introduction
Commitment is the willingness to give your time and energy to something that you believe in. It entails dedication to a particular cause nor belief and the willingness to get involved. In an organization, people who are committed always make effort and stick to such effort in order to gather momentum to advance the goals of such an organization and the more people are committed, the more effective they influence others. Management Personnel commitments implies the direct participation by the higher echelon of an organization by showing passion and interest either by formulating polices, setting up targets or benchmarks to advance the cause of such organization. On the other hand, implementation of safety regulations in Technical Institution workshops is the adherence to established safety guidelines in order to ensure the safety of workers, students and others who may have been in such environment. However, workshop activities in Technical institutions are aimed at the production and maintenance of
component. In an attempt to accomplish a given task, staff and students may be face with inherent hazards that could cause an accident if care is not taken such an accident could claim lives, destroy properties or can even cause extensive damage to the environment. Hence, it is always important for safety awareness to be created and sustained in the mind of everyone in such work environment.

However, workshop activities in Technical Institution are aimed at the production and maintenance of components, and in an attempt to accomplish a given task, staff, students and those within such environment are faced with inherent hazards that could cause serious damage. Hence, it is always important for safety awareness to be created and sustained in the mind of everyone in such environment.

Wikipedia encyclopedia (2015), defined safety as a state of being “safe”. It is a condition of being protected against physical, social, political, occupational or other types of consequences of failure, damage or any other non-desirable event. On the other hand, industrial safety can be seen as the control of recognize hazards in workplaces in order to achieve an acceptable level of risk. This can take the form of being protected from exposure to something that causes health risk or economic loss in the form of people and assets.

Safety issue is a major source of concern to all stakeholders in any organization, right from the Chief Executive Officer to the least personnel, and that is why there is a common slogan that says “SAFETY FIRST”. Onyekakeyah (2008) asserted that everyone should be made conscious of safety in all job situation no matter the services or operations carried out, or how highly placed an individual is in any organization, because the basic underlying principle of any safety management system that help to enhance the reputation of any organization to the outside community is safe operation.

For any safety programme to be successful, it has to get the support and commitment of management, because a sound safety performance reflect overall good management of such an organization. Adigo (2008) asserted that several studies that have been carried out to measure relative success of safety performance have shown that where a substantial improvement in performance has been achieved, the major factor responsible for such achievement is the personnel and visible commitment by management. Without transparent leadership and good support from management, no safety effort can survive. Hence the
management of safety in Technical Institution workshops operation has to be seen as an essential part of management personnel range of responsibilities as they should show serious concern as a basis of commitment.

However, there are safety laws guiding workplaces, these laws are enacted for employers to ensure the safety of persons at work, protection of assets and the environment. Consequently, safe operating procedures are developed by employers to ensure compliance with these laws.

Management of Technical institutions must be aware of the existence of these laws. However with heavy commitment of meeting institutional objectives i.e., the training of students, most Technical institution management personnel believe they have no direct involvement with safety regulations and implementation, therefore they delegate safety responsibilities to workshop instructors and other front line officers, which have direct contact with students. This practice does not reflect the true purpose of safety in the workplace. Management personnel need to understand the objective of these laws to be able to appreciate safety recommendations and make necessary input to establish appropriate policies that would ensure compliance with these laws and ensure effective safety of students in the cause of training and the safety of workshop personnel.

The Nigerian Institute of Safety Professionals Training Manual (2006), contain a model code of safety regulations by International Labour Organization (ILO) which is designed to improve the health and safety of workers in the workplace. Nigeria as a nation and being a member of ILO ratified and adopted this model code of safety regulation as the factory Act of 1990 with the following objectives:

1. To secure the health, safety and welfare of persons at work.
2. Protect persons at work against risks to health or safety arising out of in connection with activities of persons at work.
3. Involve everyone both management and employees and make them aware of the importance of safety.

Furthermore, part XI of the Act defined a factory as any premises in which the following purposes are attain:

1. The making of any article or part of an article.
2. The altering, repairing ornamenting, etc. of an article. These are the ambit of which workshop activities in Technical institutions are centered on.
However, management that believes that compliance with the Act is beneficial to the set objective of her institution need to make this belief known to its management personnel to comply with the provision of the Act and make management to accept responsibility, because safety require an executive order, adherence to the order and education as to the objective of the order.

On the other hand, there are safety policies that guide work places; hence, a policy can be seen as a deliberate plan of action that guide future decisions (Wikipedia Encyclopedia, 2010). Policies are not strange to establishments, as there are usually recruitment policy, administrative policy, financial policy, admission policy etc. In the like manner, there should be safety policy for organization.

A safety policy is management expression of direction to be followed on safety related issues: This expression of direction must be in writing and should be given wide circulation and publicity to reach everyone. This is to ensure that there is no confusion concerning direction and assignment of responsibility. In addition it is necessary to keep the context of this document under review, revise and re-issue as often as it is necessary in the light of changes in the safety philosophy of such an institution policy statement. This policy should therefore be signed by the Chief Executive officer of such an institution.

Grimaldi and Simonds (2004), asserted that having laid down a safety policy, the responsibility for implementation rest on the Chief Executive who report to the Board of Director or Board of Governing Council. The significance of safety is a contribution to mission achievement as well as a reflection of an effective administration of a Technical institution, because where hazards are inherent, the Chief Executive is accountable for bad record of incidence, if one eventually occurs that lead to fatality or litigation.

Finally, the factory Act imposes responsibilities on the management, staff/students of Technical institutions for effective compliance of safety regulations. Management has the duty to provide safe place of work and training for its staff and students, staff and students has the responsibility to use equipment and facilities provided in the manner in which they are required to be used, maintain and not damage them. Chief Executive has the responsibility of signing safety policies, which they are expected to have the will to adhere strictly to, and provide the necessary resources to support and enforce their implementation.
To this end, this study is designed to investigate the commitment of management personnel towards the implementation of safety regulations in Technical Institution workshops.

**Statement of the Problem**

In all Technical Institution workshop activities, there are hazards which staff and students come in contact with during the cause of Training and work execution. However, little mistake could result into incident that could claim lives and properties. Management personnel in Technical Institutions in this regard are expected to make adequate input to show commitment to the implementation of safety regulations in their workshops. However there seems to be worry that management personnel’s in Technical institutions do not show commitment towards safety regulations in their institutions as Anyanwu (2008), asserted that most Technical Institution have no written safety policy statement that is signed by such institution chief executive to act as a guide to ensure safety compliance or any proof of commitment by management personnel towards the implementation of safety regulations, hence safety issues in the workshop are organize haphazardly. Therefore it has become necessary to investigate the commitment of management personnel towards the implementation of safety regulations in Technical institution workshops.

**Purpose of the Study**

The major purpose of this study is to find out the commitment of management personnel towards the implementation of safety regulations in Technical institution workshops.

Specifically, the study intends to find out:

1. The extent Chief Executives of Technical institutions show commitment towards the implementation of safety Regulation in Technical institution workshops.
2. Ascertain the commitments of Heads of Department in Technical Institutions towards the implementation of safety regulations in their workshops.

**Research Questions**

1. To what extent do Chief Executives of Technical Institutions show commitment towards the implementation of safety Regulations in Technical Institution workshops?
2. What are the commitments Heads of Department make in Technical Institutions towards the implementation of safety regulations in their workshop?
Hypothesis

The following hypothesis was formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance.

\[ H_0: \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 \]

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be of immense benefit to Rectors, Principals and Heads of Department of Technical Institutions so as to show commitment as a way of responsibility towards the compliance of safety regulation in their workshops.

Scope of the Study

This study was designed to cover Rectors of Polytechnic, Principal of Petroleum Training Institute and Principals of Technical Colleges. However, Delta State Polytechnic Oghara, Ozoro and Ogwashi-uku, the Petroleum Training Institute Effurun and the six Technical Colleges in Delta State were used to determine the outcome of the study.
(SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 and Strongly Disagree (SA) = 1.

Validity of the Instrument
The instrument was subjected to both face and content validity by two Technical/Vocational Expert and one health and safety professional.

Reliability of the Instrument
To establish the reliability of the instrument, a pilot test was conducted on a sample of 15 management personnel i.e. (Chief Executives and Heads of Department) of Technical institutions outside the study sample. After two weeks interval, the same instrument was re-administered on the same group of persons. The researcher correlated the first test against the second test scores for the same group of persons using the spearman rank order correlation (r) of 0.88, which showed that the instrument was reliable.

Method of Data Collection
The instrument was administered to the respondents through personal contact by the researcher and one research assistant. Thirty (30) copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the respondent in the Ten Technical Institutions used for the study, the thirty copies were correctly filed and found useable and this represent a 100% return rate.

Method of Data Analysis
Data collected were analyzed using the mean statistical tool to answer the two research questions and the null hypothesis was tested with t-test at an alpha level of 0.05 level of significance.

The questionnaire that was arranged in a four point scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree and Strongly Disagree with nominal value of 4, 3, 2 and 1 assigned to each response categories. Based upon this, the researcher arrived at a decision rule of 2.50.

Any item statement with 2.50 and above is accepted as a factor for not committed to the implementation of safety regulations. While any factor below 2.50 will be rejected as a factor.

Result and Discussion
The results are presented based on the research questions raised and the hypothesis formulated.

Research Question 1
To what extent do Chief Executives of Technical Institutions show commitment towards the implementation of safety Regulations in Technical Institution Workshops?

Table 1:
The mean of respondent’s responses on the extent Chief Executives of Technical Institutions show commitment towards the implementation of safety Regulations in Technical Institution Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There is no provision for workshop safety in my annual institutional budget</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Heads of department do not submit safety performance report about their department to my office at all times</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My institution have no safety policy statement that is signed and display to the knowledge of staff and students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There is no provision for safe and healthy work environment for my employees and students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There is no direction of responsibility in the assignment of workshop safety Regulations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have never gone round to ensure safety practices and compliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have not employed a safety officer to ensure safety practices and compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Only front line officers we concern about safety Regulations in the workshop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Staff are not sent on regular safety Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I have never approved the purchase of personal protective equipment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand mean 2.71 Accept


Table 1 shows that the respondents accepted 8 identified item statements of the extent Chief Executives of Technical Institutions show commitment towards the implementation of safety Regulations in Technical Institution workshops. The mean response from items 1,2,3,5,6,7,8 and 9 were above 2.50 and above. Items 4 and 10 were below 2.50 therefore the respondents rejected that there is provision for safe and healthy work environment for their employees and students and that they always approve the purchase of personal protective equipment.

The table shows that item No 3 has the highest mean score of 4.00 while item No 10 has the lowest that is 2.00 respectively. The respondents were consistent in their opinion on the extent Chief Executive of Technical Institutions show commitment towards the implementation of safety regulations in Technical Institution workshops. The calculated grand mean of 2.71 met the benchmark of 2.50.
Research Question 2: What are the commitments Heads of Department make in Technical Institutions towards the implementation of safety Regulations in their workshops?

Table 2:
The means of respondent’s responses on the commitment Heads of Department make in Technical Institutions towards the implementation of safety Regulations in their workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No safety policy statement that act as a guide to staff and students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No annual departmental budget that assist to ensure safety compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>There are no records of safety statistics that is displayed in the workshop.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Safety performance report is not submitted to the chief executive at intervals.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I delegate Safety responsibility.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Safety sign and posters are not displayed on the workshop as way of enforcing compliance.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Safety issue is not a major source of concern to everybody in the department.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hazards identified in the workshop are not promptly eliminated or reduced to as low as possible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Workshop staff and students are not trained on how to carry out first aid on an accident victim.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Our workshop first aid box is not well stock</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Workshop staff and students are not trained on how to operate fire extinguishers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Safety Audit is not carried out regularly.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The provision of personal protective equipment encourages the enforcement of safety rules and practices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fire extinguishers are not checked at regular interval for effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand mean: 2.86 Accept

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 2 shows that the respondents accepted 13 identified item statements of the commitment Heads of department make in Technical Institution towards the implementation of safety regulations in their workshops. The mean response from items
11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 were above 2.50. Item No 24 was below 2.50, therefore the respondents rejected that fire extinguishers are not checked regularly for effectiveness. The table shows that item No 20 has the highest mean score of 3.60 while item No 24 has the lowest mean score respectively. The respondents were also consistent in their opinion on the commitment Heads of Department make in technical institution towards the implementation of safety regulation in their workshops. The calculated grand mean was 2.86 and this shows a consensus of the respondents.

**Table 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t-cal</th>
<th>t-crit</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Department</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2015

Table 3 present the t-test analysis of the data generated from the comparison of the mean responses on Chief executive and Heads of Department of Technical Institutions towards the implementation of safety regulation in their workshops. Results in the table shows that the calculated value of 1.34 is less than the table value of 2.04 with 28 degree of freedom at an alpha level of 0.05. So the hypothesis that states that there is no significance difference in the mean responses of the commitment of Chief Executives and Heads of Department in Technical institutions towards the implementation of safety regulation in their workshops is therefore retain. The implication of this result is that Chief executives and Heads of departments do not actually show much concern to safety regulations in their workshops.

**Discussion of Findings**

The findings of the study as regard research question one revealed that chief executives of Technical institutions show less commitment to the implementation of safety regulations in their workshops, as it was clearly shown that they don’t have a safety policy statement that guide staff and students, no safety officer to ensure safety compliance and practices. The study further revealed that only front line officers are concerned with the issues of workshop safety. This Adigo (2008) frowned at, as he asserted that Chief Executives should work
assiduously with subordinate by means of supervised to ensure full safety compliance of their organization so as to avoid ugly incidence that will cost much to management.

Findings with respect to research question two indicate that Heads of Department show less commitment to the implementation of safety regulations in Technical institution workshops, no safety signs and posters displayed in their workshop as a means of enforcing compliance, the responsibilities of safety in the workshop are always delegated etc. Adigo (2008) also asserted that it is necessary that Heads of Department should set a good example to ensure good safety practices and compliance, as this will encourage similar behaviors in their subordinate.

Finally, from the hypothesis formulated, it was found that there is no significant difference in the commitment Chief Executives and Heads of Department shown towards the implementation of safety regulations in their workshops. This indicates that these groups of management personnel are not committed to the implementation of safety in their workshops.

Conclusions

From the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made .For any safety implementation to be successful, it ought to be the concern of every stakeholder in an organization .Hence without transparent leadership and support from management personnel, no safety effort can survive. That is why the management of safety has to be seen as an essential part management personnel range of responsibilities. In this regard, Chief Executives and Heads of Department have to show total commitment to ensure the success of the implementation of safety regulations in their workshop by building a team approach and not by delegating the role of safety to workshop instructors, Technologist, etc because without transparent commitment from top management personnel no safety effort can be successful

Management personnel should be visibly committed to safety by formulating sound safety policies for their institutions and accord a high priority to safety in the planning and evaluation of their institutions activities. Chief Executives and Head of Departments should honestly take interest in minor and major incident that occur in their workshop and take steps to avoid the reoccurrence by discussing such in their academic board meetings. Management personnel down the line should be interested in safety issues as this will ensure the safety of their staff and students.
Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the findings of the study.

1. Chief Executive of Technical institutions should act as a role model to staff and students in their institutions by making safety in workshops as a core value with the aim and objective of the institution can be attained.

2. They should be a written policy statement that is sign by the Chief Executive and display to the knowledge of staff, students and visitors.

3. The office of a safety officer should be created and the person so appointed should be vast with safety laws and he should ensure safety compliance and safety practices of various departments.

4. Chief Executives should provide financial and human resources to safety implementation.

5. Heads of department should display records of safety statistics in their various workshops.

6. Safety signs and posters should be provided in workshops to act as a means of compliance.

7. Heads of department should discuss safety issues during staff and students meetings and encourage them to take active part in maintaining a safe and healthy workplace.

8. Heads of department should be able to recognize and reward staff for their safety effort and establish a system for effective safety communication.
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