



Evaluation of Health and Safety Strategic Policies in Sterling Engineering Exploration and Production Company (SEEPCO)

Emojewwe, Ochuko Collins, J. O. Ogbe
Department of Health and Safety Education,
Faculty of Education,
Delta State University, Abraka.

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated health and safety strategic policies and their implementation at Sterling Engineering Exploration and Production Company (SEEPCO). Three research questions and three hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted descriptive and ex post facto research design. The population comprised 600 SEEPCO employees across offshore and onshore locations. A sample size of 384 employees was selected through multi-stage sampling. Data were collected using three scales. These scales were validated through expert judgment and factor analysis. The reliability instruments were confirmed with Cronbach's alpha index. The values yielded were 0.57 for the Strategies for Implementation of Health and Safety Policies Scale, 0.68 for the Challenges in Health and Safety Policy Implementation Scale, and 0.62 for the Evaluation of Health and Safety Strategies Implementation Scale. Descriptive statistics (Mean and Standard Deviation) and regression were employed. All hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance. The findings showed that implementation strategies for health and safety policies significantly covered SEEPCO health and safety. Secondly, Challenges and barriers identified in implementing health and safety policies at SEEPCO are effective in ensuring policy implementation, and lastly, Evaluation of health and safety policies significantly implemented in SEEPCO. The study recommends the need to enhance the strategies for implementing health and safety policies, ensuring comprehensive coverage across SEEPCO operations.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: July, 2024

Received in revised form: September, 2024

Accepted: November, 2024

Published online: December, 2024

KEYWORDS

Challenges, Evaluation, Policies, safety
and Strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease and infirmity" (World Health Organization, WHO, '2010). Definitions vary across contexts; for example, the Occupational Health and Safety Association (OSHA, 2017) describes health as the physical and mental condition of workers, with safety focused on hazard control to manage workplace risk. Health and safety initiatives aim to enhance workplace standards, address injury trends, and offer risk mitigation strategies (OSHA). Health and safety policies provide procedures to limit workplace

incident consequences, with employers responsible for creating safe work conditions.

The petroleum industry encompassing exploration, extraction, refining, transportation, and marketing is structured into upstream (exploration and extraction), midstream (transportation and storage), and downstream (refining) sectors. A health and safety policy outlines an employer's approach to managing workplace safety, specifying roles and responsibilities, and demonstrating a commitment to a safe environment (Michael, 2015). According to Iwu (2017), such policies guide safety-related actions, though priorities vary by industry.

Corresponding author: Emojevwe, Ochuko Collins

✉ emojevweochukocollins@gmail.com

Department of Health and Safety Education, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



Effective health and safety strategies focus on "goal zero" (no fatalities or disabilities), with resource allocation to support this objective (OSHA). Workplace hazards—chemical, biological, physical, mechanical, psychological, and ergonomic affect both formal and informal sectors, with prolonged exposure increasing accident risk, productivity loss, and potentially severe injuries or fatalities. Effective health and safety policies can help reduce workplace incidents (Randy, 2016). In oil and gas, incidents like hydrocarbon leaks, fires, explosions, and chemical exposures are common, with chemicals such as sulfur and butane posing risks (OSHA) Ashtavinayak Hydrocarbon Limited (AHL) (2022) reports that poor safety practices, housekeeping, and procedures often lead to workplace accidents. Woods (2017) emphasizes that oil and gas employees need to cultivate good safety habits, follow policies, and provide feedback to enhance safety practices. Strategic safety policies target workplace safety goals and often incorporate employee input (Iwu, 2015). For policies to be effective, they must align with actual working conditions and positively impact staff performance.

Sterling Engineering Exploration and Production Company (SEEPCO), a major Nigerian oil and gas company, significantly contributes to the economy. This study examines SEEPCO's health and safety policies to identify areas for improvement. Oil and gas accidents are costly, resulting in lost work, disabilities, fatalities, and financial burdens. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010) highlighted the prevalence of injuries in private industry, underscoring the need for effective safety strategies. OSHA (2019) identifies common oil and gas accidents, such as vehicle collisions, explosions, falls, and ergonomic hazards, often due to inadequate procedures and training. Health and safety policies, including PPE use, incident reporting, and safe driving practices, reflect an organization's commitment to managing workplace safety. Iwu (2017) points out that policy effectiveness depends on management-employee collaboration, training, and continuous safety evaluations.

Over the years, work related accidents (be it fatal or non-fatal) have been reported to be on the increase globally (OSHA, 2019) as a result of poor strategic policy implementation. An estimate by the international labor organization (ILO) put it that every year, around 2.8 million workers who die either from accidents at work or work-related to poor policy implementation and estimated 1 million employees suffer from Permanent total disability (PTD) arising from lack of evaluation of work practices and policy. These losses of life and property constitute economic losses not only to employees but also to the company, community and nation, with SEEPCO operations not excluded. Sometimes, children are made orphans, women made widows and men widowers. The question is, could evaluation of health and safety strategies and enforcing safety policies improve staff welfare and increase productivity in SEEPCO?

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study is to evaluate health and safety strategic policies and implementation in SEEPCO.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study;

1. To what extent are the Strategies of health and safety policies implemented in SEEPCO?
2. What are the challenges in the implementation of health and safety policies in SEEPCO?
3. To what extent is health and safety policies evaluated in SEEPCO?

Hypotheses

1. Strategies of health and safety policies implementation do not significantly take care SEEPCO health and safety.
2. Challenges and barriers identified in the implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPCO are not effective in ensuring policy implementation
3. Evaluation of health and safety policies is not significantly implemented in SEEPCO.



LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

This study is based on Occupational Health Safety Theory (Domino Theory), proposed by Herbert William Heinrich in 1976. Heinrich's theory presented the idea that "the occurrence of an injury invariably results from a complicated sequence of factors, the last one of which being the accident itself." He noted that for every accident causing a major injury, there are many minor and non-injury incidents, and by addressing common root causes, injury-causing accidents can be prevented.

Relevance of the Theory to the Study

Employers have a responsibility to ensure a safe working environment for employees (OSHA, 2017). Workplace safety requires controlling recognized hazards, meaning the workplace should offer an acceptable level of risk rather than being entirely hazard-free. Actions for a safer workplace include proper chemical storage, immediate clean-up of spills, safe stacking of items, providing protective clothing, and conducting training sessions.

Hazards in the Workplace

Exposure to biological agents, such as toxins from insects or plants, can lead to diseases like Lyme disease and coccidioidomycosis. Psychosocial hazards, including occupational burnout and stress, impact psychological well-being. Burnout symptoms include a cynical attitude, lack of motivation, poor sleep, and disillusionment (Nans, 2017).

Physical hazards involve environmental factors causing harm without direct contact, such as ergonomic strain, radiation, extreme temperatures, vibrations, and noise. Heat stress and cold exposure can lead to serious health conditions, while vibration hazards from machinery can cause Hand-Arm Vibration Syndrome (HAVS). Excessive noise exposure is linked to occupational hearing loss, the most common illness in manufacturing (CDC, 2022). NIOSH recommends an exposure limit of 85 dB (A) for an 8-hour TWA and promotes the Buy Quiet program to reduce noise levels in the workplace

(NIOSH, 2022). OSHA's Hearing Conservation Program requires noise testing and protective devices (OSHA, 2017).

Health and Safety Policies

Health and safety policies outline how organizations manage workplace safety (IOSH, 2020). Implementation requires collaboration between managers and employees to clarify roles and ensure adherence to safety plans (Iwu, 2017). Health and safety managers are essential to enforce policies, conduct training, and provide policy updates. Training programs, including monthly refreshers and new employee inductions, help reinforce safe work practices and highlight policy consequences (Johnson, 2018). Compliance with policies should be emphasized, with penalties for non-compliance (Iwu, 2017).

Challenges in Implementing Health and Safety Policies

Policy implementation often faces a gap between planning and practice. There are two main approaches:

1. Top-down Approach: Policies are set by top management and communicated to subordinate levels for implementation. Effective policy implementation requires clear objectives, adequate causal theory, a compliance-focused implementation process, skilled officials, interest group support, sufficient resources, and good coordination (Buse et al., 2015).
2. Bottom-up Approach: Recognizes the role of individuals at subordinate levels who may reshape objectives and methods during implementation. Policy change may occur during the implementation process.

Challenges in policy implementation include inadequate resources, theoretical policies disconnected from practical challenges, indirect cause-effect relationships, dependency relationships, and lack of consensus on objectives, incomplete sequencing of tasks, imperfect communication, and limited authority to enforce compliance (Michael, 2021).

According to Michael, 2021 challenges in implementing health and safety policies include



1. Lack of adequate time and sufficient resources for health and safety policies to be effectively implemented
2. The required combination of resources is not available
3. The health and safety policy to be implemented is theoretical and does not address work challenges
4. The relationship between cause of health and safety policies and effect is indirect and there are multiple intervening links
5. Dependency relationships are multiple
6. Poor understanding of, and disagreement on, health and safety policies objectives
7. Health and safety policy implementation tasks are not fully specified in correct sequence
8. There is imperfect communication and coordination

Evaluation of Health and Safety Policies

An established safety program should undergo initial and periodic evaluations to ensure effective implementation (OSHA, 2018). Employers should assess progress, identify areas for improvement, and adjust the program as necessary. Program evaluation involves setting and tracking goals, using both lagging and leading indicators to measure performance, and ensuring workers' participation in the evaluation process. A single worker expressing a favourable opinion about program participation would serve as a qualitative indicator (Martins, 2016).

Action item: Verify program implementation and operation

Employers need to evaluate the program initially and at least annually to ensure it operates as intended, controls identified hazards, and progresses toward established safety and health goals. The evaluation's scope and frequency vary based on standards, program complexity, and hazard types (OSHA, 2018).

To verify program implementation, involve workers in all aspects of program evaluation. This includes reviewing information (such as incident reports), tracking performance

indicators, and identifying improvement opportunities. Key processes to verify include:

1. Reporting of injuries, illnesses, incidents, and hazards
2. Conducting workplace inspections and incident investigations
3. Tracking hazard control progress and ensuring effectiveness
4. Collecting and reporting data to monitor progress and performance
5. Review compliance audit results to confirm program shortcomings are being identified and addressed.

Action item: Correcting shortcomings and identifying improvement opportunities. When issues arise within any part of the safety and health program, employers, supervisors, managers, and workers should take prompt corrective actions to prevent recurrence. This involves:

1. Identifying and addressing program shortcomings
2. Seeking input from stakeholders to improve the program
3. Assessing if changes in equipment, facilities, or practices require program adjustments
4. Evaluating the relevance of performance indicators and goals and updating them to enhance workplace safety and health (OSHA, 2018).

Program evaluation frequency depends on program scope, complexity, maturity, and hazard type. Evaluations should occur periodically (at least annually) or be triggered by changes in processes, equipment, or incidents like serious injury or property damage (OSHA, 2022).

REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES

Okafor (2016) conducted research on the evaluation of health and safety policy in the public service in Ogun State. The study aimed to determine the role of personnel in the evaluation of health and safety policies. A survey design was used, with a sample of 100 employees from five



public offices in five local government areas. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using SPSS. Findings indicated that lower and middle-ranked employees were not consulted during the development and evaluation of health and safety policies. It was recommended that these employees be trained on workplace health and safety policies and be involved in policy development and evaluation processes. Famous (2019) examined accident rates, safety performance, and compliance in three sectors of Nigeria's oil and gas industry (indigenous, national, and international). The study involved 474 oil and gas employees and 96 staff from the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR). With a response rate of 81.43%, data were analyzed descriptively and using Kendall's coefficient of concordance. Results showed that indigenous companies had lower safety standards, awareness (44%), and compliance (47%) compared to DPR standards and experienced higher accident rates. National companies exhibited average safety standards, awareness (56%), compliance (53%), and lower accident rates. Osobga (2018) assessed workers' perceptions of occupational safety measures at the Warri Refining and Petrochemical Company (WRPC) in Delta State, Nigeria. A cross-sectional study design was used with a sample of 236 workers across different job cadres. Data collected via questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS with significance set at $P < 0.05$. Findings showed that over 50% of respondents acknowledged the effective implementation of safety measures, with 92.8% and 94.9% agreeing that these measures and safety training had improved individual and organizational performance. The study found significant associations between job cadre and perceived effects of occupational safety on performance and labor turnover ($P < 0.001$). Abanum et al. (2021) evaluated compliance with Safety Rules and Procedures (SRPs) among frontline oil and gas workers in Delta State, Nigeria. A descriptive cross-sectional design was used, sampling 317 workers from oil and gas companies. The study found a compliance rate of 91.5% with the International Association of Oil and Gas

Producers' Life Saving Rules (LSRs), with non-compliance driven by factors such as a rush to complete tasks, poor work attitudes, and lack of adequate supervision and personal protective equipment. Recommendations included enhanced safety programs to improve awareness and compliance. Yu Han et al. (2020) conducted a study on safety perceptions among construction site workers in Beijing, China, using the psychometric paradigm model. Eight hazard scenes were shown to 155 employees to assess perceptions based on risk occurrence, severity, and visibility. The study aimed to determine the influence of human factors and psychological effects on safety behaviors, impacting overall safety performance.

To the best knowledge of the researcher, no study has been carried out on evaluation of health and safety strategic policies implementation in SEEPCO. This is a gap created in literature, which this study attempt to fill.

RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

This study adopted ex-post facto research design and a descriptive method. The population of the study consist of 600 employees of SEEPCO onshore and offshore. The sample size of 384 staff was used in this study. Proportionate sampling technique were employed. The instrument for this study was a questionnaire. The questionnaire was comprising of two sections, Section A and Section B. Section A contained Demographic variables of the respondent such as place of work and educational qualification, while the section B comprised of three sections made up of B1 strategies of health and safety policies implementation, B2 Challenges in implementation of health and safety policies, and B3 Evaluation of Health and Safety Policies. Each of this scale is made up of five items describing the variables under investigation. Four point format were used in scoring the items such as strongly agreed (SA) =4, Agree =3 (A) Disagreed (D) =2 and strongly Disagreed (SD) =1. The instrument was subjected to face and content validity. To obtain the reliability of the instrument, 30 copies of the questionnaire were administered to staffs of Geo services, a similar company in Bayelsa State. Data obtained

Corresponding author: Emojewwe, Ochuko Collins

✉ emojewweochukocollins@gmail.com

Department of Health and Safety Education, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved

were subjected to Cranach Alpha reliability index. The coefficient obtained were: 0.57 for Strategies for Implementation of Health and Safety Policies Scale, 0.68 for challenges in the implementation of health and safety policies in SEEPCO Scale, and 0.62 for Evaluation of Health and Safety Strategies Implementation Scale. The evidence of above values showed that the instrument have good measure of internal consistency. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher with the help of four research assistants. Descriptive Statistics

(Mean and Standard Deviation) was employed to analyse the research questions while regression analysis was employed to test the stated hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. All hypotheses were subjected analysis using SPSS 23. Version.

RESULTS

Research Question 1: To what extent is the Strategies of health and safety policies implemented in SEEPCO?

Table 1: The mean (X) responses on of Strategies of health and safety policies implemented in SEEPCO

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	X	Decision
1.	Employees have representative in45 committee for health and safety in SEEPCO.	45 (15.0%)	96 (32.0%)	87 (29.0%)	14 (24.0%)	2.50	Accepted
2.	Representative of employees was consulted in drafting health and of SEEPCO safety policies and had input in SEEPCO.	180 (29.0%)	288 (39.0%)	174 (17.5%)	14 (14.7%)	2.82	Accepted
3.	Employee representatives and committees have a clear role that will assist to execute the health and safety policies in SEEPCO.	87 (12.3%)	117 (13.3%)	52 (47.3%)	44 (27.0%)	2.11	Rejected
4.	Employees and managers are trained on health and safety policies in SEEPCO.	37 (12.3%)	40 (13.3%)	142 (47.3%)	81 (27.0%)	2.95	Accepted
5.	There is Sensitization program for managers, employees and other stakeholders regarding the compulsory following of safety policies, and there is consequences management for Non-compliance of the policies in SEEPCO.	108 (36.0%)	116 (38.7%)	30 (10.0%)	46 (15.3%)	2.51	Accepted
Grand Total		432	348	60	46	2.58	Accepted

Table 1 reveals that the mean (X) responses of research question 1 to items 1 – 5 were 2.50, 2.82, 2.11, 2.95, and 2.51 respectively. The mean (X) grand total was 2.58 which is accepted. This shows that the Strategies of health

and safety policies in SEEPCO is implemented to a great extent.

Research question 2: What are the challenges in the implementation of health and safety policies in SEEPCO?

Table 2: The mean (X) responses on challenges in the implementation of health and safety policies in SEEPCO

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	X	Decision
1.	Employees are trained on health and safety polices in SEEPCO	50 (16.7%)	123 (41.0%)	58 (19.3%)	69 (23.0%)	2.51	Accepted
2.	Employees are informed on changes and review to health and safety	200 (18.7%)	369 (20.7%)	116 (31.0%)	69 (29.7%)	2.28	rejected

Corresponding author: Emojewwe, Ochuko Collins

✉ emojewweochukocollins@gmail.com

Department of Health and Safety Education, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



polices in SEEPCO.	224	186	186	89		
3. There are communication process and procedure to employees when new health and safety policies are introduced or reviewed in SEEPCO	72 (24.0%)	67 (22.3%)	92 (30.7%)	69 (23.0%)	2.47	Rejected
4. There are incentives for employees following health and safety policies in SEEPCO	75 (25.0%)	53 (17.7%)	62 (20.7%)	110 (36.7%)	2.31	Rejected
5. There are consequences for not following health and safety polices in SEEPCO .	84 (28.0%)	103 (34.3%)	26 (16.0%)	65 (21.7%)	2.69	Accepted
Grand Total	336	309	52	65	2.45	Rejected

Table 2 reveals that the mean (\bar{X}) responses of research question 2 to items 1 – 5 were 2.51, 2.28, 2.47, 2.31, and 2.69 respectively. The mean (\bar{X}) grand total of 2.45 was rejected. This shows that there is challenges in the

implementation of health and safety policies in SEEPCO.

Research question 3: To what extent is health and safety policies evaluated in SEEPCO?

Table 3: The mean (\bar{X}) responses on health and safety policies evaluated in SEEPCO

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	\bar{X}	Decision
1.	Health and safety policies are evaluated in SEEPCO.	96 (32.0%)	106 (35.3%)	55 (18.3%)	43 (14.3%)	2.85	Accepted
2.	There is specific time frame for the evaluation conditions in SEEPCO	94 (31.3%)	104 (34.7%)	66 (22.0%)	35 (11.7%)	2.96	Accepted
3.	Health and safety policy reveal true working conditions in SEEPCO.	86 (28.7%)	94 (31.3%)	79 (26.3%)	41 (13.7%)	2.75	Accepted
4.	There is established method for reporting, and tracking goals and targets that indicate whether the program is making progress in SEEPCO.	81 (27.0%)	103 (34.3%)	76 (25.3%)	40 (13.3%)	2.75	Accepted
5.	There is Evaluation of the program after initial incidents and periodically thereafter to identify shortcomings and opportunities for improvement in SEEPCO.	77 (25.7%)	81 (27.0%)	104 (34.7%)	38 (12.7%)	2.66	Accepted
Grand Total		308	243	208	38	2.79	Accepted

Table 3 reveals that the mean (\bar{X}) responses of research question 3to items 1 – 5 were 2.85, 2.96, 2.75, 2.75, and 2.66 respectively. The mean (\bar{X}) grand total of 2.79 was accepted. This shows that health and safety policies evaluated in SEEPCO to a great extent.

HYPOTHESES TESTING

To test all the null hypotheses regression analyses were computed as presented in Table 4.

Corresponding author: Emojewwe, Ochuko Collins

✉ emojewweochukocollins@gmail.com

Department of Health and Safety Education, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved

Table 4: Regression Analysis of Strategies implementation in SEEPCO, Challenges IHSP SEEPCO, and Evaluation of Policies SEEPCO.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig,
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Strategies of health and safety	.33	.04	.33	6.08	.00
Challenges and barriers identified	.12	.06	.10	2.19	.03
Evaluation of health	.77	.05	.56	15.20	.00

The Multiple regression in the table 4 shows the joint analyses of Strategies implementation in SEEPCO, Challenges IHSP SEEPCO, and Evaluation of Policies SEEPCO.

Testing the hypothesis 1, t-value = 6.08, P-value = .00 ≤ alpha value of 0.05. Therefore, the hypothesis which states that, Strategies of health and safety policies implementation do not significantly cover SEEPCO health and safety for evaluation was rejected. This indicates that Strategies of health and safety policies implementation significantly cover SEEPCO health and safety for evaluation.

Testing the hypothesis 2 which states that, states that, Challenges and barriers identified in the implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPCO are not effective in ensuring policy implementation was rejected. This is because t-value = 2.19, P-value = .03 ≤ alpha value of 0.05. This indicates that Challenges and barriers identified in the implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPCO are effective in ensuring policy implementation.

Testing the hypothesis 3 which states that, Evaluation of health and safety policies is not significantly implemented in SEEPCO for evaluation was rejected. This is because t-value = 15.20, P-value = .00 ≤ alpha value of 0.05. This indicates that Evaluation of health and safety policies significantly implemented in SEEPCO for evaluation.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Research question 1 was made up of items 1 – 5 with mean values 2.50, 2.82, 2.11, 2.95, and 2.51 respectively. The mean (\bar{X}) grand total was 2.58 which implies acceptance that the Strategies of health and safety policies in SEEPCO is implemented. In addition, the findings

from hypothesis 2 shows that Strategies of health and safety policies implementation significantly cover SEEPCO health and safety. The implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPCO involves a comprehensive set of strategies aimed at ensuring a robust framework for evaluation. These strategies likely include risk assessments, employee training programs, regular safety audits, and the integration of industry best practices. This aligns with Iwu's (2017) who found that the importance of effective implementation, highlighting that successful safety plans hinge upon meaningful consultation between managers and employees. Furthermore, Johnson (2018) found the significance of training, emphasizing key elements such as new employee induction, toolbox meetings, job safety analysis, and monthly health and safety meetings. These insights collectively underscore the critical role of a well-implemented safety plan and ongoing training initiatives in fostering a robust health and safety environment within SEEPCO. The focus on SEEPCO's health and safety suggests a commitment to maintaining high standards, potentially involving the use of advanced technologies, emergency response plans, and continuous improvement initiatives. Overall, these findings indicate a proactive approach to health and safety, emphasizing the importance of ongoing assessment and refinement within SEEPCO's operations.

Research question 2 to items 1 – 5 had the mean values of 2.51, 2.28, 2.47, 2.31, and 2.69 respectively. The mean (\bar{X}) grand total of 2.45 indicates a rejection that challenges in the implementation of health and safety policies in SEEPCO. However, the result in the hypothesis 3 reveals that Challenges and barriers identified in the implementation of health and safety policies at



SEEPKO are effective in ensuring policy implementation. The effectiveness of these challenges and barriers in ensuring policy implementation emphasises the importance of addressing them comprehensively. This finding agrees with Flippo, (2020) whose study found that the overall effectiveness of health and safety policies is crucial to develop and implement efficient strategies. This suggests that merely identifying challenges is insufficient; a proactive approach is necessary to devise and execute strategies that can overcome these hurdles and contribute to a more robust implementation framework. The implication is clear – a well-crafted strategy is pivotal for optimizing the effectiveness of health and safety policies within the organizational context of SEEPKO. The challenges and barriers in implementing health and safety policies at SEEPKO play a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of policy implementation. Insufficient training poses a significant challenge, as employees must be equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to adhere to health and safety protocols. Regular training sessions, workshops, and simulations can help bridge this gap, ensuring that employees are well-prepared to implement and follow established policies. Furthermore, the dynamic nature of the oil and gas industry demands frequent policy updates to address emerging risks and technologies. Keeping policies current and relevant requires a proactive approach, involving continuous risk assessments, stakeholder consultations, and regular reviews to align with regulatory changes. Overcoming challenges and barriers in the implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPKO involves addressing employee resistance through effective communication, providing comprehensive training, and maintaining policy relevance through regular updates. These efforts collectively contribute to a safer work environment and enhance the overall effectiveness of health and safety policy implementation.

Research question 3 to items 1 – 5 had the mean values of 2.85, 2.96, 2.75, 2.75, and 2.66 respectively. The mean (\bar{X}) grand total of 2.79 shows acceptance that health and safety

policies are evaluated in SEEPKO. While the findings from hypothesis 7 indicate that Evaluation of health and safety policies is significantly implemented in SEEPKO. This aligns with established practices, as highlighted by Mikel (2018), emphasizing the importance of evaluating safety and health programs to ensure proper implementation. The recognition of this process as a crucial step reflects SEEPKO's commitment to maintaining a robust safety framework. Osobga's (2018) study contributes valuable insights by affirming the positive impact of occupational safety measures on both workers and organizational performance. This correlation underscores the multifaceted benefits that can result from a well-implemented safety program. By acknowledging and incorporating these findings, SEEPKO not only adheres to industry standards but also stands to enhance overall workplace well-being and efficiency. The implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPKO is a crucial aspect of their operational framework. The evaluation process plays a pivotal role in ensuring that these policies are not only in place but also effective in safeguarding the well-being of employees and the surrounding environment. A comprehensive assessment likely involves regular audits, risk assessments, and feedback mechanisms to identify areas of improvement and compliance. The emphasis on health and safety underscores SEEPKO's commitment to fostering a secure working environment, reducing accidents, and mitigating potential hazards. This proactive approach aligns with industry standards and regulatory requirements, showcasing SEEPKO's dedication to not only meeting but exceeding safety expectations.

The evaluation process may encompass various elements, such as the adequacy of safety training, the functionality of safety equipment, adherence to protocols, and emergency response preparedness. Continuous monitoring and adjustment of policies based on evolving circumstances and lessons learned from incidents contribute to a dynamic and resilient safety framework. By prioritizing the evaluation of health and safety policies, SEEPKO not only ensures compliance with legal standards but also



fosters a culture of responsibility and accountability among its workforce. This commitment to safety not only protects employees but also contributes to the company's reputation as a socially responsible and sustainable entity.

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that strategies of health and safety policies implementation cover SEEPCO health and safety for evaluation. Challenges and barriers identified in the implementation of health and safety policies at SEEPCO are effective in ensuring policy implementation and evaluation of health and safety policies is implemented in SEEPCO.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made:

1. There is need to enhancing the strategies for implementing health and safety policies, ensuring comprehensive coverage across SEEPCO operations.
2. The company should address the challenges and barriers identified in the implementation of health and safety policies to improve overall effectiveness.
3. The company should ensure thorough evaluation practices of health and safety policies within SEEPCO to maintain a proactive approach.

REFERENCES

- Iwu, R. (2017). *Influence of occupational hazards on employees' job performance in the housekeeping department of budget hotels in Kaduna metropolis, Nigeria*. A research thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Master of Science in Hospitality Management in the School of Hospitality and Tourism, Kenyatta University.
- Lamontagne, S., Gagnon, E., Allaire, D. D., & Noreau, R. (2015). Occupational stress in the service sector: A new dimension. *Labour, Employment and Work in New Zealand*, 428–437.
- Lewis, F. S. (2018). *Effects of safety and health training on accidents/injuries' reduction among workers of chemical processing factories in Nairobi, Kenya*. A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Public Health in the School of Health Science, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Liliadrie, S. (2020). Retrieved 2015, from <http://Ezproxy.Library.Uni.Edu/Log?Direct=Aph&An=52286417&Site=Ehost-Live>.
- Meyers, J. (2018). *Assessing occupational safety and health training*. Columbia Park Way: DHHS (NIOSH) Publication.
- Occupational Health & Safety Administration (OSHA). (2017). Oil and gas exploration. Retrieved May 25, 2022, from <https://www.osha.gov/oil-and-gas-extraction/hazards/>.
- Occupational Health & Safety Administration (OSHA). (2019). Oil and gas exploration. Retrieved May 25, 2022, from <https://www.osha.gov/oil-and-gas-extraction/hazards/>.
- Ofoegbu, E. O., & Olawepo, T. G. (2015). Effects of occupational hazards on employees' productivity. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(3), 10–22.
- Okereke, C. I. (2010). Staff welfare and productivity in Patani Local Government Council, Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, 2(12), 313–320.
- Okojie, O. (2020). Compliance with occupational safety and health in Nigeria regulations. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 4, 33–44.
- Woods, B. (2017). Hand and power tools safety. World Health Organization. (2010). *Health impact of psychosocial hazards at work: An overview*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Corresponding author: Emojevwe, Ochuko Collins

✉ emojevweochukocollins@gmail.com

Department of Health and Safety Education, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved