

(1994) which reported significant link between workers presence to increased performance. Finding of the survey also revealed that workers' health status significantly affects work performance level. The second hypothesis tested revealed ($t = - 2.917$; $df = 181$; $p < .05$) by implication workers with low performance are often unhealthy.

This is in consonance with the opinion of Bevan (2010) which observed the relationship between employee health and employee performance and discovered that healthy employees perform better on the job. The survey also revealed that workers' absenteeism is as a result frequent hazards which affect workers performance. This is in consonance with the views of Mannan (2015), Onakoya (2016), Allen (2018) and Escorpizo (2019) which in their separate opinion linked absenteeism to workers' performance and confirms that workers' absenteeism will reduce performance level. Another major finding was on workers safety and work performance. The study discovered that unsafe act which lead to occupational accidents contribute to low workers performance. Hypothesis three affirmed that safe workers have high tendencies of performing on the job than workers who are unsafe at work.

a mean value of 48.61 while workers with high performance have a mean value of 44.92. This shows that worker's performance level is significantly determined by worker's health status.

Hypothesis 3: The t-test summary table showing workers' safety and work performance. Safety of Workers N MEAN S.D df t P Safe 94 47.53 8.77 Unsafe 89 45.44 8.41 181 1.647 <

Safety of Workers	N	MEAN	S.D	d.f	T	P
Safe	94	47.53	8.77	181	1.647	<.05
Unsafe	89	45.44	8.41			

The result shows that safe workers have high tendencies of performing on the job than workers who are unsafe at work. ($t = 1.647$; $df = 181$; $p < .05$). Workers that have sense of safety have a mean of 47.53 while workers who are unsafe at work have a mean value of 45.44. This shows that there is significant relationship the safety of workers and work performance. From the three (3) hypotheses, the framework above is affirmed, that is on the relationship between occupational hazards and workers performance elements (workers presenteeism and commitment).

4.4. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The research findings for this study indicated that occupational hazards were bad and need to be well managed in order to ensure workers' performance. The occurrence and frequency of occupational hazards reduces workers' level of performance. Result from the first hypothesis test confirmed this ($t = 5.146$; $df = 181$; $p > .05$) Workers with infrequent occupational hazards will significantly perform on the job than workers with frequent occupational hazards.

More so, it was found that low workers' performance is attributable to the absenteeism of workers. The finding shows that workers performance is significantly determined by their presence at work. This is in line with the findings of Angle & Perry (1981), Leong, Randall, & Cote (1994), and Baugh & Robert

Total	76	100
-------	----	-----

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 15 above shows that 39.5%, of the respondents strongly agree, another 39.5% agree, 10.5% disagree while 10.5% strongly disagree that occupational hazard cannot be totally eradicated.

4.3 TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

Hypothesis 1: The t-test summary table showing the frequency level of occupational hazards and workers' performance.

Index of Occupational hazards	N	MEAN	S.D	d.f	T	P
Frequent occupational hazards	100	43.71	5.34	181	5.146	<.05
Infrequent occupational hazards	83	49.89	10.49			

The result shows that frequency level of occupational hazards has a significant influence on workers' performance ($t = 5.146$; $df = 181$; $p < .05$). Workers with frequent occupational hazards have a mean value of 43.71 while workers with infrequent occupational hazards have 49.89. This shows that workers with infrequent occupational hazards will significantly be committed to their work and perform better on the job than workers with frequent occupational hazards.

Hypothesis 2: The t-test summary table showing the workers' health status on work performance level. Workers health status N MEAN S.D Df t P Healthy 104 44.92 8.86 Unhealthy 79 48.61 7.91 181 -2.917 P

Workers health status	N	MEAN	S.D	d.f	T	P
Healthy	104	44.92	8.86	181	-2.917	<.05
Unhealthy	79	48.61	7.91			

The result shows that there is a significant difference between the performance levels of healthy workers when compared to unhealthy workers. ($t = -2.917$; $df = 181$; $p < .05$). This means that workers with low performance were unhealthy while those that are healthy have high performance. Workers with low performance have

The above table explains that 52.6% of the respondent agreed say that the industry is concern about the danger while the remaining respondent disagreed.

4.2.13. Is the occupational hazard happening as a result of management negligence?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	50	65.8
No	26	34.2
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

According to the above table 83.3% of the respondent said yes that work hazard is as a result of management negligence while 16.7% disagreed with a no.

4.2.14 Physiological factors such as age, sex, working hours, experience are causes of occupational hazard’.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	25	32.9
Agree	15	19.7
Disagree	16	21.1
Strongly Disagree	20	26.3
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 14 above shows that 32.9% strongly agree, 19.7% agree, 21.1% disagree while 26.3% strongly agree that physiological factors are causes of occupational hazard. This affects productivity.

4.2.15 Occupational hazard cannot be totally eradicated.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	30	39.5
Agree	30	39.5
Disagree	8	10.5
Strongly Disagree	8	10.5

Yes	76	100
No	-	-
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 4.2.9 above shows all the sampled population of the staff of Olam's Floor Mills all agreed that organization hazard affect the productivity.

4.2.10 Is there any safety measures put in place by the organization

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	25	32.9
No	51	67.1
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 4.110 above shows that 32.9% of the respondent agreed that there are safety measures in place by the organization on case of hazard while 67.1% disagreed saying there isn't any measure in place.

4.2.11: If the above is yes, was it able to stop or minimize operational hazard?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	25	32.9
No	51	67.1
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 4.1.11 shows that 32.9% of the respondent believes that the measures minimize operational hazard while 67.1% disagreed to it.

4.2.12. Is the industry concern about the members in dangers as a result of occupational hazard?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	40	52.6
No	36	47.4
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

9years experience while 13.15% have 10years experience because the existence of the organization is not long. This indicates that the sampled population are experienced.

SECTION B: RESEARCH QUESTION

4.2.7 Have you been exposed to working hazard while working?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	40	52.6
No	36	47.4
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 4.2.6 shows that 52.6% of the staffs at Olam's Floor Mills has one or the other been exposed to working hazard, while 47.4% has not been exposed, which means that most management officials has not been exposed to hazard.

4.2.7 Did the danger faced by the workers affect their zeal to work?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	45	59.2
No	31	40.8
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 4.2.7 deduced that 59.2% of the agreed that the danger of work has reduced the zeal of workers while 40.8% disagreed that it did not affect their zeal to work.

4.2.8 Does organizational hazard affect the workers operation?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	76	100
No	-	-
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 4.2.8 above shows all the sampled population of the staff of Olam's Floor Mills all agreed that organization hazard affect the workers operation.

4.2.9 Does organizational hazard affects productivity?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
----------	-----------	------------

4.2.3 Distribution of Respondent By Education Qualification.

Qualification	No of respondents	Percentage %
'O' Level	10	13.2
NCE/OND	15	19.7
B.Sc/HND	31	40.78
Post graduate	20	26.3
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table shows that 13.2% of the respondents have 'O' level in their education level, 19.7% have NCE/OND, 40.78% have B.Sc/HND while the remaining 26.3% have post graduate qualification. This mean that all education qualification is fairly represented in the organization diversification.

4.2.4 Distribution of Respondent By Marital Status.

Status	No of respondents	Percentage %
Single	30	39.5
Married	30	39.5
Divorce	16	21
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 4 above shows that 39.5% of the respondents are single, 39.5% of the respondent are married while 21% are divorced. This indicates that there are more single than married and divorced. This implies that single than married and divorced. This implies that the population is adequate represented with.

4.2.5 Distribution of Respondent By Working Experience

Years	No of respondents	Percentage %
1-3years	45	59.2
4-5years	10	13.15
7-9years	11	14.5
10years	10	13.15
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table 5 above shows that 59.2%, of the respondents have 1-3years experience, 13.15% of the respondent have 4.5years experience, 14.5% have 7-

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of data obtained through the use of questionnaire administered to staffs and management of Olam's Floor Mills. Section 'A' focus on the background information of the respondents while section 'B' dealt with relevant questions on the research study. the chapter is divided into three sections: introduction, presentation, analysis and interpretation and discussion of findings.

4.2 DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.2.1 Distributing of respondents by Sex

Sex	No of respondents	Percentage %
Female	30	39.47
Male	46	60.53
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Comment from the above is 30 respondent representing 39.47% were female, while 46 respondents representing 60.53% of the sample where male hence there were more male in the organization due to the kind of work they do.

4.2.2 Distribution of the Respondent by Age

Age	No of respondents	Percentage %
20-30years	35	46.
36-50years	30	39.5
51 and above	11	14.5
Total	76	100

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The table above shows that 46% of the respondents are between 20-30years. 39.5%, were 36-50years while 14.5% fall between 51 and above. This indicate that the sample respondent are of the average age population. This implies that majority of the respondent were still very active contributing to the organizational development.