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ABSTRACT

More than 2.3 million people in this world die every year because of fatal occupational accidents or work-related diseases. In Malaysia, there are about 50 thousand accidents reported every year and more than 12,000 people suffer from permanent disability and 1,200 people are killed in these accidents every year. Managing risks in an integrated way with the organization’s operations has become increasingly important in recent years in order to prevent accidents and the firm’s productivity, economic and financial results. Although the employer is responsible for the safety of his workers, the participation of workers is indispensable. One type of behavior that can have an effect on safety performance is safety compliance and adherence to organizational rules, regulations and procedures. This study attempts to determine the predictors of safety compliance in a multinational textile manufacturing organization located in Penang, Malaysia. This survey used questionnaire concerning the predictors of safety compliance in Penfabric Mill 4. A random sample of 243 was selected from the total workforce of 517 from 9 sections of the production. Data analyzed from this study revealed that Management Commitment, Workers’ Participation, Safety Training, Safety Communication and Feedback, Safety Rules and Procedures and Safety Promotional Policies are factors that have significant correlation with Safety Compliance. Management Commitment, Safety Rules and Procedures and Safety Promotional Policies have significant influence towards the Safety Compliance. Safety Training, Safety Communication and Feedback and Workers’ Participation do not have significant influence on Safety Compliance in this organization even though they have a significant correlation.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the study

Safety Compliance is a behavior that can affect the performance of safety record in an organization. It is the employees’ adherence to the rules, regulations and procedures set by their organization, even when not monitored by their employer (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Safety compliance is related to safety climate and also defined as a behavior of following the rules in main safety activities in the organization (Griffin & Neal, 2000). Mearns et al. (2001, 2003) found that accidents at individual level and also workplace level are significantly associated with non-compliance or safety violations.

Every year, the number of people who lose their life due to occupational accidents and diseases related to their work amounts to almost 2.3 million people. This amount comes to about 7,000 people who die every day due to occupational related causes and more than 960,000 workers get injured everyday at work places (Hamalainen, Saarela & Takala, 2009). In Malaysia, there are about 50 thousand accidents reported every year. More than 12,000 people suffer from permanent disability and 1200 people are killed in these accidents (PERKESO, 2011). In recent years, integration between risks management and the organization’s operations is becoming important. This integration reduces the accident and at the same time improves the company’s productivity and profitability (O’Toole, 2002). The responsibility of accident prevention solely belongs to the employer (Blair & Geller, 2000). Walters (2000) and Versen (1983) have asserted that the cooperation between employers and workers is very important and indispensable even though the
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