

Workplace Safety and Health Policies as Predictors of Employee Well-Being, Empowerment, and Work Performance in Nigeria's National Assembly

Rashidat Mopelola Yakub and Vitalis Ukoji Ukoji*

Department of Sociology, Institute of Governance and Development Studies, Federal University Lokoja,
Kogi State, Nigeria.

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100801135>

Received: 11 September 2026; Accepted: 16 September 2026; Published: 25 September 2026

ABSTRACT

Workplace safety and health (WSH) policy is often described as something that shapes how employees feel and perform, not just whether they get hurt at work, but this claim has rarely been tested inside Nigeria's legislative institutions. This study examined whether perceived WSH policy implementation predicts employee well-being, empowerment, and work performance among staff of Nigeria's National Assembly, and how employees themselves describe this relationship. A cross-sectional mixed-methods design was used: a structured questionnaire was completed by 332 permanent staff (93.26% response rate from 356 administered), and 14 key informants were interviewed. Data were analysed using Pearson correlation, simple linear regression, one-way ANOVA, and thematic analysis. Perceived safety policy implementation was significantly and positively correlated with well-being ($r = .62$, $p < .01$), work performance ($r = .51$, $p < .01$), and empowerment ($r = .48$, $p < .01$). Regression analysis, with safety policy perception entered as the sole predictor in each model, showed that safety policy perception significantly predicted well-being ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .38$), work performance ($\beta = 0.49$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .32$), and empowerment ($\beta = 0.46$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .29$), with outcomes differing significantly by job category ($p < .05$), senior management reporting the most favourable outcomes across all three. Interviews linked safe, supportive conditions to concentration, motivation, and emotional steadiness, and linked gaps in safety provision to anxiety and lower output. Given the cross-sectional, single-predictor design, these findings describe statistical association rather than demonstrated causal effect. Overall, WSH policy is associated with better employee outcomes, an association that appears limited by how unevenly the policy is actually carried out across the institution, and that future longitudinal, covariate-adjusted research should test more directly.

Keywords: workplace safety and health, employee well-being, employee empowerment, work performance, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Organisations increasingly treat workplace safety and health (WSH) as something that shapes how employees function and perform, not only as a matter of preventing accidents (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; ILO, 2022). That shift matters because it changes what counts as evidence that a policy is working. A WSH policy that exists mainly on paper, or is only partly carried out, cannot be assumed to deliver the well-being, empowerment, or performance gains that theory says it should. Whether WSH policy actually predicts these outcomes, and how strongly, is a question that has to be tested in specific settings rather than assumed from good intentions.

Nigeria is a useful place to ask this question. The country has adopted a fairly comprehensive set of OSH instruments, including the Factories Act, the Employees' Compensation Act, and the National Policy on Occupational Safety and Health (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2020), while implementation across sectors remains inconsistent (Okolie & Okoye, 2012; Umeokafor et al., 2014). Within this setting, earlier studies have

found that safe working environments raise morale and output among public sector employees (Eneh & Awolusi, 2019), and that safety compliance is linked to better performance in public organisations (Adegoke & Oyewunmi, 2020). These results fit international evidence linking strong safety climates to motivation, lower absenteeism, and organisational commitment (Clarke, 2010; Zacharatos et al., 2005), and fit the Job Demands-Resources framework, which treats safety provisions, training, and supportive supervision as resources that offset job demands and sustain performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti et al., 2001).

This evidence, however, comes almost entirely from sectors where physical hazard is visible and outcomes like accident rates or absenteeism are easy to count, construction, manufacturing, healthcare, and general public administration (Ajayi & Dosunmu, 2014; Adegoke & Oyewunmi, 2020). It says little about well-being, empowerment, and work performance measured together as psychosocial outcomes, and almost nothing about legislative institutions, where risk is mostly psychosocial rather than physical: long hours during sittings, sedentary and computer-heavy work, and pressure tied to politically sensitive, time-bound duties (ILO, 2022; WHO, 2022). Employee empowerment in particular, a concept central to social work and organisational development (Spreitzer, 1995; Zimmerman, 2000), has barely been studied as an outcome of WSH policy in Nigeria, even though there is good theoretical reason to expect that safety systems built around participation should strengthen how much control employees feel they have over their own working conditions.

No published study has tested, in one design, whether perceived WSH policy implementation predicts well-being, empowerment, and work performance together within a Nigerian legislative institution, or examined how strongly and how consistently these relationships hold across the workforce. This matters because a legislative institution's administrative staff, several thousand people handling legislative drafting, committee support, legal work, and related functions, keep a democratic institution running day to day. If WSH policy genuinely predicts how well that workforce functions, then unresolved gaps in implementation carry consequences well beyond individual welfare, reaching into institutional performance and continuity. More broadly, evidence that safety policy predicts psychosocial outcomes, not only injury rates, would support extending OSH investment into public institutions that have traditionally been treated as low risk and, for that reason, under-prioritised.

This study tests, using both statistical and qualitative evidence, whether and how strongly perceived WSH policy implementation predicts well-being, empowerment, and work performance among National Assembly staff. It draws on Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), the Strengths-Based Approach (Saleebey, 2013), and the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) to interpret how organisational safety systems connect to individual outcomes. Its contribution is threefold: it is the first empirical test of these relationships inside a Nigerian legislative institution; it treats empowerment as an outcome alongside well-being and performance rather than in isolation; and it pairs statistical prediction with employees' own accounts of how safety conditions shape their concentration, motivation, and emotional stability, offering a fuller picture of how this relationship works, not just how large it is.

The study's objective was to examine the statistical relationship between workplace safety and health policies and employee well-being, empowerment, and work performance, guided by the question: How are workplace safety and health policies associated with employee well-being, empowerment, and work performance in the National Assembly? Specifically, it tested whether perceptions of WSH policy implementation were significantly associated with, and statistically predictive of, each outcome, and whether these relationships varied across job categories.

Conceptual Background

Workplace safety and health have increasingly become a strategic organisational priority because of their association with employees' physical, psychological and social well-being, as well as organisational effectiveness. Traditionally, workplace safety focused primarily on preventing occupational injuries and ensuring compliance with statutory regulations. However, contemporary perspectives recognise workplace safety and health as a comprehensive organisational system that integrates hazard prevention, occupational health services, employee participation, mental health support, emergency preparedness and continuous improvement of working conditions (ILO, 2022; WHO, 2022). This broader approach reflects the growing

recognition that healthy workplaces are associated with sustained employee well-being and enhanced organisational performance.

Workplace safety and health policies refer to the formal rules, procedures and organisational practices established to protect employees from occupational hazards while promoting healthy and supportive working environments. Effective workplace safety policies encompass regular safety training, risk assessment, provision of personal protective equipment where required, occupational health services, emergency response

mechanisms, and employee involvement in workplace safety management (ILO, 2022; WHO, 2022). Beyond regulatory compliance, these policies contribute to building a positive safety culture in which employees perceive management as committed to their welfare and well-being. Organisations that implement comprehensive workplace safety policies have been associated with lower rates of occupational injuries, reduced absenteeism, improved employee morale and stronger organisational commitment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Nielsen et al., 2017).

Employee well-being is a multidimensional concept that extends beyond the absence of illness or workplace injury to include employees' physical health, psychological resilience, emotional stability, social functioning and overall quality of working life (Grant et al., 2007; Dodge et al., 2012). Within organisational settings, employee well-being reflects employees' ability to perform their responsibilities effectively while maintaining positive mental and physical health. Contemporary social work perspectives emphasise that supportive organisational environments, meaningful employee participation, access to occupational health services and positive workplace relationships are associated with employee well-being (Saleebey, 2013). Consequently, organisations that invest in workplace safety and employee well-being tend to report improved work engagement, higher productivity, stronger organisational commitment and enhanced institutional effectiveness (Schaufeli, 2017; Nielsen et al., 2017).

The relationship between workplace safety and health policies and employee well-being has received increasing scholarly attention over the past two decades. Empirical evidence consistently shows that organisations with effective workplace safety systems report more favourable employee outcomes than those with weak or poorly implemented safety practices. Christian et al. (2009) reported that positive workplace safety climates are associated with improved employee safety behaviour and organisational outcomes. Similarly, Nielsen et al. (2017) found that workplace resources, including effective safety policies and supportive leadership, are associated with employee well-being and work performance. Bakker and Demerouti (2017) further argued that workplace safety and health policies function as important organisational resources that reduce occupational stress, enhance work engagement and promote employee well-being through the mechanisms proposed by the Job Demands-Resources Model. These findings collectively suggest that workplace safety and health policies are associated not only with the prevention of occupational hazards but also with healthier, more resilient and more productive workplaces.

Although substantial progress has been made in workplace safety research, most empirical studies have focused on industrial, manufacturing, healthcare and construction sectors where occupational hazards are more visible. Comparatively limited attention has been devoted to legislative institutions despite the complex organisational environments in which employees operate. Staff of the National Assembly perform legislative, administrative, research and technical functions under demanding work schedules, high workloads and evolving institutional responsibilities. Despite these workplace realities, empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of workplace safety and health policies within legislative institutions remains limited, particularly in developing countries. This gap underscores the need for the present study, which evaluates the association between workplace safety and health policies and employee well-being in Nigeria's National Assembly from a social work perspective.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Strengths-Based Approach (SBA), Ecological Systems Theory (EST) and the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model. Rather than offering three parallel explanations of the same result, each theory is used here to do a distinct piece of explanatory work, and the three are applied at different points

in the analysis below rather than treated as interchangeable.

Ecological Systems Theory, proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1979), explains that human behaviour and well-being are shaped by interactions within multiple environmental systems. Applied to workplace safety, the theory suggests that employee well-being is influenced by relationships between employees, supervisors, organisational policies, institutional culture and broader occupational safety regulations. In this study, Ecological Systems Theory is used at the broadest level: it provides the rationale for examining WSH policy as an organisational-level phenomenon in the first place, and for expecting that a single organisational-level factor could be associated with several individual outcomes, well-being, empowerment, and performance, at once, rather than with only one of them in isolation. Within the National Assembly, employees' experiences of workplace safety are shaped not only by individual behaviour but also by leadership commitment, organisational support, resource allocation and institutional governance (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, developed by Demerouti et al. (2001) and further refined by Bakker and Demerouti (2017), holds that employee well-being depends on the balance between job demands and organisational resources. Workplace safety and health policies constitute organisational resources because they provide employees with occupational health services, safety training, supportive leadership, hazard prevention mechanisms and opportunities for participation in workplace safety management. In this study, the JD-R Model supplies the specific mechanism used to interpret the well-being and performance findings: safety provisions are treated as a resource that offsets the demands of legislative administrative work, workload, procedural intensity, political pressure, and this is the theoretical basis for expecting, and for interpreting, the statistical associations between safety policy perception and both well-being and performance reported below (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

The Strengths-Based Approach, developed by Saleebey (1996, 2013), emphasises recognising and building upon individuals' existing strengths, capabilities and resources rather than focusing solely on problems or deficits. Within workplace settings, the approach suggests that employees are active contributors to organisational safety when they are given genuine opportunities for participation, continuous learning and supportive leadership. In this study, the Strengths-Based Approach is used at a narrower, more diagnostic level than the other two theories: it is applied specifically to interpret the empowerment findings, where it frames employees' capacity and willingness to participate in safety decisions as a resource that institutional structures, working committees, feedback channels, can either activate or leave underused. From this perspective, workplace safety is a collaborative process that can strengthen resilience, participation and organisational commitment when employees' existing capacities are given a structure through which to operate (Saleebey, 1996, 2013).

Read together, the three perspectives are complementary rather than overlapping accounts of the same finding. Ecological Systems Theory motivates treating WSH policy as an organisational-level variable capable of shaping multiple outcomes at once; the JD-R Model supplies the mechanism for the well-being and performance associations; and the Strengths-Based Approach supplies the interpretive lens for the empowerment association specifically. This integrated framework provides the theoretical foundation for examining the association between WSH policies and employee well-being, empowerment, and work performance in Nigeria's National Assembly, and each theory's specific contribution is returned to in the Discussion once the findings themselves have been presented.

METHODS

Research Design

A cross-sectional mixed-methods survey design was used, combining a structured questionnaire with semi-structured key informant interviews. The design allowed workplace safety policy perceptions and the three outcome variables, well-being, empowerment, and work performance, to be measured simultaneously in a large, organisationally diverse workforce and analysed using correlational and regression techniques (Creswell & Creswell, 2023), while the interview component allowed the statistical relationships to be examined against employees' own accounts of how safety conditions shape their daily functioning.

Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at the National Assembly of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja, whose National Assembly Service employs several thousand permanent staff supporting the legislative process across directorates including legislative, administrative, security, medical, and estate and works units. The target population comprised 3,195 permanent employees. Using the Taro Yamane (1967) formula at a 5% margin of error, a minimum sample of 356 was calculated, and 356 questionnaires were administered across the departments of the National Assembly Service. Of these, 332 were returned complete and usable after data cleaning, a response rate of 93.26%. This left the achieved sample 24 cases below the calculated minimum. A post hoc power analysis indicated this shortfall had no material effect on the study's ability to detect the relationships reported below: for the smallest effect observed ($R^2 = .29$, employee empowerment), statistical power at $N = 332$ exceeded .99 at $\alpha = .05$, well above the conventional .80 threshold. Respondents were selected through stratified random sampling to ensure proportional representation across directorates and job categories (senior management, middle management, junior/operational, and contract/casual staff). Fourteen key informants, one from each directorate, were purposively selected for semi-structured interviews to provide narrative accounts of how safety conditions shape their well-being, agency, and work.

Measures

Workplace safety and health policy perception was measured using a seven-item scale assessing written policy, training, equipment, health screening, enforcement, inspections, and committee activity ($\alpha = .84$). Employee well-being was measured using a five-item scale assessing physical safety, mental and emotional support, work-related stress, access to counselling, and perceived reduction in risk of illness or injury ($\alpha = .87$). Employee empowerment was measured using a five-item scale assessing involvement in safety decisions, freedom to report concerns without victimisation, training that enables self-handling of safety issues, management responsiveness, and authority to stop unsafe practices ($\alpha = .82$). Work performance was measured using a five-item scale assessing concentration, productivity, effectiveness, motivation, and absenteeism in relation to safety and health conditions ($\alpha = .85$). All scales used a 5-point Likert format ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The semi-structured interview guide elicited participants' accounts of how safety and health conditions affected their well-being, sense of empowerment, and performance.

Procedure

Questionnaires were distributed in hard copy, supplemented by an electronic version for staff unavailable during physical distribution, with a one-week completion window and a mid-week reminder. Interviews were conducted in a private office setting within the National Assembly complex, lasted 20 to 30 minutes on average, and were audio-recorded with consent and transcribed for analysis.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analysed in SPSS using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation to examine bivariate associations among safety policy perception, well-being, empowerment, and performance, simple linear regression to test whether safety policy perception statistically predicted each outcome variable, and one-way ANOVA to test for differences in outcomes across job categories. Safety policy perception was entered as the sole predictor in each regression model; demographic and occupational covariates (e.g., age, tenure, directorate) were not entered as controls, a limitation addressed below. Qualitative data were analysed thematically following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach: familiarisation with the transcripts, generation of initial codes, collation of codes into candidate themes, review of themes against the full data set, refinement and definition of each theme, and final write-up. Coding was carried out by the researcher iteratively, with codes and candidate themes revisited across successive readings of the transcripts before being finalised, with particular attention to accounts describing how safety and health conditions shaped concentration, emotional stability, agency, and productivity.

Ethical Considerations

Approval and formal permission were secured from the National Assembly Service. Participation was

voluntary and based on informed consent; no personally identifying information was collected on questionnaires, and interview participants were assigned anonymised codes (P1 to P14). Data were stored securely and used solely for research purposes, consistent with the Belmont Report principles (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research, 1979).

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analysis showed moderately positive perceptions overall, though with notable variation across constructs. Respondents rated work performance highest ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.05$), followed by employee well-being ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.12$), while employee empowerment ($M = 2.95$, $SD = 1.15$) and safety policy implementation ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 1.18$) received comparatively lower ratings (Table 1). All scales demonstrated good internal consistency.

Table 1: Mean Scores and Reliability of Major Scales (N = 332)

Scale	M	SD	Cronbach's α
Workplace Safety & Health Policies	2.88	1.18	.84
Employee Well-Being	3.15	1.12	.87
Employee Empowerment	2.95	1.15	.82
Work Performance	3.42	1.05	.85

Note. Field survey, 2025.

Correlations Among Study Variables

Pearson correlation analysis showed statistically significant positive associations among all study variables (Table 2). Safety policy perception was most strongly associated with employee well-being ($r = .62$, $p < .01$), followed by work performance ($r = .51$, $p < .01$) and empowerment ($r = .48$, $p < .01$). Well-being, empowerment, and performance were also significantly intercorrelated ($r_s = .49$ to $.58$, all $p < .01$), consistent with the theoretical expectation that these outcomes are mutually reinforcing rather than independent.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Matrix Among Study Variables (N = 332)

Variable	1. Safety Policies	2. Well-Being	3. Empowerment	4. Performance
1. Safety Policies	1.00			
2. Well-Being	.62**	1.00		
3. Empowerment	.48**	.55**	1.00	
4. Performance	.51**	.58**	.49**	1.00

Note. Field survey, 2025. ** $p < .01$.

Regression Analysis: Safety Policy Perception as a Statistical Predictor

Simple linear regression analysis, with safety policy perception entered as the sole predictor, showed that perceived safety policy implementation significantly predicted all three outcome variables (Table 3). Safety policy perception was the strongest predictor of employee well-being ($\beta = 0.58$, $p < .001$), statistically accounting for 38% of the variance ($R^2 = .38$). It was also a significant predictor of work performance ($\beta = 0.49$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .32$) and employee empowerment ($\beta = 0.46$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .29$). Across all three models, safety policy perception was a moderate-to-strong statistical predictor, with the strongest association observed

for well-being and comparatively weaker, though still substantial, associations for empowerment and performance. Because each model included safety policy perception as the only predictor, these estimates should be read as bivariate associations rather than as effects net of demographic or occupational covariates; a fuller hierarchical model incorporating such controls is identified as a direction for future research below.

Table 3: Simple Linear Regression Results: Safety Policy Perception Predicting Employee Outcomes

Outcome	β	t	p	R ²
Employee Well-Being	0.58	12.84	< .001	.38
Employee Empowerment	0.46	9.67	< .001	.29
Work Performance	0.49	10.35	< .001	.32

Note. Field survey, 2025. Safety policy perception entered as the sole predictor variable in each model; no demographic or occupational covariates were controlled.

Differences by Job Category

One-way ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences in outcomes across job categories, with senior management reporting consistently higher scores on well-being, empowerment, and performance than middle management and junior or contract staff, for example, $F(3, 328) = 9.84$, $p < .001$ for work performance. This indicates that employees' experience of WSH-related outcomes differs significantly by job category; it does not, on its own, establish that job category statistically moderates the relationship between safety policy perception and these outcomes, which would require a formal interaction test. That test was not conducted here and is noted as a limitation below.

What the Interviews Add

Interview accounts fit the statistical findings and added detail to them. Several participants linked a safe, well-supported environment directly to concentration and output: "when you feel safe and the environment is conducive, your mind is settled. You can concentrate properly and deliver your work without stress" (P9). Others described how unresolved safety concerns produced a kind of presentism, being at your desk without really working: "you may be physically present, but you are not really productive" (P3). Poor ventilation, overcrowding, and unresolved electrical faults were repeatedly linked to lower comfort and performance: "when electrical faults are not addressed on time, or when workspace is congested, it affects productivity... improving safety will definitely enhance output" (P7). On empowerment, several participants said they felt free to raise concerns but doubted this changed anything, one asking, "am I empowered?... our leaders are not even showing us anything concerning that" (P1), a comment that fits the weaker regression effect found for empowerment compared with well-being.

DISCUSSION

This study asked whether perceived WSH policy implementation statistically predicts employee well-being, empowerment, and work performance at Nigeria's National Assembly. Across all three outcomes, safety policy perception was a significant, positive predictor, though the strength of the association differed in ways worth unpacking. Because the design is cross-sectional, the associations reported here describe statistical prediction, not demonstrated causal effect; that distinction is carried through the discussion below and returned to explicitly in the Limitations.

Safety Policy and Employee Well-Being

The strongest association in the data was between safety policy perception and well-being ($\beta = 0.58$, $R^2 = .38$). This fits international evidence that strong safety climates are linked to lower stress and greater psychological stability (Clarke, 2010), and Nigerian evidence linking safe environments to better morale (Eneh & Awolusi, 2019). As set out above, the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) supplies the mechanism for this finding: safety provisions can be understood as a resource that offsets the demands,

workload, political pressure, procedural intensity, that come with legislative administrative work, so that where employees see this resource as adequate, they also report stronger well-being. That well-being showed the largest explained variance of the three outcomes suggests the association between safety policy and employees' immediate psychological experience is comparatively stronger than its association with empowerment and performance; whether this reflects a genuine sequence, safety shaping well-being which then shapes the other two, or simply a stronger direct relationship, is not something the present data can adjudicate and would need a longitudinal or mediation design to test.

Safety Policy and Employee Empowerment

Empowerment showed the weakest, though still meaningful, association ($\beta = 0.46$, $R^2 = .29$). The interviews offer one plausible interpretation. Employees often said they felt free to report safety concerns without fear of reprisal, but doubted that doing so actually changed anything. That gap, between having a voice and having influence, fits empowerment theory's distinction between participation and control as related but separate things (Spreitzer, 1995; Zimmerman, 2000). Read through the Strengths-Based Approach (Saleebey, 1996, 2013), as set out above, employees appear to have real capacity and willingness to contribute to safety decisions; what the weaker empowerment association suggests is that this capacity is not being converted into felt empowerment, plausibly because policy on its own does not confer authority, and institutional structures, working committees, clear feedback channels, appear necessary to make that conversion happen. This remains an interpretation consistent with the qualitative accounts rather than a claim the regression itself demonstrates.

Safety Policy and Work Performance

Safety policy perception also significantly predicted work performance ($\beta = 0.49$, $R^2 = .32$), and the interviews point to a plausible mechanism. Unresolved safety and comfort concerns were described as producing a kind of presentism, employees present at their desks but not really productive, which fits earlier findings that fear of accidents or ill health undermines concentration and output (Nahrgang et al., 2011). The well-being and performance associations were similar in size and strongly correlated with each other ($r = .58$), which raises the possibility that the performance association is substantially intertwined with well-being rather than fully independent of it. This is a hypothesis the present cross-sectional data are consistent with but cannot confirm; a formal mediation model testing safety policy $\rightarrow$ well-being $\rightarrow$ performance, ideally with longitudinal data establishing temporal order, would be needed to test it directly. The broader pattern also fits Ecological Systems Theory's premise that conditions at the organisational level are associated with individual functioning across several areas of experience at once (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), consistent with the theory's role, set out above, of motivating why one organisational-level factor should be examined against multiple outcomes simultaneously.

Returning to the Theoretical Framework

The pattern of findings is consistent with the distinct roles assigned to each theory in the Theoretical Framework above, rather than requiring all three to explain every result equally. Ecological Systems Theory's contribution was to justify examining WSH policy as an organisational-level variable capable of moving several outcomes together, which the correlated pattern across well-being, empowerment, and performance supports. The Job Demands-Resources Model's contribution was to explain the well-being and performance associations specifically, and these were indeed the two outcomes most strongly and most similarly predicted. The Strengths-Based Approach's contribution was to explain the comparatively weaker empowerment association, and the qualitative accounts of employees having voice without influence fit that reading. Job category differences add descriptive context to this account: senior staff were consistently better placed across all three outcomes, which is compatible with, though not a formal test of, the idea that hierarchical position affects how readily employees can convert organisational safety resources into personal outcomes.

LIMITATIONS

Several limitations should be weighed alongside these findings. First, the cross-sectional design permits statistical prediction but not a demonstration of cause: safety perceptions and outcomes were measured at the

same time, so it remains possible that more resilient or higher-performing employees simply rate safety systems more favourably, in addition to, or instead of, the reverse. Second, each regression model entered safety policy perception as the sole predictor; demographic and occupational covariates such as age, gender, tenure, directorate, and occupational risk exposure were not controlled, so the reported associations should be

read as bivariate rather than net of these factors. A hierarchical or multiple regression model incorporating such covariates is a natural next step and was beyond what the available data for this article could support. Third, the significant ANOVA differences across job categories show that outcomes vary by job category; they do not, by themselves, establish that job category statistically moderates the relationship between safety policy and outcomes, which would require a formal interaction analysis not conducted here. Fourth, reliance on self-reported perceptions raises the possibility of common-method variance inflating the observed associations, and the study used subjective ratings rather than objective indicators such as recorded incidents, absenteeism records, or supervisor-rated performance. Fifth, the achieved sample of 332 fell 24 cases short of the calculated minimum of 356, though post hoc power exceeded .99 for the smallest effect observed, suggesting this shortfall did not compromise the study's ability to detect the reported associations. Sixth, the sample was confined to permanent staff at one legislative institution, which limits how far the findings generalise. Finally, the qualitative analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six phases with coding conducted by a single researcher; the credibility of the themes would be strengthened in future work by independent coding and a formal saturation check. Longitudinal, multi-institutional research incorporating covariates, objective outcome measures, and formal mediation and moderation testing would address these limitations directly and is a clear direction for extending this study.

CONCLUSION

Workplace safety and health policy is a significant, positive statistical predictor of employee well-being, empowerment, and work performance at Nigeria's National Assembly, though its strength differs across outcomes in ways that matter practically. Its association with well-being is strongest, consistent with safety provisions functioning as a psychological resource that offsets the demands of legislative administrative work. Its association with empowerment, while real, is more limited, suggesting that policy on its own may not be sufficient to build a strong sense of agency without the participatory structures through which employees can actually exercise voice. Its association with performance is closely intertwined with well-being, consistent with, though not proof of, the idea that supported, psychologically stable employees are better placed to perform well. Because the design is cross-sectional and each model used a single predictor, these should be read as statistical associations rather than demonstrated effects; confirming direction and ruling out alternative explanations would require longitudinal data, covariate-adjusted models, and formal mediation and moderation tests. With that caveat, the findings point institutional leadership toward treating WSH policy as an investment in well-being, empowerment, and performance together, not as a compliance box to tick, with particular attention to strengthening participatory safety governance so that staff with less institutional power are not left absorbing most of the unrealised benefit.

Ethical Considerations: Approval and formal permission were secured from the National Assembly Service. Participation was voluntary and based on informed consent; no personally identifying information was collected on questionnaires, and interview participants were assigned anonymized codes (P1 to P14). Data were stored securely and used solely for research purposes, consistent with the Belmont Report principles (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research, 1979).

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Adegoke, A. O., & Oyewunmi, A. E. (2020). Occupational safety and employee performance in the Nigerian public service. *African Journal of Management Research*, 26(2), 45–58.
2. Ajayi, M. T., & Dosunmu, S. A. (2014). Evaluation of health and safety performance in the Nigerian construction industry. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences*, 5(5), 460–465.

3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
4. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
5. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
6. Christian, M. S., Bradley, J. C., Wallace, J. C., & Burke, M. J. (2009). Workplace safety: A meta-analysis of the roles of person and situation factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1103–1127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016172>
7. Clarke, S. (2010). An integrative model of safety climate: Linking psychological climate and work attitudes to individual safety outcomes using meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 83(3), 553–578. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X452122>
8. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage.
9. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
10. Dodge, R., Daly, A. P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(3), 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4>
11. Eneh, S. I., & Awolusi, O. D. (2019). Occupational health and safety practices and employee performance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research*, 1(4), 35–47.
12. Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2020). *National policy on occupational safety and health*. Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment.
13. Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being trade-offs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.26421238>
14. International Labour Organisation. (2022). *World employment and social outlook: Trends 2022*. International Labour Organization.
15. Nahrgang, J. D., Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. (2011). Safety at work: A meta-analytic investigation of the link between job demands, job resources, burnout, engagement, and safety outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 71–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021484>
16. National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioural Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
17. Nielsen, K., Nielsen, M. B., Ogbonnaya, C., Käsälä, M., Saari, E., & Isaksson, K. (2017). Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Work & Stress*, 31(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1304463>
18. Okolie, K. C., & Okoye, P. U. (2012). Assessment of national cultural dimensions and construction health and safety climate in Nigeria. *Science Journal of Environmental Engineering Research*.
19. Saleebey, D. (1996). The strengths perspective in social work practice: Extensions and cautions. *Social Work*, 41(3), 296–305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/41.3.296>
20. Saleebey, D. (2013). *The strengths perspective in social work practice* (6th ed.). Pearson.
21. Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands–Resources model: A “how to” guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organisational Dynamics*, 46(2), 120–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008>
22. Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442–1465. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256865>
23. Umeokafor, N., Isaac, D., Jones, K., & Umeadi, B. (2014). Enforcement of occupational safety and health regulations in Nigeria: An exploration. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(7).
24. World Health Organisation. (2022). *WHO guidelines on mental health at work*. World Health Organization.
25. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.

26. Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Iverson, R. D. (2005). High-performance work systems and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.77>
27. Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational and community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 43–63). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4193-6_2