

RISK CONTROL ENHANCEMENT USING SAFETY CLIMATE FACTORS FOR  
HIRARC METHOD IN STEEL PRODUCT INDUSTRY

MOHAMAD FARIZ ADIPUTRA

A project report submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Engineering (Industrial Engineering)

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JUNE 2015

To my beloved mother and father

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians, and practitioners. They have contributed towards my understanding and thoughts. In particular, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my main thesis supervisor, Dr. Mohd Shuisma Mohd. Ismail, for encouragement, guidance, critics and patience. I am also very thankful to my co-supervisor Dr. Jafri Mohd. Rohani for his guidance, advices and motivation. Without their continued support and interest, this thesis would not have been the same as presented here. I also would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mat Rebi Abdul Rani for his guidance during finding my thesis topic and Dr. Ardiyansyah bin Syahrom for his support.

I am also very grateful for the company to approve me preparing this thesis based on study in the company. I am thankful for all the cooperation given to me while I was there especially from Safety, Health, and Environment Department, Mr. Farissan and Mr. Farid. I also would like to express my gratitude to fellow friends in UTM for all the troubles that I have caused them in preparing this thesis Bang Fitra, Bang Zul, Bang Cici, Kak Cica, Kak Reiza, Kak Weni, Agung, Vika, Ihda, Dwiky, Anggi, Ichsan, Rizal, Yulizar, Dhika, Fadhil, Nyomie, and many others whom I could not mention here. Without them, this thesis would not be finished. I also would like to thank my friends anywhere for their encouragement.

Lastly, I am grateful to all my family members. To my parents, brothers, sister, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins for their full support through my master's life. Without them, this thesis would be meaningless.

## **ABSTRACT**

Accident in manufacturing industry in Malaysia has been high for the last five years. The current strategy of reducing accident by detecting the hazard and do necessary action to the hazard was found to be not enough to prevent accidents in manufacturing industry. The method used for that was Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment, and Risk Control (HIRARC). Meanwhile, safety climate was developed to understand the current condition of safety in the organization. The purpose of this study was to enhance selected risk control in HIRARC method using safety climate factors. The hazards were identified using observation, interview, and analysis of the accident history. Then each hazards were assessed to get the risk score and level. A survey was conducted to get the safety climate result. The safety climate result was subject to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). From the EFA result, it was found that five factors were safety climate in steel product industry, involving management commitment and actions for safety, worker's commitment towards safety, priority for safety over production, emergency preparedness in the organization, and safeness in work environment. From analysing the factors, administrative control method was selected to enhance risk control that was already selected by incorporating techniques in administrative control parallel with other type of risk control. In conclusion, factors of safety climate could be used in enhancing the risk control method selected for HIRARC in steel product industry.

## ABSTRAK

Kemalangan dalam industri pembuatan di Malaysia telah tinggi untuk tempoh lima tahun yang lalu. Strategi semasa mengurangkan kemalangan dengan mengesan bahaya dan melakukan tindakan yang perlu untuk bahaya yang telah didapati tidak cukup untuk mencegah kemalangan dalam industri pembuatan. Kaedah yang digunakan untuk itu adalah Pengenalpastian Bahaya, Penilaian Risiko dan Kawalan Risiko (HIRARC). Sementara itu, iklim keselamatan telah dibangunkan untuk memahami keadaan semasa keselamatan dalam organisasi. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk meningkatkan kawalan risiko yang terpilih dalam kaedah HIRARC menggunakan faktor-faktor iklim keselamatan. Bahaya telah dikenal pasti dengan menggunakan teknik pemerhatian, temu bual, dan analisis sejarah kemalangan. Setiap bahaya dinilai untuk mendapatkan nilai risiko dan paras risiko. Satu kajian telah dijalankan untuk mendapatkan hasil iklim keselamatan. Hasil iklim keselamatan adalah tertakluk kepada *Exploratory Factor Analysis* (EFA). Dari keputusan EFA, didapati bahawa lima faktor adalah iklim keselamatan dalam industri produk keluli, yang melibatkan komitmen dan tindakan untuk keselamatan, komitmen pekerja terhadap keselamatan, keutamaan untuk keselamatan ke atas pengeluaran, persediaan kecemasan dalam organisasi, dan keselamatan dalam persekitaran kerja. Dari menganalisis faktor, kaedah kawalan pentadbiran telah dipilih untuk meningkatkan kawalan risiko yang telah dipilih dengan melaksanakan teknik dalam kawalan pentadbiran yang selari dengan lain-lain jenis kawalan risiko. Kesimpulannya, faktor-faktor iklim keselamatan boleh digunakan dalam meningkatkan kawalan risiko yang dipilih untuk HIRARC dalam industri produk keluli.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER  | TITLE                           | PAGE        |
|----------|---------------------------------|-------------|
|          | <b>DECLARATION</b>              | <b>ii</b>   |
|          | <b>DEDICATION</b>               | <b>iii</b>  |
|          | <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>         | <b>iv</b>   |
|          | <b>ABSTRACT</b>                 | <b>v</b>    |
|          | <b>ABSTRAK</b>                  | <b>vi</b>   |
|          | <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>        | <b>vii</b>  |
|          | <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>           | <b>xi</b>   |
|          | <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>          | <b>xiii</b> |
|          | <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>       | <b>xiv</b>  |
| <br>     |                                 |             |
| <b>1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>             | <b>1</b>    |
|          | 1.1 Overview                    | 1           |
|          | 1.2 Background of Problem       | 1           |
|          | 1.3 Problem Statement           | 3           |
|          | 1.4 Objectives                  | 3           |
|          | 1.5 Scopes                      | 4           |
|          | 1.6 Significances               | 4           |
|          | 1.7 Organization of the Thesis  | 4           |
| <br>     |                                 |             |
| <b>2</b> | <b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>        | <b>6</b>    |
|          | 2.1 Overview                    | 6           |
|          | 2.2 Accident                    | 6           |
|          | 2.2.1 Accident Causation Theory | 6           |
|          | 2.2.1.1 Domino Theory           | 7           |
|          | 2.2.1.2 Human Factors Theory    | 8           |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2.3      | Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment, and Risk Control (HIRARC) | 9         |
| 2.3.1    | Definition of HIRARC  | 9         |
| 2.3.2    | Objectives of HIRARC  | 9         |
| 2.3.3    | Steps in HIRARC   | 10        |
| 2.3.4    | Classifying Work Activities                                       | 11        |
| 2.3.5    | Hazard Identification   | 11        |
|          | 2.3.5.1 Classification of Hazard                                  | 12        |
|          | 2.3.5.2 Groups of Hazard  | 13        |
| 2.3.6    | Risk Assessment   | 13        |
| 2.3.7    | Risk Control  | 16        |
|          | 2.3.7.1 Risk Control Method                                       | 16        |
| 2.4      | Safety Climate  | 18        |
| 2.4.1    | Definition of Safety Climate                                      | 18        |
| 2.4.2    | Dimensions of Safety Climate                                      | 18        |
| 2.5      | Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) 1994                    | 20        |
| 2.5.1    | Objectives of OSHA1994  | 20        |
| 2.5.2    | Scopes of OSHA 1994   | 21        |
| 2.6      | Literatures Summary   | 21        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>                                       | <b>23</b> |
| 3.1      | Overview  | 23        |
| 3.2      | Study Design  | 23        |
| 3.3      | Data Collection   | 25        |
| 3.3.1    | Hazard Identification   | 25        |
|          | 3.3.1.1 Kiswire Group Structure                                   | 25        |
|          | 3.3.1.2 KSB Organizational Structure                              | 26        |
|          | 3.3.1.3 KSB Factory Staffing                                      | 27        |
|          | 3.3.1.4 KSB Plan Layout   | 28        |
|          | 3.3.1.5 Accident History  | 29        |
|          | 3.3.1.6 Standard Operating Procedure                              | 29        |
|          | 3.3.1.7 Observation and Interview                                 | 30        |
| 3.3.2    | Safety Climate  | 30        |

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
|          | 3.3.2.1 Population and Sampling                    | 30        |
|          | 3.3.2.2 Questionnaire Development                  | 31        |
|          | 3.3.2.3 Questionnaire Content Validation           | 32        |
|          | 3.3.2.4 Questionnaire Distribution                 | 32        |
| 3.4      | Data Analysis                                      | 33        |
|          | 3.4.1 Risk Level Assessment                        | 33        |
|          | 3.4.2 Safety Climate Scoring                       | 34        |
|          | 3.4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis                  | 34        |
|          | 3.4.4 Safety Climate Reliability Analysis          | 35        |
| 3.5      | Risk Control Selection                             | 36        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>                      | <b>37</b> |
|          | 4.1 Overview                                       | 37        |
|          | 4.2 Accident Analysis                              | 37        |
|          | 4.2.1 Accident Based on Injury and LTI             | 39        |
|          | 4.2.2 Accident Based on Year of Experience         | 40        |
|          | 4.2.3 Accident Based on Department                 | 41        |
|          | 4.3 Hazards Identified                             | 42        |
|          | 4.3.1 Drawing Hazards                              | 43        |
|          | 4.3.2 Stranding Hazards                            | 45        |
|          | 4.3.3 Closing Hazards                              | 47        |
|          | 4.4 Risk Assessment Result                         | 50        |
|          | 4.5 Risk Control                                   | 53        |
|          | 4.5.1 Safety Climate Survey Result                 | 53        |
|          | 4.5.1.1 Respondent's Demographic                   | 54        |
|          | 4.5.1.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)          | 56        |
|          | 4.5.1.3 Reliability Test                           | 57        |
|          | 4.5.1.4 Safety Climate Factors                     | 58        |
|          | 4.5.2 Risk Control Selection                       | 62        |
|          | 4.5.2.1 High Risk Hazard Analysis                  | 62        |
|          | 4.5.2.2 Selecting and Implementing<br>Risk Control | 64        |
|          | 4.5.2.3 Enhancing Risk Control Selected            | 65        |



|          |  |              |
|----------|--|--------------|
| <b>5</b> | <b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> | <b>67</b>    |
| 5.1      | Overview                               | 67           |
| 5.2      | Conclusions                            | 67           |
| 5.3      | Limitations of the Study               | 68           |
| 5.4      | Recommendations                        | 68           |
| 5.4      | Recommendations                        | 67           |
|          | <b>REFERENCES</b>                      | <b>69</b>    |
|          | <b>Appendices A-C</b>                  | <b>74-94</b> |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <b>TABLE NO.</b> | <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|------------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1              | Example of classification of hazards  | 12          |
| 2.2              | Severity Likelihood Matrix for qualitative method<br>(Source: DOSH, 2008)       | 14          |
| 2.3              | Likelihood in semi-quantitative method<br>(Source: DOSH, 2008)                  | 14          |
| 2.4              | Severity in semi-quantitative method<br>(Source: DOSH, 2008)                    | 15          |
| 2.5              | Severity Likelihood Matrix for semi-quantitative method<br>(Source: DOSH, 2008) | 15          |
| 2.6              | Summary of important literatures  | 21          |
| 4.1              | Accident database for the period of 2011-2013 in KSB<br>and KNSB                | 38          |
| 4.2              | LTI per injury type from 2011-2013 in KSB and KNSB                              | 39          |
| 4.3              | Drawing process component description<br>(Source: KSB Internal Report)          | 44          |
| 4.4              | Drawing process hazard  | 45          |
| 4.5              | Stranding process component description<br>(Source: KSB Internal Report)        | 46          |
| 4.6              | Stranding process hazard  | 47          |
| 4.7              | Closing process component description<br>(Source: KSB Internal Report)          | 48          |
| 4.8              | Closing process hazard  | 49          |
| 4.9              | Drawing process risk assessment result  | 50          |
| 4.10             | Stranding process risk assessment result  | 51          |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 4.11 | Closing process risk assessment result                    | 52 |
| 4.12 | Respondent's demographic                                  | 54 |
| 4.13 | KMO and Bartlett's Test result                            | 57 |
| 4.14 | Total variance explained for each factor                  | 57 |
| 4.15 | Cronbach's Alpha for each dimensions                      | 58 |
| 4.16 | Safety climate factors in KSB                             | 58 |
| 4.17 | High Risk Steps in Wire Rope Department<br>sorted by Risk | 63 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| <b>FIGURE NO.</b> | <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-------------------|--|-------------|
| 2.1               | Flowchart of HIRARC processes (Source: DOSH, 2008)                           | 10          |
| 3.1               | Study design   | 24          |
| 3.2               | Kiswire group structure in Malaysia  | 26          |
| 3.3               | Kiswire Sdn Bhd organization structure illustration                          | 27          |
| 3.4               | Kiswire Sdn Bhd production department structure<br>illustration              | 28          |
| 3.5               | Typical wire rope plant layout   | 29          |
| 4.1               | Accident occurrences from 2011-2013 by year of<br>experience in KSB and KNSB | 40          |
| 4.2               | Accident summary from 2011-2013 by department                                | 41          |
| 4.3               | Wire rope production process   | 42          |
| 4.4               | Drawing process (Source: KSB Internal Report)                                | 43          |
| 4.5               | Stranding process (Source: KSB Internal Report)                              | 45          |
| 4.6               | Closing process (Source: KSB Internal Report)                                | 48          |
| 4.7               | Risk level frequency of hazards identified                                   | 53          |
| 4.8               | Risk level percentage of hazards in wire rope department                     | 62          |

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

| <b>APPENDIX</b> | <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| A               | Sample of Safety Climate Questionnaire Survey<br>Content Validation | 74          |
| B               | Sample of Safety Climate Questionnaire Survey                       | 75          |
| C               | Safety Climate Exploratory Factor Analysis Result                   | 85          |

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Overview**

This chapter is covering overview of the study from the background of problems, problem statement, objectives, scopes and significances. The brief overview explains the general information regarding the study, such as the problems studied, limits used, and goals of the study.

#### **1.2 Background of Problem**

Accident is an undesired event that causes injury or property damage (Bird and Germain, 1985). Malaysian Department of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH) is keeping records of reported occupational accidents in Malaysia (OSHA, 1994). From the record, manufacturing industry has the highest number of accident occurrences in 2014 compare to nine other sectors. Furthermore, manufacturing industry also recorded to have the highest number of non-permanent disability and permanent disability as the result of accidents in 2014. In addition, the record also shows that manufacturing industry has been the highest accident occurrences for five consecutive years from the year 2010 until 2014. Zakaria *et al.* (2012) studied that accident in manufacturing industry is from changing the production method from manual or by hand process to mechanical or machine process. This change eliminates hazard from hand or manual to the new mechanical hazard.

In order to stop accident from occurring, numerous studies have been done. The earliest theory known for accident causation model is written by Heinrich in 1931. In his theory, he stated that accident happens as the result from sequential of events. Thus, in order to prevent accident from occurring, simply removing one of the events from the sequence would be sufficient. In manufacturing industry, removing hazards from the sequence of events would prevent the accident from occurring.

To remove a hazard, it is started with identification of hazard. Hazard is a situation with potential for it to cause any harm in terms of human injury or ill health, damage to the property or environment, or any combination of these (DOSH, 2008). Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment, and Risk Control (HIRARC) method suggested by Department of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH) Malaysia could be used in identifying hazards in the process. After identifying hazards, the hazards could be prioritized before any preventive measures are given by assessing the risks from each hazard. The hazards are assessed using three method of assessing, such as qualitative method, quantitative method, and semi-quantitative method. Then risk control strategy selected for each hazards based on the priority or risk level assessed.

However, there are six method of risk control available according to DOSH (2008), such as elimination, substitution, isolation, engineering control, administrative control and using personal protective equipment or PPE. The selection of a method using DOSH guideline is based on the hierarchy of risk control method and proposed duration of risk control method will be applied, such as for long term or only for short term. For short term or temporary control, it is usually for the high risk hazard where immediate action is required. But for the long term control, it needed further planning on which method should be applied to control the risk. Meanwhile, safety climate is employees' current perceptions or opinions regarding safety policies, procedures, practices, and general importance and priority of safety at work (Griffin and Neal, 2000; Zohar, 1980). From the result of safety climate, it is expected to get the factors that are contributing to the safety in the company. By

focusing on the factors, selected method for risk control could be further enhanced mainly for the long term plan.

### **1.3 Problem Statement**

HIRARC method as strategy in preventing accident has been used in many industry. The three steps of HIRARC are applicable in every industry. The last step in HIRARC is selecting risk control method and implementing it to the hazard. On the other hand, safety climate has been studied by many researchers to understand the safety condition in the industry. From the previous studies, many dimensions as a result of safety climate have been found, such as management commitment, safety procedure, and many others. However, very limited studies of safety climate have been done in the manufacturing industry, especially in steel product industry. In addition, safety climate factors are different for each industry even between organizations in the same type of industry due to differences of the employees' perception of the safety condition in the organization. Furthermore, HIRARC as a method of preventing accident is rarely integrated with safety climate for enhancing the selected risk control method.

### **1.4 Objectives**

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- a. To determine the structure of safety climate in steel product industry using an exploratory factor analysis.
- b. To applied safety climate factors for enhancing risk control selected in HIRARC method.



## **1.5 Scopes**

The study scopes are as follows:

- a. The study was conducted in Kiswire Sdn Bhd located in Pasir Gudang, Johor, Malaysia.
- b. Historical data of accident from the company was collected for three years.
- c. Safety climate data was collected from operators and staff in the company.
- d. Risk control method suggested is for long term duration in wire rope department in the company.

## **1.6 Significances**

There are two significances from this study, there are:

- a. Gained more understanding about hazards and risks in the steel product industry.
- b. Give application of enhancing risk control selection of HIRARC method using safety climate factors.

## **1.7 Organization of the Thesis**

Chapter 2 dealt with literatures related to HIRARC and safety climate. It began with a brief overview on accident causation theories. Then followed by a detailed explanation about HIRARC method which consist of hazard identification, risk assessment, and risk control. Safety climate and dimensions were also described. Current legislation of safety in Malaysia were briefly explained. This chapter was ended with a complete review on HIRARC method and safety climate.

Chapter 3 presented the methodology used in this study. This chapter showed the data collection and data analysis process of the study. The data collection process included the data collected from the company. The analysis of the data were explained in detail. This chapter also explained the background of company where the study took place.

In Chapter 4, the data collected was represented in tables and graphics. The data then briefly explained. The analysis result of the data were also showed in this chapter. Discussion of the data and theory were the last part of this chapter. The proposed enhancement for risk control method in HIRARC using safety climate factors were discussed in detail.

In Chapter 5, concluded the discussion of this study and several recommendations for future study were given. The limitations of this study were also explained in this chapter.

## REFERENCES

- Agwu, M. O. (2012), The Effects of Risk Assessment (Hirarc) on Organisational Performance in Selected Construction Companies in Nigeria. *British Journal of Economics, Management, & Trade*. 2(3), 212-224. SCIENCEDOMAIN International.
- Astley, R. W. and Lawton, R. H. (1971). *The Ergonomic Aspects of Fork Lift Truck Design*. Bedfordshire: Cranfield Institute of Technology.
- Barling, J., Loughlin, C., and Kelloway, K. E. (2002). *An exploratory study of the role of trust in safety climates and overall safety* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Los Angeles: Alliant International University.
- Bird, F. E. J. and Germain, G. L. (1985). *Practical Loss Control Leadership*. Loganville, Georgia: International Loss Control Institute, Inc.
- Brown, R. L. and Holmes, H. (1986). The use of factor analytic procedure for assessing the validity of an employee safety climate model. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. 18(6), 445-470.
- Budworth, N. (1997). The development and evaluation of a safety climate measure as a diagnostic tool in safety management. *IOSH Journal*. 1, 19-29.
- Cox, S. and Cox, T. (1991). The structure of employee attitudes to safety: a European example. *Work and Stress*. 5(2), 93-106.
- Cox, S. J. and Cheyne, A. J. T. (2000). Assessing safety culture in offshore environments. *Safety Science*. 34, 111-129.
- Coyle, I. R., Sleeman, S. D., and Adams, N. (1995). Safety climate. *Journal of Safety Research*. 16(4), 247-254.
- DeDobbeleer, N. and Beland, F. (1991). A safety climate measure for construction sites. *Journal of Safety Research*. 22(2), 97-103.
- Donald, I. and Canter, D. (1994). Employee attitudes and safety in chemical industry. *Journal of Loss Prevention in Process Industries*. 7(3), 203-208.

- Evans, D. D., Michael, J. H., Wiedenbeck, J. K., and Ray, C. D. (2004). Relationships between organizational climates and safety related events at four wood manufacturers. *Forest Products Journal*. 55, 23-28.
- Firenze, R. J. (1978). *The Process of Hazard Control*. New York: Kendal/Hunt.
- Flin, R., Mearns, K., O'Connor, P., and Bryden, R. (2000). Measuring safety climate: Identifying the common features. *Safety Science*. 34(1-3), 177-192.
- Gadd, S. (2002). *Safety culture – A review of the literature*. London: Health and Safety Executive.
- George, D. and Mallery, P. (2006). *SPSS for Windows step-by-step: A simple guide and reference, 13.0 update*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glendon, A. I. and Litherland, D. K. (2001). Safety climate factors, group differences, and safety behavior in road construction. *Safety Science*. 34, 177-193.
- Goetsch, D. L. (2011). *Occupational Safety and Health for Technologists, Engineers, and Managers*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.) New Jersey: Pearson.
- Griffin, M. A. and Neal, A. (2000). Perceptions of safety at work: a framework for linking safety climate to safety performance, knowledge, and motivation. *Journal of Occupational Health and Psychology*. 5, 347-358.
- Gyekye, S. A. (2010). Occupational safety management: The role of causal attribution. *International Journal Of Psychology*. 45(6), 405–416.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., and Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis with readings*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Haslam, R. A., Hide, S. A., Gibb, A. G. F., Gyi, E. D., Pavitt, T., and Atkinson, S. (2005). Contributing Factors in Construction Accidents. *Applied Ergonomics*. 4(36), 401-415.
- Health and Safety Executive (1991). *Health and safety climate survey tool*. London: Health and Safety Executive.
- Health and Safety Executive (1999). *Reducing error and influencing behavior*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) London: Health and Safety Executive.
- Health and Safety Executive (2004). *Working Together to Reduce Stress at Work: A Guide for Employees* [Brochure]. London: Health and Safety Executive.
- Heinrich, H. W. (1931). *Industrial Accident Prevention: A scientific approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Heinrich, H. W., Petersen, D., and Ross, N. (1980). *Industrial Accident Prevention*. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) , New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hovden, J., Albrechtsen, E, and Herrera, I. A. (2010). Is there a need for new theories, models and approaches to occupational accident prevention? *Safety Science*. 48, 950-956.
- Joel, L. (1997). *The Handbook of Maintenance Management*. New York: Industrial Press.
- Krispin, J. (1997). *The construction and validation of a measure of safety climate: Exploring the link between attitudes and perceptions around safety and safety performances* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University.
- Latham, M. (1994). *Constructing the team HSMO*.
- Lee, T. and Harrison, K. (2000). Assessing safety culture in nuclear power stations. *Safety Science*. 34, 61-97.
- Lipton, S. and Lynch, J. (1994). *Handbook of health hazard control in the chemical process industry*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- M. S. Syed Mohamed and Harizah Ideris (2012). Managing Risks in a Manufacturing Environment: A Perspective from Reason's Accident Causation Model. *Universal Journal of Management and Social Sciences*. 2(8) 38-46.
- Malaysia (1967). *Factories and Machinery Act*. Act 139.
- Malaysia (1994). *Occupational Safety and Health Act*. Act 514.
- Malaysia (2008). *Guidelines for Hazard Identification, Risk assessment and Risk Control (HIRARC)*. JKPP DP 127/789/4-47.
- Maragakis, I., Clark, S., Piers, M., Prior, D., Tripaldi, C., Masson, M., and Audard, C. (2009). *Guidance on Hazard Identification*. European Strategic Safety Initiative.
- Mason, S. and Simpson, G. (1995). Measuring safety attitudes to target management actions. *The Safety and Health Practitioner*.
- McDonald, N., Corrigan, S., Daly, C., and Cromie, S. (2000). Safety management systems and safety culture in aircraft maintenance organizations. *Safety Science*. 34, 151-176.
- Mearns, K. J. and Reader, T. (2008). Organizational Support and Safety Outcomes: An Uninvestigated relationship? *Safety Science*. 46, 388-397.

- Mearns, K. J., Whitaker, S. M., and Flin, R. (2003). Safety climate, safety management practice, and safety performance in offshore environments. *Safety Science*. 41, 641-680.
- Mearns, K., Flin, R., Fleming, M., and Gordon, R. (1997). *Human and Organizational Factors in Offshore Safety*. Suffolk: Offshore Safety Division, Health and Safety Executive.
- Neal, A. and Griffin, M. A. (2006). A study of the lagged relationships among safety climate, safety motivation, safety behavior, and injuries at the individual group levels. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 91, 946-953.
- Niskanen, T. (1994) Safety climate in road administration. *Safety Science*. 17, 237-255.
- Noorul Huda Zakaria, Norudin Mansor, and Zalinawati Abdullah (2012). Workplace Accident in Malaysia: Most Common Causes and Solutions. *Business and Management Review*. 2(5), 75-88.
- Payne, N. (2011). Machinery Accidents in the Workplace. Cited in Noorul Huda Zakaria, Norudin Mansor, and Zalinawati Abdullah (2012). Workplace Accident in Malaysia: Most Common Causes and Solutions. *Business and Management Review*. 2(5), 75-88.
- Reason J. (1990). *Human Error*. Cambridge: University Press. As cited in M. S. Syed Mohamed and Harizah Ideris (2012). Managing Risks in a Manufacturing Environment: A Perspective from Reason's Accident Causation Model. *Universal Journal of Management and Social Sciences*. 2(8) 38-46.
- Rundmo, T. (1994). Associations between safety and contingency measures and occupational accidents on offshore petroleum platforms. *Scandinavian Journal of Work and Environmental Health*. 20, 128-131.
- Sargent, E. V. and Gallo, F. (2003). Use of Personal Protective Equipment for Respiratory Protection. *ILAR Journal*. 44(1), 52-56.
- Seppala, A. (1992). Evaluation of safety measures, their improvement and connection to occupational accidents. Cited in Niskanen, T. (1994) Safety climate in road administration. *Safety Science*. 17, 237-255.
- Shannon, H. S., Mayr, J., and Haines, T. (1997). Overview of the relationship between organizational and workplace factors and injury rates. *Safety Science*. 26, 201-217.

- Sherry, P. (1991) Person-environment fit and accident prediction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 5, 411-416.
- Stup, R. (2002). Standard Operating Procedures: Managing the Human Variables. *National Mastitis Council Regional Meeting Proceedings*.
- Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using multivariate analysis*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Tam, C. M. and Chan, A. P. C. (1999). Nourishing safety culture in the construction industry of Hong Kong. *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of CIB Working Commission W99*. March 24-27 1999. Honolulu, Hawaii, 117-122.
- Thomas. (1989). As cited in Norasikin Hussin. (2010). Occupational Safety and Health Improvement at a Casting Plant (Published master's thesis). Johor Bahru: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
- Tomas, J. M., Melia, J. L., and Oliver, A. M. (1999). A cross validation of structural equation model of accidents: organizational and psychology variables as predictors of work safety. *Work and Stress*. 13(1), 49-58.
- Trimpop, R., Kirkaldi, B., Athansou, J., and Cooper, C. (2000). Individual differences in working hours, work perceptions and accident rates in veterinary surgeries. *Work Stress*. 11, 181-188.
- USA (2003). *Personal Protective Equipment*. OSHA 3151-12R.
- Varonen, U. and Mattila, M. (2000). The safety climate and its relationship to safety practices, safety of work environment and occupational accidents in eight wood processing companies. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*. 32, 761-769.
- Vinodkumar, M. N. and Bhasi, M. (2009). Safety climate factors and its relationship with accidents and personal attributes in the chemical industry. *Safety Science*. 47, 659-667.
- Waring, A. (1992). Developing a safety culture. *The Safety and Health Practitioner*.
- Williamson, A. M., Feyer A. M., Cairns, D., and Biancotti, D. (1997). The development of a measure safety climate: the role of safety perceptions and attitudes. *Safety Science*. 25, 15-27.
- Zohar, D. (1980). Safety climate in industrial organizations: theoretical and applied implications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 65, 96-102.
- Zohar, D. (2002). Modifying supervisory practices to improve sub-unit safety: a leadership based intervention model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87(1), 156-163.