International Journal of Innovative Social & Science Education Research 12(4):36-46, Oct-Dec, 2024

© SEAHI PUBLICATIONS, 2024 www.seahipublications.org ISSN: 2360-8978

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13974958

Occupational Hazards And Compliance With Safety Practices Among Correctional Service Officers In Delta State

Gentle, Kitoye Samuel[1]; Oyibo, Rita[2]; JAMES, Bariaara Promise[3]; Amaigbani, ThankGod[4] & ETOR, Emmanuel Nwakaji[5]

[1,2,3,4,5] **Department of Health and Safety Studies,**
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
[3]***Email address: jamesbariaarapromise@gmail.com***

ABSTRACT
This study assessed occupational hazards and compliance with safety practices among correctional service officers in Delta State. The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional survey research design. The population of the study was 627 which were equally used as the sample because the population is of a manageable size. A self-structured questionnaire tagged "Assessment of Occupational Hazards and Compliance with Safety Practices among Correctional Service Officers in Delta State" (AOHCSPCSOD) was used to elicit responses from the correctional service officers. The reliability index of 0.82 was obtained using Pearson moment correlation coefficient which showed positive correlation. Instrument returned were coded and analyzed using statistical products for service solution (SPSS) version 2.50. The result showed that correctional service officers in Delta State had low extent of exposure to physical hazards 2.24±0.95 and low chemical hazard with a grand mean of 2.29 ⊀1.07 which was less than the criterion mean of 2.50. The result also showed high extent of exposure to biological hazards 2.51±1.04, psychosocial hazards 2.65±1.02, the result further showed high extent of exposure of correctional officers to ergonomic hazards with a grand mean of 2.59±1.02. The result further showed a high extent of compliance as the grand mean = 3.23±1.42 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analysis revealed high extent of compliance with the use of PPE (3.54±0.84) and safety against been caught off guard by inmates or invaders (3.45±0.94). The study concluded that correctional service officers in Delta State are exposed to occupational hazards which include physical, chemical, biological, psychosocial and ergonomic hazards. It was recommended among others that a supportive work environment including the provision of counselling services to address stress of correctional service officers be put in place.
Keywords: correctional service officers, occupational hazards, safety practices

INTRODUCTION

Correctional service officers are at risk of contracting diseases due to their level of exposure to occupational hazards. Occupational hazards are scientific and public health issue, defined as a potential risk to the health of a person emerging from an unhealthy environment. Schulte et al. (2014) defined occupational hazard as the potential risks to the health and safety of those who work outside the home. A person's occupation has an important influence on his health and well-being, depending on the organizational environment, work materials/equipment and safety rules and regulation in the organization. Correctional workers are responsible for enforcing facility rules and maintaining order, they play a pivotal role within the prison system, their duties exposes those to stressful and dangerous conditions (Tabraize et al., 2015). The negative physical and mental health outcomes for correctional officers can have harmful effects on the wider prison institution (National Institute of Justice, 2017). Staffing shortages and officers missing work create a dangerous cycle where low officer-to-

incarcerated person ratios and high turnover in staffing threaten a correctional facilities ability to implement appropriate security mandates (National Institute of Justice, 2017). The dangers that correctional service officers face is explored in National Institute of Justice (2017), supported paper that analyzes existing research. In carrying out their research work, the researchers identified risks officers confront in their work environment, assessed the officers perspectives regarding workplace risk, noted key limitations in reviewed literature related to this topic, and recommended policies designed to enhance officer well-being. For prison facilities to operate efficiently, it is important that they be staffed with officers who are physically and mentally sound and are able to respond to the numerous challenges that this line of work presents. Correctional service workers include correctional officers, chaplains, healthcare providers, teachers, vocational instructors, food service, and maintenance personnel (National Institute of Justice 2017). Corrections workers maintain institution safety and security by enforcing rules and regulations, facility security, and accountability of incarcerated persons. The Bureau of Labour Statistics (2021) estimate for correctional officers and jailers was 392,600 in May 2021. This estimate does not include other corrections workers and it identified three broad categories of dangers correctional officers confront: work-related, institution-related, and psycho-social dangers. These categories of officers are responsible for gangs and contraband, to demanding work obligations, and family conflicts, and they are also associated with a number of negative outcomes for correctional officers and corrections agencies, including negative health effects such as higher stress levels and injuries. Diminished work performance, burnout, and absenteeism among officers, for example, can lead to higher incarcerated person-to-officer ratios and reduced security levels within entire penitentiaries which are traceable ergonomic hazards. National Institute of Justice (2017) also asserted that correctional officers are aware of the dangers they face, therefore low-level security and juvenile detention facility officers expressed some degree of concern about their general safety and wellness. Across a range of facilities, officers reported that they think they were (or are) at higher risk for injury and other negative outcomes as a result of their jobs (Clement and Kiemans, 2021). Montoya-Barthelemy et al. (2022) revealed in their study that correctional officers are more likely to be exposed to organization hazards due to non-challant attitude and poor knowledge about safety protocols in workplace. Song (2017) revealed that correctional officers are exposed to hazards through behavioural factors, equipment, facilities and poor management security. Communication between authorities and officers in prisons and old methods of personnel management compound these problems. However, Sygit-Kowalkowska, et al. (2021) affirmed that good proportion of correctional staff (43.4%) suffer for occupational burnout and reported symptoms of sleeping disorder (insomnia) resulting from prolong working duration. Correctional staff members need support to define their roles and identities with respect to the prisoners and to work through the divide between the necessary activities of security and basic services and growing expectations for their involvement in the care and rehabilitation process (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health NIOSH, 2020).

The fact that hazards exist in a workplace simply suggests that workers are likely exposed to them. However, the level of exposure to available hazards is determined by the skills of workers in the job and compliance to safety practices. Correctional workers are responsible for enforcing facility rules and maintaining order so that they can be fully carried out in the correctional facility. The process of admitting and rehabilitating inmates in the correctional facility triggers the present of hazards and other risks that affect their well-being. Poor administrative methods such as prolonged working time, poor monitoring, supervision of prison staff and inmates exposed correctional service officers to risks of occupational hazards. These made most of the correctional service officers complained of being exposed to several kinds of hazards in the job which in effect threatened their health and well-being. Most of the hazards the correctional service officers complained about seem not be known to many outside the correctional service officers line of work, yet most of the correctional service officers complained about the exposure to these hazards ranging from inmates threats, work stress, injuries and diseases which makes them to often think of quitting the job, absent themselves from work and sometimes vent their angers on innocent family members including prison inmates under their care. Health and safety practices are put in place in an organization to help reduce and control workers level of exposure to inherent hazards and accident in their workplace. In the correctional facilities, there are safety measures put in place which is expected to be complied with by the workers in order to avert

the hazards present in their job. Observation of the above complains of some of the correctional service officers and the consequences of the hazards; agitate one's mind to know whether workers in correctional service comply with safety practices in their job.

There is also a lack of comprehensive research on the occupational hazards faced by correctional service officers in Delta State, Nigeria, and their compliance with safety practices. This knowledge gap presents a significant problem as it hinders the development of effective strategies to safeguard the health and well-being of these officers. It is against this backdrop that this research seeks to assess the occupational hazards and compliance with safety practices of correctional service officers in Delta State.

METHODOLOGY

Area of the Study

The area of the study was Delta State, Nigeria.

Research Design

A descriptive survey design was adopted for this study.

Population of the Study

The population of the study consisted of correctional service workers in Delta State

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample size of this study comprised of all the correctional officers in the five correctional facilities which was 627 in Delta State. The population size is manageable hence there was no need for sampling.

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument used for eliciting information was titled; "Assessment of Occupational Hazards and Compliance with Safety Practices Among Correctional Service Officers Questionnaire" (AOHCSPCSOQ). The instrument was in four sections A, B, C and D. Section A revealed information on socio-demographic characteristics of the correctional officers. Section B revealed information about occupational hazards presents in correctional facilities in Delta State, Section C gives detail information regarding the safety practices of correctional service officers while Section D addresses training, work experience and availability of safety devices as correlates of compliance with safety practices.

Validity of the Instrument

The instrument was validated by five experts which included a psychologist, statistician and an occupational health professional.

Reliability of the Instrument

Split half method was employed to determine the degree of consistency of the validated instrument, 40 copies of the instrument numbered 1 to 40 serially were administered to forty respondents (correctional officers) in Rivers State (Ahoada correctional facility) who were not part of the study area but share similar characteristics to the area of the study. The results from both halves were analyzed using Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient. The result of the correlation showed a reliability index of 0.82 which was considered reliable for use in the study.

Method of Data Collection

The instrument was distributed to the participants with the help of three research assistants who were also correctional service officers and they were briefed and guided on the purpose of the study.

Method of Data Analysis

Data collected were analysed using Statistical Products for Service Solution (SPSS) version 25.0. The analysis was based on the retrieved instrument from the field work. Descriptive statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, ANOVA and Pearson moment correlation coefficient was adopted to answer the research questions while regression analysis was used to determine the differences among variables at 0.05 significant level.

RESULTS

4.1 Results

Table 4.1:Socio-demographic data

Sex	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	388	75
Female	132	25
Total	**520**	**100**
Age		
8 — 27	104	20
28 — 37	129	25
38 — 47	118	23
48 — 57	96	18
Others	73	14
Total	**520**	**100**
Marital Status		
Married	322	62
Single	135	26
Others	63	12
Total	**520**	**100**
Level of Education		
Secondary	142	27
Tertiary	306	59
Others	72	4
Total	**520**	**100**
Work Experience		
0 — 10years	219	42
11 — 20	156	30
21 — 30	145	28
Total	**520**	**100**
Training		
Trained	520	100
Untrained	-	-
Total	**520**	**100**

Table 4.1 shows that out of 520 respondents, 388 (75%) were males while 132 (25%) were females. 104 (20%) of respondents is in the age bracket of 18-27 years, 129 (25%) were in the age bracket of 28 — 37years, 118 (23%) were in the age bracket of 38-47years, 96 (18%) were in the age bracket of 48-57years while 73 (14%) falls in the category of others. On marital status, 322 (62%) of the respondents are married while 135 (26%) are single while 63 (12%) falls in others. Based on level of education, 142 (27%) of the respondents had secondary education, 306 (59%) had tertiary education and 72 (14%) had other forms of education. On work experience, 219 (42%) of the respondents had 1-10years experience, 156 (30%) had 11-20 years and 145 (28%) had 21 — 30years work experience. Finally, all the respondents 520 (100%) are trained in the job.

Table 4.2: Mean and standard deviation showing the extent of exposure to physical hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State

SN	Physical hazards	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Remark
1	Noise at workplace	2.72	0.94	HE
2	Exposure to dust	2.50	0.89	HE
3	Slips and fall	2.13	0.96	LE
4	Aggression from inmates	2.31	1.07	LE
5	Electric shock	1.81	0.83	LE
6	Exposure to accidental discharge of firearms	2.01	0.95	LE
7	Exposure to accidents from vehicular crashes, falls, aggressions	2.21	1.03	LE
	Grand mean	**2.24**	**0.95**	**LE**

Criterion mean = 2.50. Key: HE = high extent, LE = low extent

Table 4.2 revealed the extent of exposure to physical hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State. The result showed a low extent of exposure as the grand mean = 2.24±0.95 was less than the criterion mean of 2.50. Thus, the extent of exposure to physical hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State was low. Though there was high extent of exposure to noise (2.72±0.94), and dust (2.50±0.89).

Table 4.3: Mean and standard deviation showing the extent of exposure to chemical hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State

SN	Chemical hazards	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Remark
1	Exposure to general refuse dump sites	2.43	1.06	LE
2	Exposure to chemical poisoning from inhalation of vehicular generator, Indian hemp and cigarettes	2.43	1.10	LE
3	Exposure to hazardous chemicals such as insecticides, pesticides	2.34	1.15	LE
4	Exposure to hazardous chemicals such as tear gas and pepper spray	2.20	1.09	LE
5	Exposure to fungicides	2.15	1.01	LE
6	Skin reaction from chemical agent	2.21	1.03	LE
7	Inhalation of dust or smoke from burning waste	2.28	1.06	LE
	Grand mean	**2.29**	**1.07**	**LE**

Criterion mean = 2.50. Key: HE = high extent, LE = low extent

Table 4.3 revealed the extent of exposure to chemical hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State. The result showed a low extent of exposure as the grand mean = 2.29±1.07 was less than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analysis revealed low extent of exposure to chemical poisoning (2.43±1.10) and Exposure to hazardous chemicals such as insecticides and pesticides (2.34±1.15). Thus, the extent of exposure to chemical hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State was low.

Table 4.4: Mean and standard deviation showing the extent of exposure to biological hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State

SN	Biological hazards	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Remark
1	Exposure to body fluids from impaired or injured colleagues and inmates	2.30	1.04	LE
2	Exposure to communicable diseases from infected colleagues or inmates	2.49	1.10	LE
3	Contacts with insect bites such as mosquitoes, house and midges animal secretions in prison environment	2.75	1.05	HE
4	Exposure to communicable diseases as a result of coming into contact with crowd	2.51	1.06	HE
5	Exposure to disease and disease vectors during the course of taking inmates to hospital	2.52	0.96	HE
	Grand mean	**2.51**	**1.04**	**HE**

Criterion mean = 2.50. Key: HE = high extent, LE = low extent

Table 4.4 revealed the extent of exposure to biological hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State. The result showed a high extent of exposure as the grand mean = 2.51±1.04 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analysis revealed high extent of contacts with insect bites such as mosquitoes, house and midges animal secretions in prison environment (2.75±1.05) and exposure to disease and disease vectors during the course of taking inmates to hospital (2.52±0.96). Thus, the extent of exposure to biological hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State was high.

Table 4.5: Mean and standard deviation showing the extent of exposure to psychosocial hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State

SN	Psychosocial hazards	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Remark
1	Exposure to excessive work demands and pressure such as shifts	2.84	1.05	HE
2	Exposure to emotional stress from within and outside the correctional formation	2.85	0.91	HE
3	Exposure to psychological stress from having to appear in courts for cross-examination	2.74	0.97	HE
4	Exposure to emotional stress arising from sexual harassment	2.51	1.09	HE
5	Persistent fatigue due to work related activity	2.55	1.09	HE
6	Workplace violence	2.45	1.02	LE
7	Verbal abuse from inmates and colleagues	2.34	1.07	LE
8	Problem with management or boss	2.42	1.09	LE
9	Loss of sleep due to high emotional demand	2.63	1.06	HE
10	Low recognition and reward	2.85	1.02	HE
11	Poor organizational justice	3.01	0.95	HE
	Grand mean	**2.65**	**1.02**	**HE**

Criterion mean = 2.50. Key: HE = high extent, LE = low extent

Table 4.5 revealed the extent of exposure to psychosocial hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State. The result showed a high extent of exposure as the grand mean = 2.65±1.02 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analysis revealed high extent of Poor organizational justice (3.01±0.95) and Exposure to emotional stress from within and outside the correctional formation (2.85±0.91). Thus, the extent of exposure to psychosocial hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State was high.

Table 4.6: Mean and standard deviation showing the extent of exposure to ergonomic hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State

SN	Ergonomic hazards	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Remark
1	Exposure to back pains as a result of sitting long hours in vehicles taking inmates to and from court	2.63	0.90	HE
2	Use of force to push objects	2.44	0.94	HE
3	Exposure to body pain due to standing long for hours during cell checks	2.48	0.99	HE
4	Repeated bending/standing while working	2.74	1.16	HE
5	Exposure to pain from weight of fire arms and communication gadgets	2.66	1.06	HE
	Grand mean	**2.59**	**1.01**	**HE**

Criterion mean = 2.50. Key: HE = high extent, LE = low extent

Table 4.6 revealed the extent of exposure to ergonomic hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State. The result showed a high extent of exposure as the grand mean = 2.59±1.02 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analysis revealed high extent of repeated bending/standing while working (2.74±1.16) and exposure to pain from weight of fire arms and communication gadgets (2.66±1.06). Thus, the extent of exposure to ergonomic hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State was high.

Table 4.7: Mean and standard deviation showing the extent of compliance with safety practices among correctional service officers in Delta State

SN	Safety practices	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Remark
1	Ensures safety of self when carrying out duties or working with computer	3.05	1.12	HE
2	Replaces faulty working material	2.99	1.72	HE
3	Rests when tired	2.87	1.16	HE
4	First aid is always on ground	3.25	1.65	HE
5	Emergency response pouches are reachable while working	3.18	1.16	HE
6	Avoids intake of alcohol or other forms of intoxicated drink while on duty	3.30	1.10	HE
7	Puts on PPE while on routine check on inmates and cell inspections	3.54	0.84	HE
8	Always at alert to avoid been caught off guard by inmates or invaders	3.45	0.94	HE
9	Avoids wearing uniform outside the walls of the prison	3.19	1.11	HE
10	Never shows an inmate uncertainty of any situation	3.44	1.67	HE
	Grand mean	**3.23**	**1.24**	**HE**

Criterion mean = 2.50. Key: HE = high extent, LE = low extent

Table 4.7 revealed the extent of compliance with safety practices among correctional service officers in Delta State. The result showed a high extent of compliance as the grand mean = 3.23±1.42 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analysis revealed high extent of compliance with that PPE (3.54±0.84) and safety against been caught off guard by inmates or invaders (3.45±0.94). Thus, the extent of compliance with safety practices among correctional service officers in Delta State was high.

DISCUSSION OF FINDING

The study showed a low extent of exposure to physical hazards as grand mean of 2.24 was less than the criterion mean of 2.50. This result is expected because correctional service officers work in an external environment and are not usually exposed to most of the physical hazards under study. Except of that of noise and dust that revealed a high extent of exposure 2.72 and 2.50. This may be due to

generator, radios and noise from vehicles as most of facilities are closer to busy roads, and they also share boundaries with residential homes and churches. The high extent of noise and dust revealed in the study is keeping with Elechi & Daingo (2019) report that revealed dust and noise pollution as major hazards. Mishra and Porushothanih (2019) revealed noise and dust as an occupational health problem among traffic personnel. Edmund (2017), whose study revealed a low extent on slips and falls is in accordance with this study which show a low extent of sleep and fall with a grand mean of 2.13 which is lesser than the criterion mean of 2.50. This study is at variance with Halvani, et al. (2011) whose report revealed falling as the greatest of accident (48.58%). Alamigir (2011) revealed serious work place falls as higher proportion 70% in the health care sector. This variance may be due to the internal settings of the environment and the design used for the study.

Exposure to chemical hazards with the grand mean 2.29 was less than the criterion mean of 2.50. The analyses revealed low extent of exposure to chemical poisoning 2.43, skin reaction to chemical agents 2.21, exposure to chemicals such as pesticides and insecticides 2.34 and hazardous chemicals such as tear gas and pepper spray 2.20. This result is expected because correctional services officers rarely make use of chemicals like some other occupations such as the police force and paints companies. This made the report of this study to be at variance with Sebatiampillan, et al. (2015) whose report revealed high risks of lead toxicity among traffic warden. Tomei, et al. (2011) revealed that outdoor workers were two times highly exposed to toxic (brazen) substances. Mona et al. (2019) revealed exposure to chemical hazards such as carbon dioxide and general pollution as major hazards affecting police officers. This report is so because Bonsu et al. (2020) said that chemicals such as spraying substances and fumes risks or risk is determined by the extent of exposure, and correctional service officers are not often exposed to these chemicals hence the low extent of exposure to chemical hazards.

Biological hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State with the grand mean 2.51 were higher than the criterion mean of 2.50. This result is so because the correctional service officers always have a close contact with the inmates under their care and with visitors of those inmates, even insects mostly mosquitoes bite on those majorly on night duties. This report is in credence with Mossburg et al. (2019), revealed workers demonstrated the effects of exposure to biological hazards such as fluid and exposure to high concentration of carbon dioxide. This finding is at variance with Roland et al. (2012) who revealed a low incidence of content with exposure to body fluid and that most exposures did not have the potential for this transmission. This study is plausible because most workers are prone to biological hazards in their workplace.

High exposure to psychosocial hazards among correctional service officers in Delta State was revealed, as the grand mean of 2.65 was higher than the criterion mean of 2.50. This is as a result of poor organizational justice, low recognition and reward, excessive work demands and pressure such as shifts, exposure to stress from having to appear in court for cross-examination, emotional stress arising from sexual harassment and loss of sleep due to work-related activity. This finding is keeping with Adegoke (2004) whose report revealed significant effect of work related stress, frustration and depression on the psychological well-being of police officers. Njejjo, et al. (2015) revealed sexual abuse and verbal abuse faced by healthcare workers in Talaraiz, et al. (2015) revealed good proportion of officers (65%) suffer from occupational stress and get exhausted after daily work. Violantia et al. (2016) revealed police officers are chronically exposed to work stress and identified increasing stress of administrative practices and lack of organizational support were associated with hopelessness. Chirico et al. (2017) revealed correctional service officers are most likely to face psychological risk or stress, negative criticism and may be beaten up by inmates. There was no contrary report against these findings at the time of this study.

Exposure to ergonomic hazards of correctional officers in Delta State revealed a high extent of exposure as the grand mean of 2.95 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50 as most of the correctional officer had back pain as a result of sitting long hours in the office, and in vehicles while taking inmates to and from court, pains of weight of firearms and communication gadgets among others. This result is in consonance with Bonsu, et al. (2020) whose study revealed carry and pushing heavy objects, bending and standing contribute to bodily pain such as lower back pain, neck pain, leg pain, muscle spasm and shoulder pain. Ochei et al. (2020) revealed great pains from prolong bending and twisting of the body. Chen et al. (2017) revealed vigorous activities, lifting heavy objects, as

potential work-related stressor or hazardous situations. Huang et al. (2016) revealed musculo-skeletal disorder (lower back, neck and shoulder) pain. Also Bilai et al. (2019) revealed (41.51%) police officers were suffering from muscular-skeletal pains as a result of work activity. Aderaw et al. (2011) revealed lack of sleeping disturbances and job stress increase the risk of occupational injuries. Kryger et al. (2013) revealed high job demands and time pressure as baseline were risks factors for onset of firearm pain.

Mona et al (2020) revealed that there were higher rates of work injuries among police officers. From the reviewed literature, all occupations are faced with similar ergonomic hazards ranging from waist pains, back pains, leg pains, shoulder pains etc. of which the correctional service officers is not an exemption.

Extent of Compliance with Safety Practices

There was a high extent of compliance with safety practices among correctional service officers in Delta State as the grand mean 3.23 was greater than the criterion mean of 2.50. This result is expected because the correctional service officers have undergone training and retraining through workshops, seminars and pep-talks, which enable them to comply with safety rules and regulations set by management, and also make use of their safety devices to reduce risks of hazards. This result is keeping with Huang et al. (2020) that management commitment to safety was high and thus improves compliance with safety practices. Mayanga et al. (2022), revealed that organizational factors including adequacy of legislation, availability of PPEs and Sops or policy were determinants towards compliance to occupational safety and health respectively. Arewa and Farrell (2012) revealed that non-compliance with health and safety tends to be higher per accident in SMEs than in large firms, that advance planning and proper legislation will spin off into workers motivation, efficacy, effectiveness and productivity. More also, Gurung et al. (2021) affirmed that more than average number of workers utilize safety devices to minimized the prevalence of occupational accidents in the workplace. Correctional service officers in Delta State are among those workers that valued their health and well-being therefore complied with safety rules and regulations of the correctional facilities in order to prevent the risk of hazards that may put them in danger.

CONCLUSION

From the study it is concluded that correctional service officers in Delta State are exposed majorly to psychosocial, ergonomic and biological hazards which were revealed to be in a high extent while physical and chemical hazards were in a low extent. Also the results revealed a high extent of compliance of correctional service officers with safety practices.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the finding and conclusion of the study, the following recommendations were made:

i. The study recommends that creation of a supportive work environment including the provision counselling services to address the stress experience by correctional officer.
ii. A stress management training program needs to be implemented so that Delta States correctional service officers practice stress management on a regular basis
iii. Correctional service officers should go for periodic medical examination and screening regularly so as to reduce the effects of job related hazards.
iv. Work practice control procedures that consider and reduce awkward posture should be implemented the government through internal monitoring.
v. Correctional service officers should be trained on proper work techniques on how to position their body while working to accomplish their task.
vi. There should be need for further research to identify the specific factors that influence compliance with safety practices among correctional service officers in Nigeria.
vii. Correctional service officer should be encourage to improve on their level of safety compliance to further reduce their risk of exposure to occupational hazards in their work place

REFERENCES

Adegoke, T.G. (2014). Effects of occupational stress on psychological well-being of police employees in Ibadan metropolis, Nigeria, *African Research Review,* 8(1), 302-320.

Adeniyi, J.A. (2012), Occupational health and safety: concepts, objectives and relevance. *Nigerian School Health Journal*, 17 (2),192-199.

Aderaw, Z., Engdaw,D., & Tadesse, T. (2011). Determinants of occupational injury: a case control study among Textile factory workers in Amhara Religion State Ethiopia. *Journal of Tropical Medicine*.657275. Article 657275.

Alamgir, H., Ngan, K., Drebit, S., Guiyun L., & Keen. D. (2011). Predictors and economic burden of serious workplace falls in health care. *Occupational Medicine*, 61(4), 234—240.

Arewa, A. O., & Farrell, P. (2012). A review of compliance with health and safety regulations and economic performance in small and medium enterprises. In Smith, S.D (ed) Proceedings at 28th Annual ARCOM Conference, 3-5, Edinburge, UK, Association of Researchers in Construction Management, 423-432.

Bonsu, W.S., Adei, D. & Agyemang-Duah, R. S. (2020). Exposure to occupational hazards among bakers and their coping mechanisms in Ghana. *Cogent Medicine,* 7:1 DOI: 10.1080.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2021). *Correctional officers and jailers. Occupational employment and wage statistics.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Chirico, F, Ferrari G, Taino G, Oddone E, Giorgi I, &Imbriani, M. (2017). Prevalence and risk factors for sick building syndrome among Italian correctional officers: A pilot study. *Journal of Health & Social Science*.2(1):31-46.

Clemente, M; Adele, R; & Coloma, R. (2015). The occupational health of correctional officers in Peru: The impact of length of work experience. *The prison Journal 95*(2) 224 – 263

Clements, J. A., &Kinman, G., (2021). Job demands, organizational justice, and emotional exhaustion in prison officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice Studies*.34(4), 441-458.

Elechi, C. E. & Daingo-Ilate, W. (2019). The occupational health hazards associated with saw mill workers in Port Harcourt Metropolis in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Healthcare Research* 7(1):1-7.

Gurung, P., Dahal, M., Baral, K., Pathak, A. & Khand, S. (2021). Knowledge and understanding of personal protective equipment use among labourer population of the Nepalese workforce. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 7679185. Doi: 10.1155.

Halvani, G.H., Jafarinodoushan, R., Mirmohammadi, S.J. & Mehrparvar, A.H. (2011). A survey on occupational accidents among construction industry workers in Yazd city: applying time series 2006-20 1 1. *Journal of Occupational Health and Environment*. 1(1): 1-8.

Huang, Y., Ho, M., Smith, G.S. & Chen, P. Y. (2012). Climate and self-reported injury: Assessing the mediating role of employee safety control. *Accident Analysis and Prevention,* 38(3), 425-443.

International Labour Organization (2011), *Safety in numbers*: *Pointer for a global safety culture at work*. Geneva.

Kryger, A. I., Andersen, J.H., Lassen C. G; Brandit, L. P., Viistrup, I., Overguard, E., Thomsen J. F.,& Mikklsen S. (2013). Does computer use pose an occupational hazard for forearm pain; *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine,* (1): 14. Doi: 10, 1136.

Mishra, P. K. &Purushothana J. (2019). Occupational hazards and health problems among traffic personnel of Mangaluru city. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health,* 8(6): 3608-3618.

Mona, G.G., Chimbari, M.J., & Hongoro, C. A., (2019). Systematic review on occupational hazards, injuries and diseases among police officers worldwide: Policy implications for the South African Police Service. *Journal of Occupational Medical Toxicology,* 14(1), 1-15.

Montoya-Barthelemy, A., Gibson, B. R., Lee, C. D., Bade, A. M. Butler, J. W., Smith, E., Skipworth, D., Gutekunst, J., Segula, M. N., Wicken, C., Friedman, E., Darbari, I., Menegas, S., Thatai, S., & Wheeler, L., (2022). Occupational and environmental hazards of correctional settings. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Management,* 64(3), 172-182.

National Institute of Justice, (2017). *Correctional officer safety and wellness* — Literature Synthesis Learned from the Research Literature.

National Institute of Safety and Health (NIOSH) (2019). NIOSH pocket guide to chemical hazards. *IOHA Admin*, 1st June 2019.

Ndejjo, R., Musinguzi, D. & Wang, J.S. (2015). Occupational health hazard among health care workers in Kampala Uganda. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health,* 2, 13-16. Article No. 913741.

Roland, C. M., Nettleton, J. E., Mayer, K. H., Bruce M. &Becker, B. M., (2012). HIV post-exposure prophylaxis among police and corrections officers, *Occupational Medicine*,58(7), 502—505.

Schulte, P.A., Pandalai, S., and Wulsin, V, (2014). Interaction of occupational and personal risk factors in workforce health and safety. *Am J Public Health*; 102(3): 434—448.

Sebastiampillai, B.S, Navinan, M.R., Guruge, S.I.T., Wijarantne D.R., Sissanayake B.S., Dissanayake. D,.M.S.V., Perera, M.S., Thehkorala, S.M., Wijayasurendra, H.D., Wickramaratne, D.L.N., Arambepola, C. & Fernendo R. (2015) Lead toxicity among traffic Worders, a high-risk group exposed to atmospheric lead, is still a cause or concern? *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology,10,* (4) 1-8

Song, Y. (2017). Risk factors analysis of criminals escape from prison based on interpretative structural modelling. *Advances in Applied Sociology,* 7(12), 365-377.

Tabraiz, S., Ahmad, S., &Shehzad, I. (2015). Study of physio-psychological effects on traffic wardens due to traffic noise pollution, exposure — effect relation. *Journal of Environmental Health Science and Engineering;* 13(1), 07-11.

Tomei, F,,Ghihori, S,, Imbriani, M., Pavanello, S., Carere, A., Marcon, F., Marhni, A., Baccola, T.P., Tomao, E. &Zijno, A. (2011). Environmental and biological monitoring traffic warden from the city of Rome. *Society of Occupational Medicine*. 51(3), 198-203.