Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Determinants of Workplace Safety Climate in Iron and Steel Industries in Tanzania

Saumu Shabani
Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences
Bente Elisabeth Moen
bente.moen@uib.no
University of Bergen
Teferi Abegaz
Addis Ababa University
Simon Henry Mamuya
Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences

Research Article

Keywords:

Posted Date: November 11th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-11371928/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Title

Determinants of Workplace Safety Climate in Iron and Steel Industries in Tanzania

Authors

Saumu Shabani[1], Bente Elisabeth Moen[2*], Teferi Abegaz[3] and Simon Henry Mamuya[1]

Author affiliations

1. Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, School of Public Health and Social Sciences, Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
2. Department of Global Public Health and Primary Care, Centre for International Health, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
3. Department of Preventive Medicine, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

***Corresponding author**

Correspondence to Bente Elisabeth Moen, bente.moen@uib.no, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

Abstract

Introduction Safety climate has been associated with several workplace safety outcomes. However, limited research has examined its determinants. Understanding these determinants is essential for developing and implementing effective safety improvement strategies. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the relationship between workplace safety climate and selected sociodemographic and organizational factors in the iron and steel industry in Tanzania**.**

Methods A cross-sectional study was conducted in four iron and steel industrial sites in Tanzania. Three hundred and twenty-one workers from the production lines participated. Data were collected through interviews using the Swahili version of the Nordic Safety Climate Questionnaire (NOSACQ-50- Kiswahili). Regression analyses were used to identify determinants of safety climate.

Results Most workers (80,4%) reported a low level of safety climate. Workers with more than four years of experience (adjusted odds ratio 2.22, and 95 percent confidence interval 1.04-4.72) and those who had received on-the- job safety training (adjusted odds ratio 2.12, and 95 percent confidence interval1.02-4.42) were significantly more likely to report a positive safety climate in the iron and steel industry.

Conclusions This study indicates that work experience and on-the-job training are determinants of safety climate in the iron and steel industry. Organizations should prioritize comprehensive on-the-job training, particularly during employee induction, to ensure that recruits acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to recognize workplace hazards, comply with safety procedures, and understand their responsibility for maintaining a safe work environment.

1 Introduction

The iron and steel industry is a significant sector in the economic development of any country. Steel is a fundamental material in many industrial sectors [1]. Steel is essential for infrastructure development, including bridges, railways, and highways, as well as for the manufacture of heavy machinery and tools. The continuous demand for raw materials and the distribution of finished steel products also stimulate the expansion of other industries, including mining, energy, and logistics.

Occupational accidents are a significant challenge across the iron and steel industries worldwide, resulting in injuries and fatalities among workers, property damage, and productivity losses. Studies reveal a high burden of occupational injuries among workers in the iron and steel industry, with the prevalence ranging from 55% to 76.33% [2–4]. The evidence from previous studies suggests that the occurrence of occupational injuries is associated with workplace factors such as use of personal protective equipment (PPE), night shift work, and long working hours) [2, 3], as well as individual factors (work experience, education, and marital status) [4]. Reducing the occurrence of occupational injuries in the iron and steel industry remains a critical priority due to the substantial human, social, and economic consequences associated with workplace accidents. To achieve this, it is important to understand which factors are relevant for increasing safety at these workplaces

Safety climate refers to the shared perceptions of employees of how safety is prioritized, valued, and enforced within an organization at a given point in time. Safety climate can be used to proactively assess an organization's effectiveness in identifying and mitigating work-related hazards. It reflects the current condition of safety in the workplace and may in turn, assist in preventing the occurrence and recurrence of occupational injuries. The expression ’safety climate’ is a multi-layered construct influenced by organizational, managerial, and individual factors [5]. These factors shape the worker’s perception of safety in the workplace. Recent studies have highlighted the contribution of the workers’ perception of organizational commitment to safety (safety climate) in shaping the safety behaviour and the occurrence of occupational injuries [5–8]. These findings suggest that a positive safety climate is associated with favorable safety outcomes, including higher levels of safety compliance and safety participation

among employees, as well as lower rates of occupational accidents and injuries. Conversely, a poor safety climate is often associated with adverse safety outcomes, such as increased unsafe behaviors, higher accident rates, and a greater likelihood of work-related injuries. However, although the relationship between safety climate and safety outcomes has been extensively documented, the factors that contribute to the development and maintenance of a positive safety climate remain insufficiently understood. Specifically, a greater attention is needed to understand how organizational and personal factors interact to shape the employees' perceptions of the safety climate in each workplace. While organizational factors provide the conditions and context in which safety perceptions are developed, personal factors may influence how employees interpret these conditions and perceive the effectiveness and importance of the safety measures implemented in the workplace. The organization may have a comprehensive safety policy, consistently provide training to the workers, and an effective contractual employment system. The employees who are exposed to and engaged in these organization's practices are more likely to develop a positive safety climate. This relationship is, for instance, supported by the evidence from a study conducted in Taiwan, where the trained employees had higher perceptions across all five safety climate dimensions than untrained employees [6]. However, the workers' perception of the safety climate can also be affected by personal factors, such as education and work experience [7]. Studies have shown that workers with a high educational level, particularly high school education or above, scored higher in safety climate [8,9]. Similarly, employees in large industries with work experience above five years scored a higher safety climate [7, 10]. However, other studies have shown other results, indicating that employees with more than 15 years of work experience had lower scores of safety climate variables, suggesting that the relationship between work experience and safety climate may vary according to organizational and industrial contexts [11,12]. Employees with less than 5 years of experience in small and medium-sized industries had lower perceptions across various safety climate factors [7]. These results are contradictory, and to perform new studies, assessing both organizational and personal characteristics is important for identifying the factors that strengthen or hinder the development of a positive safety climate.

A previous study conducted in the iron and steel industry reported a relatively low level of safety climate, and this finding was associated with a higher occurrence of occupational injuries [13]. Although such evidence highlights the importance of safety climate in influencing workplace safety outcomes, it does not identify the specific factors that contribute to the development and maintenance of a positive safety climate. Consequently, there remains a need to investigate the determinants of safety climate to identify the factors that can be targeted through safety interventions. Understanding these determinants is essential for the design and implementation of effective safety improvement strategies. Without a clear understanding of the factors that influence safety climate, efforts to enhance workplace safety may lack direction and fail to address the underlying causes of poor safety performance. Therefore, examining the determinants of safety climate is a critical step toward developing evidence-based interventions that promote a positive safety environment and ultimately improve workplace safety outcomes.

This study is part of a larger study with previous publications assessing occupational health and safety practices [14], occupational injuries [3], and safety climate in the iron and steel industry in Tanzania [13]. Based on these previous studies, we hypothesize that socio-demographic factors and organizational factors are possible determinants of safety climate. Therefore, this present study aims to examine the relationship between safety climate and sociodemographic factors and organizational factors in the iron and steel industry. The findings are expected to generate practical insights for both the industry and policymakers in occupational health in designing effective interventions to improve workplace safety and prevent occupational injuries.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study design and population

A cross-sectional study was conducted in four iron and steel industries based in Dar es Salaam and the Pwani areas of Tanzania from July 2022 to September 2023. Four industries were selected from the Tanzanian Occupational Safety and Health Authority (OSHA) registry. Two industries were from Dar es Salaam and two from Pwani.

The four industries have similar manufacturing processes but differ in terms of industrial size and age. The number of employees in these industries ranged from 76 to 165. Industry B had fewer employees than the others and industry D had the highest number of employees. The industries were established in the period 1994 -2013, and industry B was the oldest and industry C was the most recently established.

2.2 Sample size

The required sample size was determined using OpenEpi, version 3, with a total population size of 1,000 workers used to apply the finite population correction (FPC) factor. The hypothesized percentage (%) frequency of the outcome factor (occupational injury) in the population was 33%, according to the study of work-related injuries and associated risk factors among iron and steel industry workers in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia [15]. The sample size confidence interval (CI) was 95%. The calculated sample size was n = 381, with a significance level of 0.05 and a statistical power of 85.

2.3 Selection of participants

Eligibility for this study required being a worker employed permanently or temporarily in the iron or steel industries with at least twelve months of work experience and aged 18 years or more. The total sample size of 381 was proportionally distributed according to the number of workers in the production line of each of the four factories. Industry A had 125 workers in the production line, and we randomly selected 99 participants from this group. Similarly, Industry B had 76 production workers, and 60 workers were selected; Industry C had 116 production workers, and 92 were selected; Industry D had 165 workers, and 130 were selected.

2.4. Data collection tools

2.4.1 Socio-demographic and organizational questions

A structured questionnaire was used to collect information on selected socio-demographic and organizational characteristics of the workers. Socio-demographic variables included age (years), marital status (married/ never married), education level (never being in school/ primary school/ secondary school and above), and work

experience (1-4 years / more than 4 years). Organizational factors included Industry (A, B, C, or D) job condition (permanent/temporary), work section (furnace/ rolling mills), working hours per day (less than 10 hours or 10 hours and above), shift work (yes/no), the presence of a written occupational health and safety policy in the workplace (yes/no), and the availability of on-the-job training (yes/no). On-the-job training is a learning process in which employees acquire job-related knowledge, practical skills, and competencies through direct experience, observation, and safe performance of tasks in their actual work environment.

2.4.2 Safety Climate questions

The Nordic Safety Climate Questionnaire (NOSACQ-50) was used to measure the safety climate conditions in the iron and steel industry. The tool has been validated for use in 54 different languages, including Kiswahili [16]. This validated tool consists of seven safety climate dimensions, comprising 50 items. Of these, 22 items evaluate safety at the management level, and 28 items at the worker's level. The seven dimensions include 22 items dealing with three managerial dimensions: 'management safety priority and ability' (9 items, of which four are negated or reversed); 'safety empowerment' (7 items, 2 negated); and 'safety justice' (6 items, 2 negated). The remaining 28 items deal with the workers' dimensions: 'safety commitment' (6 items, 3 negated); 'safety priority and risk non-acceptance' (7 items, 6 negated); 'peer safety communication, learning, and trust in safety ability' (8 items, 1 negated); and 'trust in the efficacy of safety systems' (7 items, 3 negated). A four-point scale was used for rating each statement, using the terms strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree, which correspond to a 1–4 rating scale for positively formulated statements, and 4–1 rating scale for the reversed statements. A mean score was calculated for each dimension per participant. The individual mean scores were calculated as the number of positive and reversed responses divided by the number of answered questions. After calculating the individual mean score, we calculated the total mean for the population for each of the 7 dimensions as a 'mean of the mean'. Based on the criteria for interpreting the safety climate dimension scores, a score greater than 3.30 indicates that the safety climate level at the workplace is good. Safety climate dimension scores

between 3 and 3.30 are considered fairly good, with a slight need for improvement. Safety climate scores between 2.99 and 2.70 are considered fairly low, with need for improvement, and a score less than 2.7 indicates a low safety climate level with a great need for improvement [17,18]. In our study, we adapted the Kiswahili version of the Nordic Safety Climate Questionnaire (NOSACQ-50), available on the website, and we combined good and fairly good as a safety climate 'good score' and fairly low and low as a safety climate 'low. This means that a score greater than or equal to 3 represents a Good safety climate, while a score less than or equal to 2.99 represents a Low safety climate.

2.5 Pretesting

A pre-test was done in another industry that was not participating in the present study before the main study was performed. The pre-test was conducted for the whole questionnaire, among 20 workers from another factory not participating in the present study. A few minor corrections to the questionnaire were made afterwards, as some questions needed clarification, and we needed to use more words for the explanations.

2.6 Data collection procedures

A research assistant with a bachelor's degree in sociology, who had experience with data collection, was trained to collect the data by interviewing each worker. Prior to the interviews, all study participants had provided written informed consent to take part in the study. The paper-based interviews took place at the worksite, in a private room. The data collector reported and discussed the data collected daily with the principal investigator during the whole data collection period. Each interview session took on average 15 to 20 min.

2.7 Data analysis

The collected data were cleaned, coded, entered, and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 27. Univariate logistic regression was conducted by including the dependent variable, which is safety climate (Good or Low), and independent variables were age group, education level, marital status, work

experience, job condition, work section, working hours, work shift, safety policy, on-the-job training, and industry. Multivariate analysis was conducted by including variables with a *P*- value less than 0.2 in the univariate analyses: Work experience, working hours, job training, industry, and presence of safety policy. In addition, potential confounders (age group, education level, marital status) were included. Statistical significance was defined as a *P*-value less than or equal to 0.05.

3 Results

3.1 Description of study participants

Of 381 invited workers, 321 (84%) participated in the study. Among the four industries, industry A had the largest representation of participants (31%), and industry B had the lowest number of workers (19%). All participants were male, with a mean age of 32 (±8) years. Most workers had completed secondary education (53%). The majority worked in rolling mills (56.7%). The work experience of the workers was less or equal to four years among 76.3%. Many of the iron and steel workers (76%) worked for more than 10 hours per day. Most workers (80.4%) reported a low level of safety climate (Table 1)

Table 1 Characteristics among 321 workers in the iron and steel industries.

Variable	Counts (no)	Percentage (%)
Socio-demographic factors		
Age (years)		
18-30	179	56
31-44	107	33
≥45	35	11
Education		
Never being in school	19	5.9
Primary school	133	41.4
Secondary school and above	169	52.6
Marital status		
Never married	83	25.9
Married	238	74.1
Work years (experience)		
1-4years	245	76.3
> 4years	76	23.7
Organizational factors		
Job condition		
Permanent	286	89.1
Temporary	35	10.9
Work section		
Furnace	139	43.3
Rolling mills	182	56.7
Working hours		
≤10 hours	77	24
> 10 hours	244	76
Shift work		
Yes	184	57.3
No	137	42.7
Presence of safety policy		
Yes	133	41.4
No	188	58. 6
On-the-job training		
Yes	119	30.1
No	202	69.9
Industry		
A	99	31
B	60	19
C	92	29
D	70	21
Safety climate		
Good	63	19.6
Low	258	80.4

Table 2 Association between safety climate and socio-demographic factors, work organization factors, and safety management factors among workers in the production line of the iron and steel industries

Variable	Category	Safety climate		COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)
		Good n (%)	Low n (%)		
Age	18-30 yrs	35 (19.6)	144 (80.4)	1	1
	31-44 yrs	19 (17.8)	88 (82.2)	0.88 (0.48-1.65)	0.69 (0.34-1.39)
	>=45 yrs	9 (25.7)	26 (74.3)	1.42 (0.61-3.31)	0.66 (0.24-1.85)
Marital status	Never married	13 (15.7)	70 (84.3)	1	1
	Ever married	50 (21.0)	188 (79.0)	1.43 (0.73-2.80)	0.69 (0.32-1.45)
Education	Never being in school	1 (5.3)	18 (94.7)	1	1
	Primary (1-7)	32 (24.1)	101 (75.9)	5.70 (0.73-44.4)	5.78 (0.72-46.23)
	Secondary and above	30 (17.8)	139 (82.2)	3.88 (0.50-30.2)	5.40 (0.67-43.69)
Job condition	Permanent	60 (21.0)	226 (79.0)	2.83 (0.84-9.57)	2.75 (0.76-9.99)
	Temporary	3 (8.6)	32 (91.4)	1	1
Work experience	<4 yrs	37 (15.1)	208 (84.9)	1	1
	>=4 yrs	26 (34.2)	50 (65.8)	2.92 (1.62-4.21)***	2.22 (1.04-4.72)*
Presence of safety policy	Yes	43 (20.5)	167 (79.5)	0.85 (0.47-1.54)	0.76 (0.40-1.46)
	No	20 (18.0)	91 (82.0)	1	1
On-the-Job training	Yes	42 (20.8)	160 (79.2)	1.23 (0.69-2.19)	2.12 (1.02-4.42)*
	No	21 (17.6)	98 (82.4)	1	1
Industry	A	12 (12.1)	87 (87.9)	1	1
	B	18 (30.0)	42 (70.0)	3.11(1.37-7.04)**	2.75 (0.95-8.01)
	C	18 (19.6)	74 (80.4)	1.76 (0.80-3.90)	1.26 (0.51-3.10)
	D	15 (21.4)	55 (78.6)	1.98 (0.86-4.54)	2.02 (0.82-4.97)
Working hours	< 10 hours	19 (24.7)	58 (75.3)	1	1
	>=10 hours	44 (18.0)	200 (82.0)	1.49 (0.81-2.75)	1.44 (0.77-2.70)
Shift work	Yes	33 (17.9)	151 (82.1)	1	1
	No	30 (21.9)	107 (78.1)	1.28 (0.74-2.23)	1.43 (0.78-2.64)

COR = Crude odds ratio, AOR=odds ratio adjusted, for marital status, education, work experience, job condition, working hours, and industry. 95% CI = 95% confidence interval.

* *P*<=0.05, ** *P*<=0.01, *** *P*<=0.001

3.2 The determinants of safety climate

In a crude regression analysis, employees with ≥4 years of work experience were significantly more likely to report a positive safety climate score than those with less experience (COR = 2.92, 95% CI: 1.62-4.21). Similarly, employees working in Industry B

were significantly more likely to report a positive safety climate score compared with those working in the reference industry (COR = 3.11, 95% CI: 1.37-7.04) (Table 2).
However, after adjustment for potential confounders in a multivariable logistic regression analysis, work experience (AOR = 2.22, 95% CI 1.04-4.72) and job training (AOR = 2.12, 95% CI 1.02-4.42) were the significant determinants of safety climate in the iron and steel industry (Table 2).

4 Discussion

In this study, we found that work experience and job training are determinants of the safety climate in the iron and steel industry. Workers with 4 years or more of work experience had 2.2 times higher odds of reporting a good safety climate compared to those with 1-4 years of experience.
This finding is consistent with several previous studies, which have shown that workers with greater work experience report a more positive safety climate compared to their less experienced counterparts. For example, a study conducted in Ghana reported that workers with 11–15 years of work experience and those with more than 15 years of experience reported a more positive perception of management's commitment to safety and expressed greater confidence in the effectiveness of existing safety programs. In contrast, workers with only1–12 months of experience expressed less favorable perceptions of the safety climate [19]. Similarly, a study conducted among workers involved in a high-rise building project in Pakistan reported that workers who had more than 5 years of service in the current company had significantly higher safety climate scores than those with less than one year of work experience [11]. The consistency of these findings across different occupational settings implies that the relationship between work experience and safety climate may not be unique to the iron and steel industry. Rather, it may reflect a broader occupational phenomenon in which workers with more experience, as a result of prolonged exposure to the work environment, develop a better understanding of the workplace hazards [20] as well as greater familiarity with existing safety policies, procedures and practices. Longer work experience also provides opportunities to strengthen safety knowledge through training and practical experience. In contrast, less experienced workers have limited familiarity

with the workplace environment, which may affect their ability to identify and manage workplace hazards [21–23]. Less experienced workers are also likely to have received less support from supervisors and colleagues during their early years of employment.[24]. These situations altogether may lead to a lower perception of the organizational safety climate.

However, findings from previous studies are not entirely consistent. A study conducted in India reported differences in safety climate perceptions across levels of work experience; however, the pattern was not sufficiently clear to support a definitive association between longer work experience and more favorable safety climate perceptions. Specifically, it remained unclear whether employees with longer work experience had more or less favorable perceptions of the safety climate [12].

In contrast, a study conducted in chemical manufacturing industries in Malaysia found that employees with more than 15 years of work experience reported less favorable perceptions across several safety climate dimensions, including safety rules, the work environment, safety priority, and safety training, particularly in large industries [7]. These findings suggest that the relationship between work experience and safety climate is likely complex rather than linear and may be influenced by organizational characteristics, industry context, and working conditions.

Regarding on-the-job training, the findings revealed that employees who received job training had 2.12 times higher odds of reporting a good safety climate compared with those who had not received any training. This finding is consistent with several studies; for instance, a study from the West Azerbaijan province in Iran investigated safety climate in 3 manufacturing companies certified by the Occupational Health and Safety Assessment Series OHSAS 1800, and 3 uncertified companies. In this study, employees who had received safety training reported a better perception of the safety climate than those who had not received any safety training [25]. In a study from the West Java Region, workers from fuel stations with training experience reported a significantly higher level of safety perception across all seven dimensions [26]**.** Also, our present findings are supported by results of an Iranian study examining the effect of safety training intervention on safety climate among operational staff at an oil and gas company [27]. The study reported a significant improvement in employees' perception of

the safety climate following an educational intervention of safety training compared to a pre-intervention safety climate assessment [27]. These findings can be explained by considering that the provision of training at the workplace might demonstrate how the workplace places importance on protecting workers and provides them with the skills that are essential in performing their tasks. Through training, workers become more aware of management's safety expectations and will be better equipped to recognize and respond to potential hazards.

Our findings revealed no statistically significant difference in safety climate related to marital status, which is consistent with studies conducted among nurses working in Zabol hospitals [28], and among workers on a construction project in Southern Africa (South Africa and Zimbabwe [29].

We found no significant association between safety climate and educational level. This finding is consistent with previous studies conducted for instance, among healthcare workers in Norwegian home health nursing [30], and workers in a power distribution company in Iran [31], which both reported no significant association between educational level and safety climate. A possible explanation is that educational attainment may not necessarily translate into differences in employees' perceptions of workplace safety. Safety climate is likely to be influenced by factors such as communication, leadership commitment, employee involvement, and the implementation of safety measures, which may affect workers regardless of their educational background.

In the case of job condition, no statistically significant difference in safety climate was observed between workers employed on temporary contracts and permanent contracts. This finding is consistent with a study done in Ireland, where permanent and contingent workers did not significantly differ in safety climate perception [32] This means that differences in employment arrangements do not necessarily influence safety climate perceptions when workers operate within the same organizational safety system. Permanent and temporary workers may be subject to the same safety policies, procedures, and practices, which may contribute to similar perceptions of safety climate. Furthermore, we found there is no statistically significant association between shift workers and those workers with no shift (daytime workers) on the safety climate, the

finding is consistent with the study conducted among workers in two chemical companies in Sweden [33]. The findings can be explained by the fact that the work schedule alone may not substantially influence the worker's perception of safety climate.

Based on findings from this study, organizations should prioritize comprehensive on-the-job training, particularly during employee induction, to ensure that new recruits acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to recognize workplace hazards, comply with safety procedures, and understand their responsibility for maintaining a safe work environment. Structured mentoring, embedded with orientation, close supervision, and practical safety guidance, may help familiarize new workers with workplace safety expectations and organizational safety practices. Regular interaction with experienced workers may also provide opportunities for clarification, feedback, and discussion of safety concerns. These efforts are particularly relevant in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), including Tanzania, where new employees and less experienced workers may face limited access to formal occupational safety and health training and may be employed with limited work experience.

Therefore, future research in Tanzania and other LMICs should evaluate contextually appropriate interventions targeting less experienced workers, such as structured mentoring and practical safety training. Intervention studies should assess not only changes in safety knowledge and compliance with occupational health and safety practices but also their effects on safety climate and workplace injuries. Evidence from such research could help identify cost-effective and sustainable approaches that can be adapted across different sectors and settings within Tanzania and potentially applied in other LMICs with similar occupational health and safety challenges.

The response rate in this study was high, as the workers were generally willing to cooperate. However, the study has some limitations. Because a cross-sectional design was employed, we cannot obtain causal relationships between safety climate and the determinants. Due to this limitation, regression analyses were performed to study associations between the safety climate and different variables. Future studies in this area should adopt a longitudinal study design to better capture temporal relationships between safety climate and other variables.

In our present study, data were collected through self-reports, which may introduce information bias due to recall inaccuracies or misreporting. However, the study used a validated instrument to assess the safety climate, the Kiswahili version of the NOSACQ 50. This method increases the validity of our findings. Another potential source of bias was social desirability, as the workers might have hesitated to provide truthful responses due to concern that management would be informed. To address this, interviews were conducted in a private room by a trained research assistant. The participants were assured confidentiality and anonymity in reporting.

5 Conclusions

This study indicates that working for more than 4 years (experience) and receiving on-the- job training are the main determinants of the safety climate in the iron and steel industries. Employers should strengthen workplace safety by implementing comprehensive on-the -job training for newly recruited and less experienced employees. This training could be complemented by structured mentorship programs that pair inexperienced workers with experienced employees to facilitate the transfer of practical knowledge and safe work practices.

Abbreviations

AOR	Adjusted Odds Ratio
CI	Confidence Interval
COR	Crude Odds Ratio
FPC	Finite Population Correction
NOSACQ-50	Nordic Safety Climate Questionnaire
OHS	Occupational Health and Safety
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Authority
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for the help we received from Mr Matiku and Dr. Materu from OSHA, their support and cooperation were invaluable. We sincerely thank the Management team and the health and safety officers in the participating factories of the iron and steel industries, and all the workers who consented to participate in this study.

Author contributions

SS conceived the study, was responsible for the study design, data collection, analysis, and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. SHM conceived the study, reviewed the proposal, supervised data collection and analysis, and reviewed the manuscript, BEM reviewed the proposal, supervised analyses of data, and reviewed the manuscript, TA supervised and assisted in analyses of data, and reviewed the manuscript. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are not openly available due to restrictions from the ethical committee, but are available upon reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethical approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Science Institutional Review Board on 31/03/2022 with approval number MUHAS-REC-03-2022-1061. All participants gave their written consent before the interview was performed, and confidentiality regarding their information was underlined. The study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Funding

This research was funded by the Norwegian Programme for Capacity Development in Higher Education and Research for Development (NORHED II—SAFEWORKERS Project), grant number: 69181.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Omole SO. The Role of Iron and Steel in Economic Development of a Nation. Mater Sci Forum. 2026;1178:29–33.

2. Shabani S, Mamuya SH, Moen BE. The prevalence of occupational injuries and associated risk factors among workers in the iron and steel industries : a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Public Health. 2024;24:1–12.

3. Shabani S, Moen BE, Deressa W, Mamuya SH. Prevalence of occupational injuries among workers in the iron and steel industries in Tanzania. Ann Glob Health. 2025;91:9.

4. Parimita P, Debata I, Nayak S, Behera BK. Work-related injuries and stress among iron and steel fabrication workers in Bhubaneswar, Odisha: A cross-sectional study. Int J Occup Safety Health. 2024;14:522–32.

5. Luo T. Safety climate: Current status of the research and future prospects. J Saf Sci Resil. 2020;1:106–19.

6. Wu T-C, Liu C-W, Lu M-C. Safety climate in university and college laboratories: Impact of organizational and individual factors. J Safety Res. 2007;38:91–102.

7. Saedi AM, Majid AA, Isa Z. Evaluation of safety climate differences among employees' demographic variables: a cross-sectional study in two different-sized

manufacturing industries in Malaysia. Int J Occup Saf Ergon. 2021;27:714–27.

8. He C, Hu Z, Shen Y, Wu C. Effects of demographic characteristics on safety climate and construction worker safety behavior. Sustainability. 2023;15:10985.

9. Meng X, Chan AHS. Cross-regional research in demographic impact on safety consciousness and safety citizenship behavior of construction workers: A comparative study between mainland China and Hong Kong. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19:12799.

10. Esseh SS, Ry-Kottoh LA, Denyo MM. Safety climate in the Ghanaian printing industry. PLoS One. 2022;17:e0278100.

11. Zahoor H, Khan RM, Ali B, Maqsoom A, Mazher KM, Ullah F. Diverse impact of sensitive sub-categories of demographic variables on safety climate of high-rise building projects. Architecture. 2022;2:175–95.

12. Vinodkumar MN, Bhasi M. Safety climate factors and its relationship with accidents and personal attributes in the chemical industry. Saf Sci. 2009;47:659–67.

13. Shabani S, Moen BE, Abegaz T, Mamuya SH. Safety Climate and Occupational Injuries in the Iron and Steel Industries in Tanzania. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2025;22:1372.

14. Shabani S, Moen BE, Deressa W, Mamuya SH. Occupational Health and Safety Practices in Relation to Occupational Injuries Among Iron and Steel Workers. Safety. 2026;12:101.

15. Kifle M, Engdaw D, Alemu K, Sharma HR, Amsalu S, Feleke A, et al. Work related injuries and associated risk factors among iron and steel industries workers in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Saf Sci. 2014;63:211–6.

16. Environment NRC for the W. Safety Climate Questionnaire - NOSACQ-50 [Internet]. Natl. Res. Cent. Work. Environ. 2011 [accessed 2026 Oct 13]. Available from: https://nfa.dk/vaerktoejer/spoergeskemaer/safety-climate-questionnaire-nosacq-50

17. (NFA) NRC for the WE. Interpreting the Nordic Occupational Safety Climate

Questionnaire NOSACQ-50 results. [accessed 2026 Oct 13]. Available from: https://nfa.dk/vaerktoejer/spoergeskemaer/safety-climate-questionnaire-nosacq-50/how-to-use-the-nordic-occupational-safety-climate-questionnaire-nosacq-50/interpreting-the-nordic-occupational-safety-climate-questionnaire-nosacq-50-results/#:~:text=The%20results%20of%20the%20NOSACQ-50%20reflect%20the%20participants%27,a%20%27snapshot%27%20of%20conditions%20that%20can%20easily%20change.

18. Kines P, Lappalainen J, Mikkelsen KL, Olsen E, Pousette A, Tharaldsen J, Tomasson K, Törner M. Nordic occupational safety climate questionnaire. NOSACQ-50. J Ergon. 2011;41:634-646.

19. Ayim Gyekye S, Salminen S. Organizational safety climate and work experience. Int J Occup Saf Ergon. 2010;16:431–43.

20. Tadesse S, Bezabih K, Destaw B, Assefa Y. Awareness of occupational hazards and associated factors among welders in Lideta Sub-City, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. J Occup Med Toxicol. 2016;11:15.

21. Haas EJ, Eiter B, Hoebbel C, Ryan ME. The impact of job, site, and industry experience on worker health and safety. Safety. 2019;5:16.

22. Eiter BM, Bellanca JL, Helfrich W, Orr TJ, Hrica J, Macdonald B, et al. Recognizing mine site hazards: identifying differences in hazard recognition ability for experienced and new mineworkers. International Conference Appl Hum Factors Ergon. 2017;104–15.

23. Eiter BM, Bellanca JL. Identify the influence of risk attitude, work experience, and safety training on hazard recognition in mining. Mining Metal Explor. 2020;37:1931–9.

24. Liu P, Zhang Y, Ji Y, Wu S. Threat upon entry: effect of coworker ostracism on newcomers' proactive behaviors during organizational socialization. Front Psychol. 2021;12:545478.

25. Ghahramani A. An investigation of safety climate in OHSAS 18001-certified and non-certified organizations. Int J Occup Saf Ergon. 2016;22:414–21.

26. Wibowo A, Lestari F, Modjo R. Safety climate assessment in fuel stations in the West Java Region. Safety. 2023;9:9.

27. Omidi N, Jafari EM, Omidi MR. The effect of safety training intervention on safety climate among the operational staff of west oil and gas company. Health in Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly. 2021; 7(1):15-20.

28. Poursadeqiyan M, Arefi MF, Khaleghi S, Moghaddam AS, Mazloumi E, Raei M, et al. Investigation of the relationship between the safety climate and occupational fatigue among the nurses of educational hospitals in Zabol. J Educ Health Promot. 2020;9:238.

29. Muzira T. Assessing the influence of demographic factors on safety climate in construction projects: Perspectives from Southern Africa. Open J Saf Sci Technol. 2024;14:147–56.

30. Olsen RM, Bjerkan J. Patient safety culture in Norwegian home health nursing: A cross-sectional study of healthcare provider's perceptions of the teamwork and safety climates. Safety in Health. 2017;3:15.

31. Kiani M, Asgari M, Abbas Gohari F, Rezvani Z. Safety climate assessment: a survey in an electric power distribution company. Int J Occup Saf Ergon. 2022;28:709–15.

32. Leitao S, Greiner BA. Safety climate in permanent and contingent workers - The link with occupational accidents and injuries. In: Sacré M (Ed). Safety Culture, Nova Science Publishers, Inc., New York 2019:49-80.

33. Bergh M, Shahriari M, Kines P. Occupational safety climate and shift work. Chem Eng Trans. 2013;31:403-408.