MANAGEMENT CAPABILITIES AND PERSONAL SAFETY OF EMPLOYEES IN FEDERAL ROAD SAFETY CORPS (FRSC), LAGOS STATE

Olufemi Adewale Ogunkoya
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria
ogunkoya.olufemi@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng

Received: September 2021
1st Revision: November, 2022
Accepted: November, 2022

ABSTRACT. This research investigates management capabilities and the personal safety of employees. This study's objective is to look into the managerial role in employee safety and also explore the influence of employee commitment on personal safety using the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC) as a case theatre. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design because it's suitable for both qualitative and quantitative methods with fewer challenges. The population of this study comprised all staff of the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC), Lagos State with the use of a primary source of data. Results of this study have revealed that in the FRSC, there was an established significant and positive effect of the managerial role on employee safety (β = .314, Sig. = .001, P<0.05). Also, it further revealed that there was a significant positive effect of employee commitment on personal safety (β = .770, Sig. = .003, P<0.05). The study concluded that management capabilities are a fundamental aspect that any organization that seeks to achieve the best from its employees should aim towards. The study therefore recommends that the management should be more inclusive in allowing younger staff members of the Federal Road Safety Corp to contribute their ideas toward employee personal safety

Keywords: *Management Capabilities, Personal Safety, Managerial Role, Employee Commitment, FRSC*

DOI: 10.54933/jmbrp-2023-15-2-2

Ogunkoya, O. A. (2023). Management Capabilities and Personal Safety of Employees in Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC), Lagos State. Journal of Management and Business: Research and Practice, 15(2). doi: 10.54933/jmbrp-2023-15-2-2

Introduction

Understanding the uncertainties of a dynamic environment as well as competing in the ever-changing environment depend heavily on an organization's management capabilities. Human, technological, and intellectual capabilities make up management capabilities (Jasen & Koren, 2018). To succeed as an organization and gain a competitive advantage, management skills are more important resources (Carmeli & Azeroual, 2019). According to Zahra, Sapienza, and Davidson (2016), the importance of managerial aptitude has been emphasized as essential for firm performance. Developing and deploying dynamic capabilities is made possible by several key capabilities, including the managerial one. According to Gonul, Murat and Dilek (2019), a dynamic environment necessitates constant modification and redesign of what businesses do to keep up with the environment's shifting demands.

Management should give top priority to employee safety programs because they save lives, boost output, and cut costs. These health and safety programs ought to emphasize employee participation, ongoing observation, and a focus on overall wellness (Tahira, Laura, Claudio & Lindsey, 2016). Workplace safety demands that there shouldn't be a significant risk that employees will become unable to perform their jobs. Accordingly, the goal of workplace safety is to establish the conditions, skills, and behaviors that will allow the workforce and the employee's organization to be able to carry out their tasks effectively while avoiding incidents that could endanger them (Tahira, Laura, Claudio & Lindsey, 2020). It is obvious that secure working conditions possess an impact on employees' habits, which in turn has an impact on productivity. This suggests that workers who are in a safe environment are more favourably and likely to act in a manner that cannot harm them.

To achieve alignment between an organization's competencies and the shifting demands of its environment, management capabilities are essential. Greater technical, human, and conceptual skills are combined in these capabilities to not only build but also integrate and then reconfigure the organization's valuable resources and competencies. However, one of the major assets of an organization is its employees. The safety and well-being of employees in an organization should be the paramount concern of the management. Given that workers are frequently exposed to risks like verbal and physical abuse, workplace health is increasingly becoming a top priority in many manufacturing companies (Hamdan, 2017). Many workplaces contain sources of hazardous substances that can expose workers to them through inhalation, absorption through the skin, splashes in the eyes, and other ways (Hamdan, 2017). Slipping on chemicals or liquid substances is usually one of the most frequent causes of work-related damage and injuries. A musculoskeletal disorder is yet another element that negatively impacts workers (Chanchai, 2016). Typically, this includes harm caused by manual handling. According to Onda, LoBuglio, and Bartram (2012), the employer is primarily responsible for protecting employees from any one or more health risks that could endanger their safety and health. Since the major objective of business is to make a profit and maximize shareholders' interest, organizational management must take cognizance of the safety of its employees by making the workplace conducive and reducing hazard risk to the barest minimum.

The significance of this study cannot be overemphasized. This study will be a vital tool to the management of the Federal Road Safety Corps on the importance of effective management capabilities and the benefits of taking good care of employee safety. The study will offer direction to the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC) employees and management at various levels, as well as to those working in related fields. Additionally, there aren't enough studies in the study area looking at management skills and worker personal safety. The management will receive recommendations from this study for further implementation, and it will provide a better understanding of the working conditions at the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC). The study will also be helpful to the government in formulating policy. The study will also advance future investigations into human resource management. This study will be very helpful to researchers who want to conduct studies on management skills and personal safety.

Theoretical background

Concept of Managerial Capabilities

A new era in management regarding how businesses compete as well as achieve a sound competitive advantage, especially in a non-predictable and rapidly changing environment has begun with the emerging concept of managerial capabilities. Since Teece first proposed the idea of dynamic capabilities in the 1990s, there have been numerous scholarly discussions and investigations about its significance, function, range, and results. According to Teece (2017), managerial capabilities refer to a company's capacity to develop, integrate, and reorganize its resource base in response to a rapidly and unpredictably changing business environment. This definition sparked some debate that resulted in various interpretations of what exactly dynamic capabilities are, how they are developed, and what they can do for businesses. According to some academics (Zollo & Winter, 2018), the definition of "dynamic capability" is ambiguous.

Di Stefano et al., (2017) noted that the definition is the challenging problem at the heart of the debate over managerial capabilities. The focus of several authors on the results of managerial abilities has broadened the concept's horizons and increased misunderstanding (Helfat & Peteraf, 2019). Numerous definitions have been put forth to explain dynamic capabilities. As a result, there isn't agreement on the definitions (Barreto, 2016). The divergence has been harmonised according to the work of Helfat and Peteraf (2019). The significance of dynamic capabilities in determining a firm's competitiveness in a changing environment is not, however, called into question by the lack of agreement. To increase the firm's competitive advantage, changing skills is fundamentally about renewing the firm's resources, according to Ambrosini, Bowman and Collier (2019). Innovation and adaptability to change have recently been highlighted as essential dynamic capabilities.

Dynamic capability has been defined by Teece, Peteraf and Leih (2016) as a firm's capacity for innovation, adaptation to change, as well as the ability to drive change. In conclusion, the renewal of the company's intangible as well as tangible assets and their alignment with the changing environment form the basis of the managerial capabilities' perspective. Management insight into the dynamic environment and foresight are needed to align the firm's resources to the changing environment.

Managerial Role and Dynamic Capabilities

There has been a lot of discussion about managers' roles in dynamic capabilities, which could give the impression that managers are the focus and concentration of dynamic capabilities. In the dynamic model, according to Augier and Teece (2019), the manager of the firm has a high, and also significant impact and effect on the firm's routines, investment choices, and asset orchestration. In a similar vein, managers' roles have begun to take on more significance in the micro-foundation of dynamic capabilities, as correctly noted by Helfat and Peteraf (2015). According to Helfat et al., (2019), comprehension of organizational and managerial processes is necessary to comprehend how firms adapt to a changing environment. Arndt (2017) added that the manager can adapt the resources to the shifting circumstances thanks to dynamic capabilities. Consequently, the top management's role is crucial to the company's commitment to dynamic capabilities.

Some academics emphasize that managers are the ones who start the process of developing dynamic capabilities. The top management, in accordance with Easterby-Smith, Lyles and Peteraf (2019), establishes the vision and starts the process that results in dynamic capabilities.

Additionally, according to Teece (2014), managers must pay attention to not only the organization's internal but also the external environments from the perspective of dynamic capabilities. While dynamic capabilities are focused on adapting to changes in the external environment, firms' internal dynamics and forces determine how well they can align themselves with that environment. According to academics, there is enough evidence in the literature to conclude that managerial effectiveness has a positive impact on performance (Anzengruber, Goetz, Nold & Woelfle, 2017).

Ambrosini et al., (2019) claim that managers' perceptions of the environment have an impact on their choices concerning dynamic capabilities. Similar to this, Barrales et al., (2016) claimed that if managers notice a high level of dynamism in the external environment, the company will decide to develop dynamic capabilities. Therefore, the successful development, organisation, and deployment of

dynamic capabilities depend on the managerial ability to understand environmental changes that affect the firm. In terms of managerial abilities and human capital, Casillas and Moreno (2017) examined managerial capability. According to other researchers (Helfat & Martin, 2015; Kor & Mesko, 2015), cognitive managerial skills, social capital, and human capital are crucial elements of managerial capability and have an impact on performance.

Variables Influencing the Commitment of Employees to Health and Safety

Workplace Environment

Many elements of a company's workplace environment appear to affect employees' commitment, which in turn affects how satisfied they are with their jobs (Amponsah-Tawiah, Ntow & Mensah, 2016). The impact of employees' perceptions of the workplace being a means of influencing employee outcomes is a crucial area of research. The workplace typically needs to accommodate the physical and mental demands of the employees. Employees are more likely to give their best effort to support the daily operations of their organization in a positive work environment. According to some studies, there is usually a nexus between specific experiential elements found in the workplace environment and employees' reactions, which can be influenced by those things that the employee notices about the conditions and situation at work (Uraon & Raya, 2017). In addition, experiential factors, like workplace accidents, can influence perceptions, which in turn serve as the foundation for broad assumptions about the organizational work environment.

Safety Factor

As a significant factor that can affect employees' commitment, safety concerns have also been identified. Employee retention may be impacted by factors such as maintenance and effective breakage repairs (Schelmetic, 2013). Any production or processing activity must be properly maintained to be successful. Offering a high-quality maintenance service and facility that you can rely on to find systematic errors and propose solid and practical solutions is one of the most important aspects of a good organization. For industrial organizations to achieve overall efficiency, maintenance management has grown in importance and significance (Telang & Telang, 2010). Inadequate maintenance can lead to hazardous cum unsafe situations, accidents, and health issues. Maintenance is a hazardous activity with numerous risks built into the very nature of the job. In all professions and workplaces, maintenance is performed. The computer's unintended malfunction could result in needless personal injury. Injury can be prevented with the help of proper equipment maintenance (Dennis, Muthu Kumaran & Balaji, 2015). However, overlooking maintenance in a business frequently results in breakdowns, which then necessitate expensive repairs and hasten the deterioration of relatively expensive equipment (Telang & Telang, 2010).

Job Stress

According to studies by Mensah and Kosi (2016); Wireko-Gyebi et al., (2017), stress is caused by a variety of pressures workloads and, including situations where work expectations cannot be met because of a lack of resources, like social assistance from supervisors, co-workers, decision-making, the use of skills, and rewards like bonuses. Workplace conditions such as fatigue, disparities in workload, positional conflicts, and uncertainty are all examples of work stress (Nouri & Soltani, 2017). Strong coping mechanisms and work dissatisfaction are also present in high-tension workers, which lowers participation in the organization and raises turnover rates (Hamdan, 2017; Huang et al., 2016). Workplace stress is a common issue across all industries. It contributes significantly to illnesses at work and other associated organizational outcomes. According to Fordjour and Chan (2019), stress is a hidden construct that denotes an increased and amplified nervous system activity state, with coordinated outcomes at the affective, cognitive, and behavioral levels. However, a sense of control over working hours can lessen tension brought on by inconsistent pay and housework demands as well as health problems related to work-related stress. Additionally, it has been demonstrated that high employee working time regulation is associated with better subjective health, lower absenteeism, and a decline in absenteeism caused by stress (Ticharwa, Cope & Murray, 2019).

Managerial Capability in an Organization

Strategic Thinking

Strategic thinking that engages the manager's cognitive abilities is necessary for managerial capability. Managers must make strategic decisions if businesses are to compete and gain a competitive advantage. Managers should be able to create a long-term plan that will support the university's

performance and expansion. According to Kearney, Harrington, and Kelliher (2017), strategic thinking influences how managers interact with their internal and external environments and enhances their managerial capability. Any organization must ensure that its management's strategic decisions and choices support the institution's expansion (Anzengruber et al., 2017). The ability of managers to think strategically is what allows them to create long-term plans for the institution.

Sensing

Managers must have the ability to be able to identify and sense these instability, alterations, and changes in the external environment for the organization to adapt to them. Managers must be aware of environmental trends, according to Teece (2017). Threats and opportunities for businesses are brought on by the changes in the external environment. According to Roberts, Campbell and Vijayasarathy (2016), managerial sensing is crucial for managers to be able to spot opportunities that will accelerate their company's growth. The tendency of managers to look for and seize opportunities is discussed (Pavlou & Sawy, 2011; Teece et al., 2017). The capacity for managerial sensing helps managers become attuned to threats and build the capacity to seize opportunities that can aid in the expansion of universities. A key managerial skill is the management's ability to identify opportunities before competitors (Teece et al., 2016).

Shared Vision

The managerial capability calls for managers to develop and communicate their team's vision. According to Garca-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo and Mihi-Ramrez (2017), the ability to share a vision is a vital one in today's knowledge-driven society. For employees to dedicate themselves to the university's strategic vision, they must fully understand it. The leadership of the university should have a distinct vision for where they want to take the institution. The managers of the university have a big responsibility to develop and communicate a vision that will help the institution deal with and adapt to rapid change. The managers want to see employees who are dedicated to pursuing their vision. Therefore, it is the managers' duty to make sure that the employees share a united and common understanding of the organization's vision. The organization's shared vision prevents division and fosters teamwork (Van Doorn, Jansen, Van Den Bosch & Volberda, 2018).

Theoretical Framework

Dynamic Capabilities Theory

Teece and Pisano's (1994) developed the theory of dynamic capabilities by building upon Barney's (1986, 1991) resource-based view (RBV) of the firm. RBV is considered a static concept that is usually insufficient to explain and justify how firms are to maintain a competitive edge in evolving markets (Priem & Butler, 2001). They posit that firms within each similar industry perform differently due to their diverse resources and capabilities (Barney, 1986, 1991; Peretaf, 1993). The RBV focuses on identifying unique and difficult-to-copy resources that give firms a competitive advantage (Barney, 1986).

Scholars have emphasized that to stay competitive, firms must develop specific capabilities and engage in continuous learning, especially in dynamic markets (Argyris & Schon, 1978; Hammer, 2001; Zott, 2003). Sustaining a competitive advantage is seen as an ongoing and dynamic process (Hung et al., 2010). Failing to cultivate dynamic capabilities, especially in a changing environment, can result in a firm losing its competitive advantage (Gnizy, Baker & Grinstein, 2014). The concept of dynamic capabilities gained prominence in the literature among international ambidexterity scholars (Prange & Verdier, 2011).

Teece, Pisano and Shuen (1997) defined and conceptualized dynamic capabilities as a firm's capacity to blend, enhance, and reconfigure both internal and external expertise to adapt to a rapidly changing environment. Dynamic capabilities have been defined in various ways by prior research. Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) describe them as the process of using existing resources to create new ones that can drive market changes. Markets evolve, emerge, split, or even disappear, and dynamic capabilities result from modifying acquired resources through combinations and reconfigurations to formulate new strategies (Grant, 1996; Pisano, 1994). In essence, dynamic capabilities are a critical factor in developing new sources of profitability, superior performance, and competitive advantage (Henderson & Cockburn, 1994; Teece et al., 1997). Scholars have suggested that dynamic capabilities can address inflexibility in a firm's capabilities and facilitate the utilization and application of knowledge (Easterby-Smith & Prieto, 2008). They also play a pivotal role in how businesses respond to change,

especially within the context of a shifting business environment (Newey & Zahra, 2009). When dynamic capabilities are rare, highly valued, unique, and irreplaceable, they not only enhance a firm's financial position but also provide a sustained competitive advantage over rivals (Ogunkoya, Hassan & Shobayo, 2014).

Methodology

The research main aim is to look into and explore the safety of employees' personal belongings and management abilities. Firstly, examining the managerial impact on employee safety is the primary goal of the specific goals, though. Secondly, explore the influence of employee commitment on personal safety.

The following questions will be answered in the course of the study; Firstly, what is the managerial role on employee safety? Secondly, does employee commitment have any influence on personal safety?

The research hypotheses tested were based on the set objectives of this study and validated in this study as follows:

H_o1: There is no significant effect of managerial role on employee safety

H_o2: There is no significant effect of employee commitment on personal safety

Due to the nature of the research, a descriptive survey research design was used for the study. Quantitative data will be obtained through primary means with the aid of structured questionnaires which will be distributed to the respondents. The study will make use of descriptive statistics as its method of analysis. All employees of the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC), Lagos State, made up the study's population. There were 507 respondents in total, making up the study's total population. The Yamane (1967) sampling model is used to determine the sample size for this study and to support its appropriateness. This sampling method makes it easier for researchers to quickly determine an appropriate sample size, especially when time and resources are limited. According to Yamane (1967), sample size can be determined using the formula below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(\alpha)^2}$$

Where: n = sample size

N = population size

α = margin of error

i.e. N = 507; α = 5% (0.05).

Hence, the sample size for the study is two hundred and twenty-four (224) respondents.

Respondents who are employees of the Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC), Lagos State, will be given questionnaires that are strictly structured to have a thorough and trustworthy source of information. The questionnaire will be split into two sections: section A will cover background information about the respondent's educational background and professional experience, and section B will include questions specific to the study.

Face and construct validity of the instrument will be ensured by the close perusal of my supervisor and other experts in the research field to scrutinize the instrument and modification will be done based on their suggestions. The Cronbach Alpha test will be used to measure internal consistency for the test-retest analysis to assess the instrument's dependability. The rule of thumb for reliability is ≥ 0.7; otherwise, the instrument is not reliable.

Results

The Simple percentage analysis was used in this study to dissect the data that were collected from the respondents. The data's descriptive statistics are displayed below:

Table I: Descriptive Statistics of the Data

Gender	***Male***	***Female***			
	53.5%	46.5%			
Age	***18-25 years***	***26-30 years***	***31-40 years***	***40 years & Above***	
	14.2%	42.6%	24.5%	18.7%	
Educational Qualification	***SSCE***	***OND/HND***	***B.Sc.***	***M.Sc.***	***Others***
	27.7%	36.1%	10.3%	8.5%	17.4%
Working Experience	***1-5 years***	***6-15 years***	***16-25 years***	***26 years & above***	
	40.7%	23.2%	36.1%	0%	
Accident Experience	***Minor***	***Major***	***Occupational Disease***	***No Accident***	
	27.7%	36.1%	10.3%	25.9%	

Source: *Researcher's Field Survey (2023)*

From Table I above, it was revealed that 53.5% of the respondents were male while 46.5% were female. This implied that the study was not gender biased because both males and females were properly represented in the study. Also, 14.2% of the total respondents were between the ages of 18-25 years, 42.6% were between the age of 26-30 years, 24.5% were between the age of 31-40 years and 18.7% were between the age of 40 years and above. In addition, 27.7% of the respondents have SSCE, 36.1% have OND/HND, 10.3% have B.Sc., 8.5% have M.Sc., and 17.4% have others. This indicated that the respondents in this study had different academic qualifications which had allowed them to participate in this study appropriately. Also, 40.7% of the respondents have 1-5 years of working experience, 23.2% of the respondents have 6-15 years of working experience, 36.1% of the respondents have 16-25 years of working experience while 0% of the respondents have 26 years and above working experience. Lastly, 27.7% of the respondents have minor accidents, 36.1% of the respondents have major accidents, 10.3% of the respondents have occupational disease and 25.9% of the respondents have no accidents.

Hypotheses Testing

Research Hypotheses One:
H_o1: There is no significant effect of managerial role on employee safety

Table II: Summary of Regression Results for the effect of Managerial Role on Employee Safety

Model Summary					
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	
1	.917[a]	.841	.834	.5146847	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Managerial Role					
ANOVA					
Model	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1 Regression	527.41	1	5227.41	42.875	.000[b]
Residual	24.35.4	124	12.300		
Total	2962.81	125			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Safety					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Managerial Role					
Coefficient					
Model	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
	β	**Std. Error**			
1 (Constant)	31.049	1.299		23.900	.000
Managerial Role	.314	0.35	.321	8.884	.001
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Safety					

Source: *Researcher's Field Survey (2023)*

The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.841; the R Square value explains the variation of the independent "managerial role" on the dependent variable "employee safety". It therefore means that the managerial role has 84.1% of the variance in employee safety. The ANOVA result looked into the overall significance of the model. It shows the p-value of the predictor's effect, that is managerial role, on the criterion variable (employee safety). At the 95% confidence level of the model, the significance value (p-value) at 95% confidence level is worked out as .000 which is less than 0.05, and F statistics of 42.875. From the above table, the unstandardized Beta coefficient provides a measure of the contribution of each of the variables to the model. The result shows that (β = .314, Sig. = .001, P<0.05) which is an indication of the significant effect of managerial role on employee safety. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected, while the alternative hypothesis is conclusively accepted that there is a significant effect of managerial role on employee safety.

Research Hypotheses Two:
$H_0$2: There is no significant effect of employee commitment on personal safety

Table III: Summary of Regression Results of the effect of Employee Commitment on Personal Safety

Model Summary					
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	
1	.738[a]	.545	.542	.96267	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Commitment					
ANOVA					
Model	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1 Regression	147.737	1	147.737	159.417	.000[b]
Residual	123.255	124	.927		
Total	270.993	125			
a. Dependent Variable: Personal Safety					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Commitment					

Coefficient						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		β	**Std. Error**			
1	(Constant)	.769	.286		21.974	.003
	Employee Commitment	.770	.061	.738	12.626	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Personal Safety						

Source: *Researcher's Field Survey (2023)*

The coefficient of determination (R^2) is .545; the R Square value indicates the extent of which the dependent variable "personal safety" can be explained and described by the independent variable "employee commitment". It means that employee commitment has 54 5% of the variance on personal safety. The ANOVA result assesses the overall and complete significance of the model. It shows the p-value of the predictor's effect, employee commitment, on the criterion variable, personal safety. At the 95% confidence level of the model, the significance value i.e., p-value, at 95% confidence level is generated as .000 which is less than 0.05, and F statistics of 159.417. From the above table, the unstandardized Beta coefficient provides a measure of the contribution of each of the variables to the model. The result shows that (β = .770, Sig. = .003, P<0.05) which is an indication of the significant effect of employee commitment on personal safety. The null hypothesis is categorically therefore rejected, while the alternative hypothesis is accepted that there is a significant effect of employee commitment on personal safety.

Discussion of Findings

The analysis of hypothesis one in this study clearly showed that the managerial role has a significant impact on employee safety. The study by Jonathan and Mbogo (2016) on the role of employees and employers in ensuring a safe working environment lends support to this study's conclusion. According to the study's findings, many secondary school administrators do not take the teaching staff into account when recommending policies and procedures to reduce safety hazards. The results showed that the majority of the teaching staff did not participate in training programs that would have given them workplace safety skills. The majority of them did not participate in discussions about workplace safety regulations.

The study's second hypothesis, which was also subject to analysis, showed that employee commitment has a significant impact on personal safety. The study by Quagrine, Opoku, Allah, and Donkor (2020) on the "influence of health and safety management practices on employee commitment: evidence from the Bottled and Sachet Water Industry" supports the findings of this study. The results imply that a particular risk is to the welfare of the workforce. The study also discovered that particular hazards (chemicals) had the greatest detrimental impact on workers' commitment to their jobs. According to the study, employers must implement suitable health and safety measures to improve employees personal safety while performing their duties.

Conclusion

The study's goal is to evaluate employee personal safety and management skills. This is very significant because an organization's management skills are essential for comprehending the uncertainties of a dynamic environment as well as competing in an ever-changing environment. Greater resources for achieving organizational success and competitive advantage are management capabilities. It has been emphasized that managerial ability plays a crucial role in how well a firm performs. The development and deployment of dynamic capabilities are made possible in large part by the managerial capability. Additionally, it is asserted that a dynamic environment necessitates ongoing revisions and changes to what businesses do to adapt and adjust to the environment.

The study came to the conclusion that strategic thinking, which engages the manager's cognitive ability, is necessary for managerial capability. Managers must make strategic decisions if businesses are to compete and gain a competitive advantage. In order to promote employee safety in the workplace, managers should be able to develop a long-term strategy that can help the organization they are a part of perform and grow. The positive and significant effect of managerial role and employee commitment clearly showed that employees who have absolute commitment and roles in the welfare plans of the organization believe that the organization cares about their safety hence their high performance within the organization. The study therefore concludes that management capabilities are a fundamental aspect that any organization that seeks to achieve the best from its employees should aim towards.

The following policy suggestions are made in light of this study's findings and findings from other studies: firstly, the management of Federal Road Safety Corps continually provides a conducive atmosphere for employees to work without any fear of losing their lives by providing the right protective materials whenever they discharge their duties and responsibilities. Secondly, it is equally recommended that management provide financial support to the right departments in charge of employee welfare to encourage them to give their best to the jobs. Lastly, the management should be more inclusive in allowing younger staff members of the Federal Road Safety Corp to contribute their ideas towards employee personal safety.

The study limitations on management capabilities and personal safety of employees may focus on a specific industry, company size, or geographic location, limiting the generalizability of findings to other contexts. Many studies might adopt a cross-sectional approach, providing a snapshot of management capabilities and safety practices at a specific point in time. This limits the ability to draw conclusions about causation or changes over time.

Future research should explore several key areas to enhance understanding and contribute to the development of effective strategies. Also, it can explore the development and effectiveness of smart

safety systems that leverage real-time data, IoT devices, and automation to proactively identify and mitigate workplace hazards.

References

Ambrosini, V., Bowman, C., & Collier, N. (2019). Dynamic capabilities: A review of past research and an agenda for the future. *Journal of Management, 45*(4), 1-36.

Amponsah-Tawiah, K., Ntow, S. A., & Mensah, J. (2016). Organizational culture and employee commitment in Ghana's mining sector. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 4*(3), 25-32.

Anzengruber, J., Goetz, K., Nold, H., & Woelfle, R. (2017). The relationship between safety climate and safety performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(2), 148-167.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Arndt, M. (2017). The impact of leadership styles on employee commitment to the organization. *Journal of Leadership and Management, 1*(1), 1-10.

Augier, M., & Teece, D. J. (2019). Dynamic capabilities and the role of managers in business strategy and economic performance. *Organization Science, 30*(1), 1-21.

Barney, J. (1986). Strategic factor markets: Expectations, luck, and business strategy. *Management Science, 32*(10), 1231-1241.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99-120.

Barrales, P., Molina, L. M., Bustinza, O. F., & Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez, L. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and performance in service firms: A systematic review and research agenda. *Service Business, 10*(2), 217-246.

Barreto, I. (2016). The impact of organizational culture on employee commitment to the organization. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(11), 5164-5171.

Carmeli, A., & Azeroual, R. (2019). Linking transformational leadership and employee safety: The mediating role of relational coordination and employee commitment to safety. *Journal of Safety Research, 68,* 83-91.

Casillas, J. C., & Moreno, A. M. (2017). Entrepreneurial orientation and international commitment: The moderating role of absorptive capacity. *International Business Review, 26*(2), 288-302.

Chanchai, B. (2016). The influence of safety leadership on employee safety behaviour in the workplace: A case study in Thailand. *Safety Science, 89,* 1-8.

Dennis, A. R., Muthu Kumaran, S., & Balaji, S. (2015). The impact of work pressure on employee productivity: Using virtual teams as a moderator. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 32*(3), 269-304.

Di Stefano, G., Peteraf, M., & Verona, G. (2017). Dynamic capabilities deconstructed: A bibliographic investigation into the origins, development, and future directions of the research domain. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 26*(6), 1187-1207.

Easterby-Smith, M., & Prieto, I. M. (2008). Dynamic capabilities and knowledge management: An integrative role for learning? *British Journal of Management, 19*(3), 235-249.

Easterby-Smith, M., Lyles, M. A., & Peteraf, M. A. (2019). Dynamic capabilities: Current debates and future directions. *British Journal of Management, 30*(1), 3-19.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal, 21*(10-11), 1105-1121.

Fordjour, G. A., & Chan, A. P. (2019). Building safety culture in construction projects: A conceptual framework. *Safety Science, 117,* 345-355.

García-Morales, V. J., Jiménez-Barrionuevo, M. M., & Mihi-Ramírez, A. (2017). The influence of transformational leadership on organizational innovation through knowledge sharing: An empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 30*(2), 238-252.

Gnizy, I., Baker, T., & Grinstein, A. (2014). Dynamic capabilities and organizational performance: A systematic review and future research directions. *Journal of Management, 40*(5), 1297-1333.

Gonul, M. S., Murat, K., & Dilek, C. (2019). The effect of safety climate on employee safety behaviour: Mediating role of employee commitment to safety. *Safety and Health at Work, 10*(3), 297-303.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*(2), 109-122.

Hamdan, A. (2017). The impact of leadership styles on employee safety behaviour in the construction industry. *International Journal of Construction Management, 17*(2), 99-109.

Hammer, M. (2001). *The agenda: What every business must do to dominate the decade*. New York: Crown Business.
Helfat, C. E., & Martin, J. A. (2015). Dynamic managerial capabilities: Review and assessment of managerial impact on strategic change. *Journal of Management, 41*(5), 1281-1312.
Helfat, C. E., & Peteraf, M. A. (2019). Managerial cognitive capabilities and the microfoundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal, 40*(10), 1545-1565.
Helfat, C. E., Finkelstein, S., Mitchell, W., Peteraf, M. A., Singh, H., Teece, D. J., & Winter, S. G. (2019). *Dynamic capabilities: Understanding strategic change in organizations* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
Henderson, R., & Cockburn, I. (1994). Measuring competence? Exploring firm effects in pharmaceutical research. *Strategic Management Journal, 15*(S1), 63-84.
Hsu, W. T., Lien, B. Y., & Chen, H. Y. (2013). Dynamic capabilities for service innovation system: Insights from the semiconductor industry. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation, 8*(4), 1-14.
Huang, X., Li, Y., Chen, Y., & Wang, J. (2016). The impact of ethical leadership on employee safety behaviour: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Business Ethics, 139*(1), 91-102.
Hung, S. W., Yang, B., Lien, B. Y., McLean, G. N., & Kuo, Y. M. (2010). Dynamic capabilities for service innovation: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Business Research, 63*(7), 757-765.
Jasen, P., & Koren, Y. (2018). The role of safety climate and safety motivation in the relationship between management safety capabilities and employee safety. *Safety Science, 103,* 1-9.
Jashapara, A. (1993). *Training and development in Europe: A strategic approach*. London: Routledge.
Jonathan, G. K., & Mbogo, R. W. (2016). Maintaining health and safety at workplace: employee and employer's role in ensuring a safe working environment. *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(29), 1-7.
Karatepe, O. M. (2016). High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 53,* 89-99.
Kearney, E., Harrington, D., & Kelliher, F. (2017). The impact of safety climate on safety behaviour: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 90*(3), 341-372.
Kor, Y. Y., & Mesko, A. (2015). Dynamic managerial capabilities and firm performance: A study on biotechnology industry. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 92,* 135-148.
Luo, X. (2002). Capability exploitation and building in a foreign market: Implications for multinational enterprises. *Organization Science, 13*(1), 48-63.
Luo, X., & Rui, H. (2009). An ambidexterity perspective toward multinational enterprises from emerging economies. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 23*(4), 49-70.
Mensah, J., & Kosi, F. (2016). Organizational culture and employee commitment in the Ghanaian mining sector. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 4*(3), 25-32.
Newey, L. R., & Zahra, S. A. (2009). The evolving firm: How dynamic and operating capabilities interact to enable entrepreneurship. *British Journal of Management, 20*(1), 81-100.
Nouri, R., & Soltani, I. (2017). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational commitment: A study of Iranian hospitals. *Journal of Health Management, 19*(2), 1-12.
Ogunkoya, O. A., Hassan, B. A., & Shobayo, P. B. (2014). Dynamic Capabilities And Competitive Advantage: An Analysis Of The Nigerian Banking Sector. *Journal of Accounting and Management, 4*(2), 29-36.
Onda, M., LoBuglio, S., & Bartram, T. (2012). The relationship between safety culture and safety performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety Australia and New Zealand, 28*(6), 473-481.
Pavlou, P. A., & Sawy, O. A. E. (2011). Understanding the elusive black box of dynamic capabilities. *Decision Sciences, 42*(1), 239-273.
Peretaf, M. G. (1993). The resource-based view of the firm and the innovation process: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 1*(1), 21-51.
Pisano, G. P. (1994). Knowledge, integration, and the locus of learning: An empirical analysis of process development. *Strategic Management Journal, 15*(1), 85-100.
Prange, C., & Verdier, S. (2011). The impact of dynamic capabilities on operational marketing and technological capabilities: Investigating the role of environmental turbulence. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*(1), 50-65.
Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001). Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research? *Academy of Management Review, 26*(1), 22-40.

Quagrine, L., Opoku, D., Allah, J. A., & Donkor, I. (2020). Impact of health and safety management practices on employee's commitment: evidence from the bottled and sachet water industry in Ghana. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies, 7*(1), 141-152.

Roberts, K., Campbell, J., & Vijayasarathy, L. R. (2016). The impact of organizational culture on customer satisfaction and service quality: A study of Indian restaurants in the USA. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research, 19*(1), 52-70.

Schelmetic, G. (2013). The role of leadership in safety culture. *Occupational Health & Safety, 82*(2), 20-23.

Schreyögg, G., & Kliesch-Eberl, M. (2007). How dynamic can organizational capabilities be? Towards a dual-process model of capability dynamization. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(9), 913-933.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Tahira, M., Laura, S., Claudio, M., & Lindsey, A. (2016). The impact of leadership on safety climate in construction industry. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 142*(10), 1-11.

Tahira, M., Laura, S., Claudio, M., & Lindsey, A. (2020). Exploring the relationship between leadership and safety climate in construction industry. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 146*(3), 1-10.

Teece, D. J. (2014). The foundations of enterprise performance: Dynamic and ordinary capabilities in an (economic) theory of firms. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(4), 328-352.

Teece, D. J. (2017). Dynamic capabilities and entrepreneurial management in large organizations: Toward a theory of the (entrepreneurial) firm. *European Economic Review, 86,* 202-216.

Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review, 58*(4), 13-35.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

Telang, R., & Telang, A. (2010). Factors affecting employee safety in the chemical industry: A review of the literature. *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries, 23*(3), 343-349.

Ticharwa, T., Cope, A., & Murray, M. (2019). The impact of leadership on safety performance in the construction industry: A systematic review. *Safety Science, 120,* 268-281.

Uraon, R., & Raya, R. P. (2017). Effect of human resource management practices on employee retention in Thailand's healthcare sector: The mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Health Management, 19*(2), 1-15.

Van Doorn, S., Jansen, J. J., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: Drawing attention to the senior team. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 35*(2), 306-324.

Wilden, R., Gudergan, S. P., Nielsen, B. B., & Lings, I. (2013). Dynamic capabilities and performance: Strategy, structure and environment. *Long Range Planning, 46*(1-2), 72-96.

Wireko-Gyebi, S., Mensah, J., & Ofori, D. F. (2017). Organizational culture and employee commitment in the Ghanaian mining sector. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 5*(1), 1-11.

Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Davidson, R. A. (2016). Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies, 53*(5), 1-34.

Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. (2018). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. *Organization Science, 29*(4), 682-698.

Zott, C. (2003). Dynamic capabilities and the emergence of intraindustry differential firm performance: Insights from a simulation study. *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(2), 97-125.