



GSJ: Volume 10, Issue 10, October 2022, Online: ISSN 2320-9186

**REWARD MANAGEMENT AS A CORRELATE OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
PERFORMANCE IN SOME SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN ONDO STATE**

AKINNAWONU, Omotayo

Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.

E-mail: Omotayo.akinnawonu@aaua.edu.ng

Tel: +2347062399076.

Abstract

This study assessed reward management as a correlate of administrative staff job performance in selected universities in Ondo State. The study adopted the correlational survey research design. The population of the study comprised 3,115 non-academic staff in the three universities in Ondo State. The sample size of 368 was obtained using William Godden formula. Simple random sampling technique was used to select respondents from each of the selected institutions. Data were collected using researcher - developed questionnaire. The instrument was subjected to both face and content validities. Similarly, the instrument was subjected to estimate of internal consistency specifically, Cronbach Alpha to determine a co-efficient of 0.67. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient was used to answer the research while the t-test for correlational analysis was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of this study revealed that there is a positive high relationship between staff development opportunities affect job performance of employees of Universities in Ondo State. The findings also revealed that there is a positive low relationship between work environment and turnover of employees of Universities in Ondo State. The study equally revealed no significant relationship between staff development opportunities affect job performance of employees of Universities in Ondo State. Based on the findings, the study recommended that Universities in Ondo State, Nigeria should ensure that staff development opportunities should be created for employees' of universities.

Keywords: Reward, management, reward management, performance, administrative, staff, and University.

INTRODUCTION

The current economic difficulties have thrown into sharp relief not just what people get paid, but whether it is fair, from a perspective of many stakeholders resulting in a challenging balancing act for reward (Cotton, 2013). With the increased global competition, developments in Information Communication and Technology (ICT), and changes in workplace demographic characteristics, organizations need to reform their reward system to be relevant in terms of performance in order to get the best from its employees and withstand the tides of incessant competition (Ibrahim, Mayendesifuna, Buteeme & Lubega, 2013). A survey on global talent management and reward by Towers Watson (2012) in partnership with world at work, reported that 63% of employers have difficulty in attracting the skills required for business growth and 47% faced problems of retaining top talents. The mismatch alignment between what employers are ready to offer in terms of rewards and what administrative staff wants is assumed to be the reason for this difficulty in attracting talent and the loss of intellectual capable employees (Maycock & Salawudeen, 2014).

The basic premise of reward systems which is to maintain administrative staff motivation in order to increase production and sustain a competitive edge, while keeping costs low has been evident throughout the centuries but was especially dominant during the historical period spanning the late 1800s to the early 1920s, a period known as the scientific management era (Milkovich, Newman & Gerhart, 2011). The numerous reward types on offer further complicates the challenge of designing, communicating and monitoring what, since the 1990s, has been referred to as the 'total reward' approach (Cotton, 2013).

Total reward, which is a tool of reward management, is seen by market analyst as top priority of UK human resource agenda (Nazir, Shah & Zaman, 2012). Total reward is a term adopted to describe a reward strategy that brings additional components such as learning and development, together with aspects of the working environment, into the benefits package (Zhou, Qian, Henan & Lei, 2009).

In Nigeria, KPMG surveyed 86 organisations in different sectors of the economy on their human resource (HR) practices and found that more Nigerian organisations are taking active steps to align their HR and reward strategies to international best practices. The organisations appreciate the fact that their ability to stay ahead of competition is dependent on being able to weave a

competitive advantage around their people and so for them, focus on effective people management should continue in the future as HR becomes more strategically positioned to attract, motivate and retain top talents, as well as provide measurable support to enable organisations achieve business goals (Ajayi, Apanpa, Alile & Ogbonna, 2014).

The criteria for rating Universities all over the world include amongst others, their research outputs (demonstrated in terms of publications in referred journals, number of postgraduate outputs (particularly doctoral), and the quality of academic staff (doctoral). The number and quality of academic staff, coupled with their effectiveness make the difference in university education production function. As Evenson (2004) surmises:

The escape route from the mass poverty now endemic in most African countries is improved income. This means invention and reinvention, innovation, and reverse engineering and such processes require skills that can be produced only in higher education programs (p.174).

Nwadiani and Akpotu, (2002) noted that university education in contemporary time the world over, is becoming an exceedingly complex enterprise and this complexity requires a high degree of competence and proven scholarship from the university academic staff in particular and the entire staff in general (Samuel & Chipunza, 2013). They contribute much to the social, political and economic development of a nation and that is why every government is making efforts to budget a huge amount to that sector (Ajayi, Awosusi, Arogundade & Ekundayo, 2011).

In the UK, government know that the success of their universities depends very substantially upon their having a staff that is motivated, committed and supportive of the institutions' mission to conduct internationally-leading research and teaching and so developed a framework known as the 'Science and Innovation Investment Framework 2004–2014' (Hooley, Kent & Williams, 2010). This framework has ensured that universities received substantial investment from government through year-on-year increases in the budget. The money has enabled higher education in the United Kingdom to expand through the recruitment of new staff, both academic and those in professional and support roles and to repair or replace a decaying research infrastructure. While Government, the European Union and others seek to develop an environment within which human capital investment is emphasised, it is left to individuals within universities to interpret this and implement it 'on the ground' (Hooley, Kent & Williams, 2010).

In Nigeria, successive government seems to see education as a social (welfare) services to the citizenry. Education is not vigorously pursued as a vital and dynamic sector that determines all

spheres of development and so lip service is paid to the effective management and dynamic approach to its development (Hamza, 1999). Though the number of universities has been increasing as reported by NUC in 2008, the number of qualified teachers is not increasing proportionately (Adeniji, 2011). Thus, there had been constant mobility of these highly skilled persons from one university to another or to other countries abroad where the environment is more conducive to work and there is better remuneration package. This mobility has been tagged as —brain drain and is the major challenge of Nigerian universities. Other challenge facing Nigerian universities include incessant strikes, weak accountability for educational performance, poor work environment, academic staff shortage, corruption, et cetera (Ajayi, Awosusi, Arogundade&Ekundayo. 2011). In addition, the motivation of university employees' has been reported to be affected by challenging situations like irregular research investment (Igwe, 1990 &Donwa, 2006), inadequate resources to acquire advanced information technologies such as internet, intranet, extranet, browsers, data warehouse, data mining techniques, software agents, lack of feedback regarding personnel evaluation reports, management emphasis on particular administrative style, workload, lack of support from superior in terms of mentoring to salary package and unchallenging jobs (Adeniji, 2011). There are cases of some absentee lecturers that come to class only when exams are around to rush their lectures. Some of the lecturers also have been alleged of using graduating students to lecture students, record scores and compute student results.

Also, there are observed cases of arbitrary award of marks, examination malpractices and students tell stories of academic staff that abandon their students to chase contracts and political appointments (Ajayi, et al. 2011). The researcher also observed that this does not affect the lecturers only. It is also seen in the way some non-teaching staff do their work. There are instances of absences among these calibres of staff, lateness, lack of initiative in the performance of duties, lack of commitment to task and the organization, luke-warmness, work stress, delays in administrative performance, et cetera.

One of the factors influencing performance is identified to be motivation to perform well on the job (Van- Knippenber 2000) which can be influenced by rewards. The need to ensure that administrative staff perceive organization reward as fair and directed toward their satisfaction on the job is necessary to harness employee's potential for business benefit (Maycock&Salawudeen, 2014). A lot has been researched about reward management. However, little attention seems to

have been given to variables such as employee benefits, staff development, work environment, job enrichment and their effect on performance. Against this background, the study attempted to contribute to the knowledge base by assessing the relationship between reward management and organisational performance of universities in Ondo State, Nigeria.

Statement Problem

Managing employees' reward is today more difficult than it has ever been due to many economic, cultural and social influences which were not there before. Workers are more sensitive to the value they create and the reward they get in form of pay and benefits.

It has been observed that in many Nigerian organisations both public and private, apathy and nonchalance on the part of employees are a general phenomenon and many reasons adduced for such apathy, low morale and indifference include lack of staff development opportunities, poor management styles, unconducive work environment and above all poor remuneration. As a result, university employees through their respective unions embark on strike to press on their demand for a better condition of service. Also, it appears that performance evaluation which is vital to reward management is not adequately being utilized, as such; it does seem that most rewards are not based on performance.

From the foregoing, it does seem that the members of staff of the universities are not well motivated such that there are cases of truancy, absenteeism, job burnout, withdrawal and indifference to university norm and value expectation and job dissatisfaction. In addition, there is disruptive office politics, negative work attitude, low productivity, missed deadlines, low quality and poor customer service. The perceived problems seem to have negative effect on the quality of graduates produced into the labour market as the fundamental purpose of university deteriorates to be an institution of learning how to read and write, designed to prepare the mind as a ticket to acquiring wealth (not knowledge) and to separate the mind from collective (community) progress and national development, to individual interest. Our universities loses a lot of revenue due to the fact that many potential students prefer universities in neighbouring African countries including Ghana, Benin and Togo not because of superiority of academic programmes but because of instability of academic calendar. If our universities are to nurture the manpower needs of the nation and satisfy the aspirations of the people for a good and humane society, then it is important for university employees to be properly motivated to ensure that they

give their best in job performance. Against this background, this study seeks to assess the relationship between reward management and administrative staff performance in selected universities in Ondo State.

Research Question

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the nature of relationship between staff development opportunities and job performance of Universities' employees in Ondo State?
2. What is the nature of the relationship between remuneration and employees' turnover in Ondo state universities?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant relationship between staff development opportunities and job performance of employees' of universities in Ondo State?
2. There is no significant relationship between remuneration and employees' turnover of universities in Ondo State?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Concept of Reward Management

Reward management is one of the central pillars of human resource management (HRM). It is an area of people management that is complex because its focus of attention is people – managers and employees. It is concerned with the formulation and implementation of strategies and policies that aim to reward people fairly, equitably and consistently in accordance with their value to the organization (Armstrong and Murlis, 2004).

Reward management is about understanding individuals' motivating factors and determining the level of pay, bonus and other incentives they receive in order to perform. Zingheim and Schuster (2000) use their book *Pay People Right* as a rallying cry to employers to ensure that reward management systems are fundamentally in alignment with their organizations' strategic goals (Perkins and White, 2011). Many researchers see reward management as a major predictor of administrative staff performance because they help maintain a positive motivational environment for workers, determine both business goals and employee values which are essential in administrative staff performance (Agwu, 2013; Armstrong, 2006; Kepner, 2001; Kirunda, 2004;

Armstrong, 2006 cited in Musenze, Thomas, Stella &Muhammadi, 2013:90).Reward management is not only about pay and benefits butis also concerned with non-financial rewards such as recognition, learning and development opportunities and increased job responsibility (Armstrong, 2007:3). These non-financial rewards provide motivation.

Motivation is one of the key elements in employee performance and productivity (Ezigbo & Court, 2011). It is a hidden power in the individual that stems from a deep rooted belief that causes the individual to behave in a certain way; it is strongest when it comes from our inner values (Lock, 2001, cited in Al-Khour, 2010:3). Thus, understanding motivation empowers us to better understand ourselves and others and in turn, enable us to change and/or further improve our behaviours and performance (Al-Khour, 2010:3). Organizations without adequate staff motivation will always perform poorly because the overall performance of an organization depends directly on the amount of efforts positively applied by workers individually or collectively towards attaining the desired goals (Agu, 2003, cited in Ezigbo& Court 2011).

An employee who is properly rewarded feels that he/she is valued by the employer and so is motivated to work harder for the achievement of the organizational goal. Many theories of motivation exists which help to explain the behaviour of people at certain times with respect to the work situation. It has been shown based on field research that no motivational theory on its own can fully explain human motivation (Furtado, Aquino &Meira, 2012). In order to consistently motivate employees, managers need to devise a system of rewards that has unanimous acceptance among the employees. They need to have a rich toolkit of incentive mechanisms at their disposal in order to address the conflicting interests of the parties to the employment relationship (Gibbons & Waldman, 1999, cited in Pouliakas&Theodossiou, 2009).

Reward management may be defined as all the actions combined which an employer may take to define the level at which employee reward will be offered, the criteria and data it'll be based on, how the offer will be regulated over time, and how both the intended links between organizational goals and values should be understood and acted on by the parties to the employment relationship (Perkins & White, 2011).

Reward management is based on a philosophy that is consistent with the values of the organization and help to enact them. The philosophy says that, if human resource management (HRM) is about investing in human capital from which a reasonable return is required, then people should be rewarded differentially according to what they've contributed to the

organisation. The philosophy also recognizes that it must address longer-term issues relating to how people should be valued for what they do and what they achieve (be strategic). Reward strategies and the processes that are required to implement them have to flow from the business strategy. Reward management adopts a ‘total reward’ approach, which emphasizes the importance of considering all aspects of reward as a coherent whole that is linked to other HR initiatives designed to achieve the motivation, commitment, engagement and development of employees. This requires the integration of reward strategies with other HRM strategies, including talent management and human resource development (Armstrong, 2007:4).

The aims of reward management are to: reward people according to the value they create; align reward practices with business goals *and* with employee values and needs; reward the right things to convey the right message about what is important in terms of behaviours and outcomes; help to attract and retain the high-quality people the organization needs; motivate people and obtain their engagement and commitment; develop a high-performance culture.

They are achieved by developing and implementing strategies, policies, processes and practices that are founded on a philosophy, operate in accordance with the principles of distributive and natural justice, function fairly, equitably, consistently and transparently, are aligned to the business strategy, fit the context and culture of the organization, are fit for purpose and help to develop a high performance culture (Armstrong, 2007).

Work Environment

Work environment is the result and product of a company’s distinct culture. Company culture includes elements such as the way in which conflicts are handled, the freedom to try new things and fail without consequences, dress code policies, and other intangible details (Ingram, 2015). It is also the sum of the relationship that exist among the employees themselves and the environment in which they work (Noah & Steve, 2012). Productivity and efficiency are directly affected by how people work, and this equally is affected by their work environment. This may include issues such as office space, equipments, air conditioning, comfortable chairs just to mention but a few. Many people are dissatisfied if working conditions are poor (George and Jones, 1999 cited in Ng’ethe, Iravo & Namusonge, 2012). Carlopio (1996) cited in Rizwan and Muktar (2014) found that satisfaction with workplace is positively related with job and reduce turnovers for a better future. Workers cannot give their best if they don’t have a favourable work

environment. Improved work environment enhances employee's productivity. The environment that employees work in greatly influences their satisfaction, which in turn directly affects the rate of employee turnover. These three distinct concepts are inseparably linked (Ongori, 2007).

When a worker is engaged in a low-wage position with restricted benefits, there is nothing that'll make him/her to stay if a comparable employer offers even a slightly higher rate of pay (Sattar& Ahmed, 2014:111). People quit from one organization to another or leave the organization because of lack of commitment in the organization and job dissatisfaction (Firth et al, 2004 cited in Ongori, 2007). Also, people quit due to no prospective chance for progressions or promotions (Sattar& Ahmed, 2014:111).

Opperman, (2002) cited in Noah and Steve (2012) opined that work environment is made up of three major sub-environments. They are technical environment, human environment and organizational environment. Technical environment refers to tools, equipment, technological infrastructure and other physical or technical elements. The technical environment creates elements that enable employees perform their respective responsibilities and activities. The human environment refers to peers, others with whom employees relates, team and work groups, interactional issues, the leadership and management. This environment is designed in such a way that encourages informal interaction in the work place so that the opportunity to share knowledge and exchange ideas could be enhanced. This is a basis to attain maximum productivity. Organizational environment include systems, procedures, practices, values and philosophies. Management has control over organizational environment. Measurement system where people are rewarded on quantity, hence workers will have little interest in helping those workers who are trying to improve quality. Thus, issues of organizational environment influence employee's productivity.

Kyko (2005) identified two types of work environment - Conducive Work Environment and Toxic Work Environment. Conducive work environment enables employees to find pleasure at work and helps them to actualize their abilities and behaviour. It also reinforces self-actualizing behaviour. On the other hand, toxic environments bring about unpleasant experiences, decasualize employees' behaviour and reinforce low self-actualizing behaviours. This leads to the development of negative traits of the employees' behaviour. He opined that these factors - opaque management, biased boss, company's policies, working conditions, interpersonal

relationship and pay contribute to a toxic work environment and hence bring about low productivity of workers (Noah & Steve, 2012)

Employees Performance

An organization is a formal structure of planned coordination, involving two or more people who share a common purpose (Robbins 2000:2). It consists of productive assets such as labour, management, entrepreneurial skills, capital, and individuals that combine for a particular purpose. To measure the administrative staff performance, the ability of the organisation to create value is compared with the value the owners of the productive assets expect. In addition to the productive assets, strategy also determines performance. Most definitions of strategy focus on the formulation of organizational objectives, and what decisions should be made to achieve them, but in general, all strategies focus on the impact of the strategy on performance (Barney, 1998 cited in Van Huyssteen, 2001). Continuous performance is the focus of any organization because only through performance organizations are able to grow. Although the concept of administrative staff performance is very common in the academic literature, its definition is difficult because of its many meanings. For this reason, there isn't a universally accepted definition of this concept (Gavrea et al, 2011:287).

Administrative staff performance has been defined as the ability of an organization to fulfill its mission through sound management, strong governance and a persistent rededication to achieving results. It is the relative strength and ability of an organization to achieve corporate goals through internal work motivation, wide-ranging management style, greater commitment, employees' retention, job satisfaction and work place opportunities which have significant and important effects on corporate success (Bibhuti, 2008 cited in Salau, Adeniji&Oyewunmi, 2014).Richard et al. (2009), opine that administrative staff performance comprises the actual output or results of an organization as measured against its intended outputs or goals and objectives (Definitions of Administrative staff performance, *StudyMode.com*). For Jones, George and Hill (2006), it is a measure of how efficiently and effectively managers use resources to satisfy customers and achieve organizational goals and it increases in direct proportion to increases in efficiency and effectiveness (Ezigbo& Court, 2011:122).

There are rarely absolute yardsticks by which to judge the performance of public sector organizations. This is because performance is a complex issue and there are many components that make up its composition. Its complexity stems from the fact that there is no homogeneous

measure for it (Camilleri et al, 2007). This is the case with organizations such as universities that specialise in the provision of services. Measuring their performance involve comparing public resources in terms of total amount of money expended, the personnel and other resources, with outputs such as students' academic performance, graduation rate and quality of research (Abdulkareem & Oyeniran, 2011).

Organizational Key Performance indicators offer concrete evidence as to how a company's administrative staff performance can be measured and evaluated by means of data which to a large extent, are already available but which are rarely used in order to comprehend the overall performance of a company (www.hucama.com/media/). In organizational research, some commonly used criteria for measuring administrative staff performance according to Gbadamosi (1995) include productivity or output, goal attainment, profitability, employee satisfaction, employee performance, morale, turnover and absenteeism (Aluko, Odugbesan, Gbadamosi&Osuagwu, 2004). Dyer and Reeves (1995) cited in Rogers and Wright (1998) proposed four possible types of measurement for administrative staff performance. They are – HR outcomes (turnover, absenteeism, job satisfaction), organizational outcomes (productivity, quality, service), financial accounting outcomes (return on assets), capital market outcomes (stock price, growth, returns). Performance indices for universities include stability of academic calendar, quality of teaching, research, physical development, funding, quality assurances, internal efficiency, staff and student union activities and elimination of vices (Abdulkareem & Oyeniran, 2011:5)

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Expectancy-Value Theory

Victor Vroom in 1964 propounded expectancy theory which proposes that an individual makes decision believing that it will lead to reward or reduce the likelihood of pain. The theory argues that people choose among alternative behaviour according to their expectation that a particular behaviour will lead to one or more desired outcomes such as pay recognition or new challenges. He hypothesizes that if people expect a positive and desirable outcome, they will usually work hard to perform at the level expected of them. Vroom is saying that performance can be thought of as a multiplicative function of motivation and ability (that is $P = M \times A$). Motivation in turn varies with the valence (V) or attractiveness of outcomes upon the performance for that task, and

the instrumentality (1) of performance for attaining the outcome (Idemobi et al, 2011). So it means that effort, performance and motivation must be linked for an employee to be motivated. Therefore, the outcome expected by an employee determines the amount of effort he/she puts into an assigned task. Basic to the expectancy model is the belief that people are capable of deciding what they want and then estimating the chances of achieving their objectives. The expectancy model tries to account for the difference in human behaviour by tracing each step in the motivation process from the initial decision to make an effort to the ultimate reward. This theory further predicts that an employee will be motivated to improve performance if the employee knows that he or she is capable of the desired behaviour, believes that satisfactory performance will result in the desired outcome and places a high value on that outcome.

In Ondo state universities, employee

METHODOLOGY

A descriptive research design was used in this study. The population of the study comprised 3,115 non-academic staff in the three universities in Ondo State. The universities are: Adekunle Ajasin University, Federal University of Technology, Akure and University of Science and Technology, Okiti-pupa. A sample size of 368 (three hundred and sixty-eight) respondents was used for the study. Proportionate stratified and simple random sampling technique was used to ensure equal opportunity participation of every member of the population and to prevent unnecessary bias in the selection process. For the purpose of this study, primary source of data was used. The primary source is based on administration of questionnaire. The questionnaire items were administered and collected personally by the researcher to reduce cost, time and loss of questionnaire. A 17 – item questionnaire with open-ended questions was designed for the study in accordance with the research objectives, research questions and hypotheses. A structured 5 point Likert-scale questionnaire were designed based on; Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD).

The instrument was subjected to content validation. The reliability of the instrument was computed using test retest and yielded a co-efficient of 0.79, the instrument was therefore deemed reliable for the study. In collecting data, the researchers trained three research assistants and adopted direct approach in administering the questionnaires to the respondents. Pearson

Product Moment correlation was used to answer the research questions while t-test of correlation analysis was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research Question 1: What is the nature of relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance in universities in Ondo State?

Table 1: The nature of relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance in universities in Ondo State

N	Correlation co-efficient (r)	Remark
550	.879	Very high positive relationship

Data presented in Table 1 reveals a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient computed to determine the nature of relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance in universities in Ondo State. The result reveals that there is a very high positive relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance ($r = .879, n = 550$).

Research Question 2: What is the nature of the relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State?

Table 2: the nature of the relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State

N	Correlation co-efficient (r)	Remark
550	.329	low positive relationship

Data in Table 2 show the nature of relationship between the nature of the relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State. The analysis reveals a low positive relationship between the nature of the relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities ($r = 0.329, n = 550$).

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance in universities in Ondo State.

Table 3: Test of significance between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance in universities in Ondo State

Correlation coefficient (r)	N	Df	A	t-calculated	t-critical	Decision
.879	550	548	0.05	26.49	1.960	Significant

Result presented in Table 3 shows that the t-calculated value (26.49) is greater than the t-critical value (1.960) at .05 alpha level ($26.49 > 1.960$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that there is a significant relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff performance in universities in Ondo State.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State?

Table 4: Test of significance between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State

Correlation coefficient (r)	N	Df	A	t-calculated	t-critical	Decision
.329	550	548	0.05	5.97	1.960	Significant

Result presented in Table 4 shows that the t-calculated value (5.97) is greater than the t-critical value (1.960) at .05 alpha level ($5.97 > 1.960$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. This means that there is a significant relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State.

Discussion of Findings

Result analysis of research question one revealed that there was a positive high relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff job performance in universities in Ondo State. This is in line with the findings of Katou (2008) who showed that HRM policies (such as development, promotion and communication, involvement and job design, et cetera) associated with business strategies (cost, innovation quality) will affect administrative staff performance. This means that opportunity to learn new things by means of training is a source of motivation for the employees. Such motivation leads to positive outcomes such as updated knowledge, skills, abilities and good work ethics.

Similarly, data obtained from hypothesis one showed that there was a significant relationship between staff development opportunities and administrative staff job performance in universities in Ondo State. This findings relates to the findings of Bongogoh (2009) that emphasized that there is a significant relationship between opportunity to learn new things by means of training and source of motivation. This means that not having the skills to perform a job correctly can set up employees for failure and put the organisation at a less than competitive disadvantage.

Result analysis in research question two revealed that there was a low positive relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State. This finding opposed the findings of Leblebici (2012) who showed that physical and behavioural workplace environment has a greater effect on employee performance, was socially and physically challenging, and thereby leading to some negative behaviour such as absenteeism, low commitment and apathy. This difference in the findings might as that the present study was carried out in a university environment while the study Leblebici was conducted in organizations.

Similarly, the data analysis of hypothesis two showed that there was no significant relationship between work environment and turnover of employees' of Universities in Ondo State. This is in line with the findings of Sattar and Ahmed (2014) who debunked that there is a significant relationship between work environment, attitude to work and job performance.

Conclusion

It has been shown that reward management (financial and non-financial) help to create an enabling environment for creativity and innovation, nurture the manpower needs of the nation, develop talents and build research capacity in the Universities in Ondo State, Nigeria.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study it is recommended that;

- 1) Universities in Ondo State should ensure that employees are promoted based on merit, as at when due, treated with respect, mentored and appreciated to ensure better performance;
- 2) Staff development opportunities should be created for employees' of universities in Ondo State, Nigeria. These opportunities can be in the form of effective communication on

performance expectations, training and retraining, and access to necessary materials and equipment;

- 3) Management of universities in Ondo State should ensure that the work environment is very conducive for employees. This can be achieved by encouraging a cordial employee-employee and management-employee relationship, as well as ensuring that the necessary work tools are provided for;
- 4) Employees should be encouraged to exercise their skills, with adequate supervision, job empowerment, and the provision of adequate information and knowledge which enhances them for effective job performance;

References

- [1] Abdulkareem, A.Y. &Oyeniran, S. (2011). Managing the performance of Nigerian Universities for sustainable development using data envelopment analysis. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*,1(special issue), 1 – 7. Retrieved from www.hrmars.com.
- [2] Abosede, A.J. &Adekunle, O.A. (2012).Reward system as a predicator of workers job performance: The case of health workers in Lagos State, Nigeria,' *International Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (11),7-17. Retrieved from http://cprenet.com/uploads/archive/IJBBS_12-11831.pdf
- [3] Adeoye, A. O. & Fields, Z. (2014).Compensation management and employee job satisfaction: A case of Nigeria.*Journal of Social Sciences*, 41(3), 345 – 352.
- [4] Agwui, M.O. (2013). Impact of fair reward system on employee'sjob performance in Nigeria Agip Oil Company Ltd, Port-Harcourt.*British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 3(1), 47-64. Retrieved from www.sciencedomain.org
- [5] Ajayi, I.A., Awosusi, O.O., Arogundade, B.B. &Ekundayo, H.T. (2011), 'Work Environment as a Correlate of Academic Staff Job Performance in South West Nigerian Universities,' *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 3 (1), 1 - 9
- [6] Ajila, C. &Abiola, A. (2004), 'Influence of Rewards on Workers Performance in an Organization,' *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1),7-12.

- [7] Al-Khouri A.M.S.M. (2010). Improving organizational performance. The association on employment practices and principles, eighteenth annual international conference, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, 29th Sept – 1st Oct, 1-19.
- [8] Hail, M.S. & Al-Ghamdi, S.M. (2012). The relationship between strategy, reward and organizational performance: An empirical investigation. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 11(10), 1463 -1371.
- [9] Hakala, D. (2008). *16 Ways to measure employee performance*, retrieved from HR world.com.
- [10] Hjørland B, & Nicolaisen J. *Systems theory*. Retrieved from http://www.iva.dk/jni/lifeboat_old/Positions/Systems%20theory.htm
- [11] Human Resources Piece Rate Pay. Retrieved from http://www.tutor2u.net/business/people/motivation_financial_piecerate.asp
- [12] Idemobi, E.I. & Onyeizugbe, C. (2011). Performance management as an imperative for effective performance in Delta State of Nigerian public owned organizations. *Sacha Journal of Policy And Strategic Studies*, 1(2), 46-54.
- [13] Idemobi, E.I., Onyeizugbe, C.U., & Akpunonu, E.O. (2011). Compensation management as tool for improving organizational performance in the public sectors: A study of the Civil Service of Anambra State of Nigeria. *Sacha Journal of Policy And Strategic Studies*, 1(1), 109-120. Retrieved from www.sachajournals.com/documents/Idemobi002SJPSS.pdf
- [14] Improving Organizational Performance: Reversal theory at work. Retrieved from <http://www.eq4u.co.uk/AI023%20Improving%20Organizational%20Performance%20-%20Reversal%20Theory%20&%20Work.pdf>.
- [15] Ingram, D. (2015). Relationship between work environment and job satisfaction in an organization for employee turnover. *Houston Chronicles*. Retrieved from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/relationship-between-work-environment-job-satisfactionorganization-employee-turnover-11980.html>.
- [16] International Reward Management. 362-363. Retrieved from <http://www.cipd.co.uk/NR/rdonlyres/50268868-C9E8-4441-9234A034411844FC/0/9781843981565.pdf>
[International](http://www.cipd.co.uk/NR/rdonlyres/50268868-C9E8-4441-9234A034411844FC/0/9781843981565.pdf).

- [17] Jiang, Z., Xiao, Q., Qi, H. & Xiao, L. (2009). Total reward strategy: A human resource management strategy, going with the trend of the times. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(11), Nov., 177 – 181.
- [18] Katou, A.A. (2008). Measuring the impact of HRM on organizational performance. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 1(2), 119 – 142.
- [19] Kerr, S. (1975). On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(4), 769. Retrieved from <http://www.ou.edu/russell/UGcomp/Kerr.pdf>.
- [20] Khalid, K., Salim, H.M. & Loke, S. (2011). The impact of rewards and motivation on job satisfaction in water utility industry. 2011 International conference on financial management and economics, *IPEDR* vol. 11, Singapore: IACSIT press
- [21] Kwak, J. & Lee, E. (2009). An empirical study of “fringe benefits” and performance of the Korean firms. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(2).
- [22] Laszlo, A. & Krippner, S. (1998). Systems theories: Their origins, foundations, and development. J.S. Jordan (Ed.), *Systems theories and a priori aspects of perception* (47 - 74). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- [23] Lawler III, E.E (1993). Effective reward systems: Strategy, diagnosis, design, and change. *Centre for Effective Organization Publication*, G93-5(225).
- [24] Leblebici, O. (2012). Impact of workplace quality on employee’s productivity: Case study of a bank in Turkey. *Journal of Business, Economics and Finance*, 1(1), 38 – 49.
- [25] Lewis, P. (2001). Reward Management. In *Contemporary human resource management* (pp. 98 - 127). Pearson Education. Retrieved from <https://ulib.derby.ac.uk/ecdu/CourseRes/dbs/manpeopl/LEWIS.pdf>.
- [26] Lunenburg, F.C. (2011). Expectancy theory of motivation: Motivating by altering expectations. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1).
- [27] Malhotra, Y. (1996). Organizational learning and learning Organizations: An Overview. Retrieved from <http://www.brint.com/papers/orgirng.htm>.
- [28] Marco, V.H., Mirjam, V.P. & Kees, C. (2005). The effects of performance measurement and compensation on motivation: An empirical study. *De Economist* 153, 03-329.
- [29] Marsden, D. (2009). The paradox of performance related pay systems, ‘Why do we keep adopting them in the face of evidence that they fail to motivate?’ LSE Research Online, 1- 14. Retrieved from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/23639/>

- [30] Mba, S.I., Mgbemena, G.C, Ejike, D.C. (2015). Effective reward management and employee performance in civil service (a study of Anambra State Civil Service). *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(27), 137 – 152. www.iiste.org
- [31] McAuley, J., Duberley, J., & Johnson, P., (2007). Organizational theory – challenges and perspectives. Pearson Education Limited, Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE, England. Retrieved from <http://www.nimarket.ir/pdf/modiran90/organization%20>
- [32] McGraw, M. (2012, Jan). The role of reward systems. *Human Resource Executive Online*. LRP Publications. Retrieved from <http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/story.jsp?storyid=533344313#top>
- [33] Milikić, B.B., (2007). Role of the reward system in managing changes of organizational culture. *Scientific Papers*, 9-27. Motivation Theories. Retrieved from <http://www.citehr.com/166711-motivation-theories.html>.
- [34] Murlis, Armstrong, M. & Helen (2004). *Reward management: A handbook of remuneration strategy and practice (5th ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
- [35] Musenze, I.A., Thomas, M., Stella, B., & Muhammadi, L. (2013). Reward management and organizational performance: An empirical study of private Universities in Uganda. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 2(8), 90 – 96, August.
- [36] Ngambi, H.C. (2011). The relationship between leadership and employee morale in higher education. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), 762 – 776.
- [37] Ng’ethe, J.M., Irano, M.E. & Namusonge, G.S. (2012). Determinants of academic staff retention in public Universities in Kenya: Empirical review. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(13), 205 – 212.
- [38] Njanja, W.L., Maina, R.N., Kibet, L.K. & Njagi, K. (2013). Effect of reward on employee performance: A case of Kenya Power and Lighting Company Ltd. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(21), 41 – 49.
- [39] Noah, H. & Steve, M. (2012). Work environment and job attitude among employees in a Nigerian work organization. *Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1(2), 36 – 43.

- [40] Ohioyenoye, J.O. & Eboime, O.F. (2014). Organization culture types and performance in Nigerian Universities. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (18). Retrieved from www.iiste.org
- [41] Ojinta, R.I. (2013). The impact of recruitment and selection process on employee and organizational performance. A dissertation presented to the University of Liverpool for the award of Masters Degree in Business Administration.
- [42] Olubusayo, F. H, Stephen, I.A. & Maxwell, O. (2014). Incentives packages and employees' attitudes to work: A study of selected government Parastatals in Ogun State, South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*.
- [43] Onah, F.O. (2012). Engaging the challenges of human resource management in public organizations in Nigeria. 65th Inaugural Lecture Prof. Fab Onah, Prof. of Public Administration and Local Government, University of Nigeria,
- [44] Ongori, H. (2007). A review of the literature on employee turnover. *African Journal of Business Management*, June, 49 -54.
- [45] Osibanjo, O.A., Adeniji, A.A., Falola, H.O. & Heirsmac, P.T. (2014). Compensation packages: A strategic tool for employees' performance and retention. *Leonardo Journal of Sciences*, Issue 25, 65 – 84.
- [46] Parsons, R., Westminster, C. & Salt Lake City, U. (2012). Motivational theory and its relationship to economic theories of wage. Proceedings of ASBBS Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Feb, 19(1), 681 -690. Retrieved from <http://asbbs.org/files/ASBBS2012V1/PDF/P/ParsonsR.pdf>.
- [47] Perkins, S.J. & White, G. (2011). *Reward Management*. Introducing the reward management system a free sample chapter (2nd ed.). CIPD, United Kingdom, 2-25
- [48] Phonsanam, S.T. (2010). Total compensation practices and their relationship to hospitality employee retention. A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Hospitality Administration, William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration, Graduate College, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. public Universities. *Journal of Management and Marketing*, 12(2), 173 – 189.

- [49] Samson, A.J. (2015). The colossus of rewards and motivation on employeesperformance in Kogi State University, Anyigba.*International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR)*,2(5), March, 85 – 94.