

## **Promotion, Welfare and Non-Academic Staff Job Productivity in Universities in Southwest, Nigeria**

**Adesina Ajayi Adedapo (Ph.D)**

Ekiti State University, Ado - Ekiti,, Ekiti State, Nigeria

**Olusola Christianah Abiri (Ph.D)**

Ekiti State University, Ado - Ekiti,, Ekiti State, Nigeria

**Bolanle Funmilayo Adedapo**

Bamidele Olumilua University of Education, Science and Technology, Ikere - Ekiti,  
Ekiti State, Nigeria

---

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejtds.2014/vol11n11929>

Published January 21 2024

---

**Citation:** Adedapo A.A., Abiri O.C. and Adedapo B.F. (2024) Promotion, Welfare and Non-Academic Staff Job Productivity in Universities in Southwest, Nigeria, *European Journal of Training and Development Studies*, Vol.11 No.1, pp.19-29

---

**ABSTRACT:** *This study investigates the relationship between staff promotion and welfare and the job productivity of non-academic staff in public universities in Southwest, Nigeria. Employing a descriptive survey research design, the study sampled 1200 non-academic staff from six universities using a multistage sampling procedure. Two self-designed instruments, the Staff Promotion and Welfare Questionnaire (SPWQ) and the Job Productivity Questionnaire (JPQ), were used to collect data. The reliability coefficients for SPWQ and JPQ were found to be 0.89 and 0.85, respectively. Data analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics, with hypotheses tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The results revealed a significant relationship between staff promotion, welfare, and non-academic staff job productivity. In conclusion, the study emphasizes the importance of implementing staff welfare packages and conducting timely staff promotions to enhance job performance. Recommendations include the need for robust staff welfare implementations and periodic promotions for deserving non-academic staff to improve overall job productivity in university settings.*

**KEYWORDS:** promotion, welfare, non-academic staff, job productivity

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The university is commonly regarded as a hub of exceptional quality, while the administrative structure of a university serves as the operational core, responsible for ensuring the efficient functioning of the institution. Looking at the university environment in Nigeria, particularly in Southwest, Nigeria, there seems to be degradation in the system. The researcher noted a lack of effective maintenance of student and staff data by the non-academic workers at the

institution. There is a delay in processing students' results, issuing notifications of results, transcripts, and certificates, and properly managing municipal services at the student's hostels. The service delivery executed by the non-academic workforce lacks effectiveness and efficiency. The response time for written letters to the central administration is significantly delayed, and there is no guarantee of receiving a response at all. The process of filling and retrieving documents in both staff and student files is unsatisfactory, with vital information being mismanaged and lost due to the negligent attitude of certain non-academic staff members.

The researcher noted a lack of adequate orientation for newly hired non-academic workers at the institution, resulting in disruptive behaviour and disregard of their responsibilities. The workload originally assigned to five employed staff members is now being handled by one or two dedicated staff members who rarely express dissatisfaction. Under such circumstances, they may experience excessive workload without enough compensation, leading them to align themselves with the group of lazy and uncommitted staff members at the university. This may also diminish the job productivity of the non-academic staff. The study also noted that the non-academic personnel in the University in the South-West Nigeria exhibit a lack of devotion, resulting in disregard of their tasks. This is evident via frequent absences and irregularities at work, ultimately leading to low productivity. In certain circumstances, there may be staff members who are eager to work, but lack the necessary tools and experience poor cooling and heating due to unreliable power supply, which affects the operation of computer systems and other office equipment. The researcher noted a lack of motivation among the non-academic workforce. Some dedicated and loyal employees feel disheartened because they are not sufficiently recognised through means such as appreciation letters or rapid advancement.

The decline in productivity among non-academic staff in Nigerian universities is apparent, as some individuals in this group display a lack of dedication to their responsibilities. Many are consistently tardy or absent from work, and they demonstrate a negative work ethic and a lack of enthusiasm in performing their duties. Universities, like any other organisations, encounter challenges that hinder personnel from working efficiently and effectively to accomplish their goals. The success or failure of their efforts heavily relies on the circumstances of service for the personnel, since these factors have the potential to determine the achievement of the organisational objectives.

The universities in Southwest, Nigeria are facing significant challenges in fulfilling their fundamental responsibilities and meeting their declared goals and objectives due to delays in promotions and a lack of staff welfare services.

Promotion as the performance motivator at place of work is a crucial event in reaching the objectives and aims of the business. It should be noted that in some instances where promotions have been used as a motivational tool, the results are more beneficial. Promotion is the process by which a worker's status is elevated to a higher position, resulting in increased responsibilities and duties. In addition to increasing one's income, promotion has a significant and attractive impact, serving as a signal of appreciation for an individual's success. This

implies that promotion might be seen as the outcome of the employees' commendable performance. It has been observed that promotion typically energises individuals, enhances their skill and knowledge, and increases their degree of dedication to the organization's goals. Muheeb (2014) argued that the denial of promotions to individuals inside an organisation might lead to their disengagement and subsequent turnover. Receiving a desired promotion at the appropriate moment will undoubtedly enhance the worker's motivation to perform their job efficiently. The study noted that the productivity of certain non-academic personnel at institutions is subpar due to prolonged stagnation in their current position beyond the mandated years before promotion. In certain instances, individuals who experience delays may not get their financial rewards, unlike academic staff members who have all their overdue promotions retroactively compensated from the day of their promotion. Prima Facie Qualified (PFQ) refers to a preliminary assessment of being qualified based on first evidence or appearance. In spite of the actuality that it is articulated in article 77 section 9 of National Policy on Education (FGN, 2014) that promotion opportunities will be fashioned at all educational levels to facilitate the professional development at every level, non-academic staff job promotion in the universities seems not to be implemented accordingly.

Gupta (2011) argued that promotion refers to the advancement of a person to a higher position, accompanied by the performance of more challenging responsibilities, a higher rank, and an increased remuneration. Similarly, the ascending employee's journey within the organisational hierarchy is towards a job that commands greater influence, higher rank, and superior conditions of service. Promotions are utilised to reward employees for superior achievement and to incentivize them for increased effort. Elevating employees from lesser positions to higher positions fosters a feeling of satisfaction among the workforce. Gupta (2011) elucidated that promotion stimulates self-enhancement and engenders inquisitiveness in educational and developmental initiatives.

Promotion enhances employees' job satisfaction and motivation by providing them with increased salary, higher position, and more challenging responsibilities. By fostering loyalty, the level of support decreases, but productivity increases. The probability of advancement often acts as a primary catalyst for enhanced executive performance, and promotions are the primary and significant way to differentiate superior performance. Peter (2014) emphasises the importance of promotions being fair, based on merit, and free from favouritism. Occasionally, even fair and appropriate promotions can resolve various issues, such as causing resentment among excluded members of an organisation, which can negatively impact their self-worth and productivity.

Robbins (2013) states that promotions offer chances for personal growth, more responsibilities, and higher social status. An employee's job productivity might be influenced by the opportunities they have for advancement. Bull (2005) determined that many individuals feel successful when they believe that their future aspirations are positive. This might potentially lead to career advancement and growth chances inside their current workplace, or enhance the likelihood of finding other employment. According to Ubom (2002), the promotion potential was shown to be the most significant and accurate predictor of work productivity, as each promotion is accompanied with a compensation increase.

Promotion often involves increasing rewards, whether it is within the same level or to a higher one. An ongoing procedure, contingent upon the degree of service and expert skill, is initiated upon promotion to an advanced level in a job promotion. Akande (2014) demonstrated a strong correlation between timely salary payment, promotion, fringe benefits, staff development, and staff job performance. Akinbode (2006) stated that job productivity is sturdily synchronous with opportunities for promotion and there is an unswerving and positive association between the possibilities for promotion and job productivity.

The promotion techniques have a positive correlation with the employee's performance (Tessema & Soeters, 2006). Evangeline and Thavakumar (2015) demonstrated that promotion procedures were shown to have no significant correlation with employee work productivity. In their study, Choi, Cheung, and Pang (2012) found a significant correlation between job promotion and job productivity, leading them to believe that a substantial portion of a worker's vocation is influenced by promotions.

Peter's (2014) findings indicate a significant association between organisational performance and promotion. The findings also demonstrated that promotion exerts an impact on both the organisation and individuals by stimulating high-quality performance, fostering positive connections, inspiring motivation, and increasing incentives. The study findings indicate that there were factors that influenced non-compliance with promotion procedures, which in turn affected both individual and organisational performance. These factors include poor performance, increased promotion rates, decreased productivity, and strained relationships. In a study conducted by Saharuddin (2016), it was demonstrated that the factors of remuneration and promotion had significant and beneficial effects on job satisfaction, self-esteem, and work productivity. According to Arabi (2000), promotion is a crucial determinant of job productivity, since he discovered a significant correlation between promotion and job productivity.

Welfare refers to the act of seeking substantial, psychological, ethical, and expressive well-being for an individual. Employees are irrefutably crucial stakeholders who affected the efficacy of the organisation by steadying the shaking generated by the surroundings of the firm. Every organisation has an undeniable role in providing comprehensive wellness programmes to their employees, regardless of the circumstances or format. The satisfaction of employees is crucial for the progress of an organisation, and the concept of employee well-being has always been and will continue to be a significant factor in the organization's performance. Welfare services play a crucial role in ensuring the delivery of high-quality services inside the institution.

Staff wellbeing, as defined by Bamusananire (2010), refers to the total well-being and satisfaction of employees, both in their personal lives and in the workplace. The term 'welfare' is often understood to refer to the provision of a minimal level of happiness and societal support. Ensuring the well-being of employees has consistently been a key determinant of their productivity. According to Famade et al. (2016), the well-being of employees is crucial for their engagement in the organization's achievements. Dessler (2008) supported the idea

that organisations provide welfare amenities to their employees in order to maintain their strong commitment.

Employee welfare benefits, such as leave pay or retirement pension, and health insurance, are essential financial compensations (Mathis and Jackson, 2004). The advantages provided by the management serve not only as a means to enhance employee performance, but also to attract potential candidates during the recruiting process. Welfare benefits are commonly seen as a kind of compensation for employees and can contribute to a sense of continued appreciation from employers. Benefits, contrary, are not just to help the worker nevertheless as well profit the corporation on a long-standing (Amah, 2010).

Souza (2009) argued that the provision of welfare payments might reduce the occurrence of strikes and malingering, hence enhancing effectiveness and efficiency. Priti (2009) posited that the purpose of welfare activities is to promote economic development by enhancing competence and efficiency. The key objective is to foster a sense of teamwork and a collective commitment to the well-being of employees, thereby ensuring their dedicated and harmonious service. Welfare provides employees with an environment conducive to personal growth and development, fostering collaboration and strengthening the relationship between employees and management. However, Mwiti (2007) observed that while welfare services may not directly contribute to an employee's employment, their presence or absence significantly impacts the employee's performance, efficiency, attitude, and income.

Amah (2010) stated that employees aspire to receive more than just a pay for their efforts. In addition to their salary, employees expect other incentives for attending work. The additional remuneration provided may incentivize and inspire people to perform optimally. He believes that employees' loyalty may be sustained by providing them with more than just a paycheck. Everyone engages in employment with the expectation of receiving some form of compensation or benefit. Employee perks are crucial for fostering the growth of corporate industrial relations. Amah (2013) determined that welfare benefits had a significant impact on employee job motivation, productivity, and performance inside the organisation.

Doucouliaagos and Laroche (2003) have discovered a strong and meaningful correlation between staff wellbeing and employee productivity. Lagat, et al (2014) shown a strong positive link between people wellbeing and organisational production. There is a strong correlation between reward packages and employee performance (Osibanjo, et al., 2014). Job productivity may be achieved by cultivating a genuine enthusiasm and appreciation for the chosen profession (Nagar, 2012). He identified a substantial relationship between health and job productivity. Cascio (2003) stated that dedicated employees tend to be more diligent and contribute to the organization's effectiveness. A welfare benefit yields enhanced corporate returns, enhances employee accountability, promotes fair treatment of employees, and supports their work-life quality. The concept of reward and pay has been acknowledged as a crucial factor in retaining people inside their organisations (Oluchuckwu, 2010). Employee perks have the potential to serve as a source of competitive advantage (Sahoo & Mishra, 2012). Cascio (2003) argued that employee welfare benefits have a crucial role in influencing their decision-making and performance in the workplace. Sajuyigbe et al. (2013) argued that

when employees perform well and receive significant welfare benefits, it is more likely that future performance would also be high.

Nnorom, et al. (2016) conducted a research that examined the impact of salary administration on employee productivity. The study investigated the components of effective incentive management in organisations and the resulting financial gains. The study utilised a descriptive survey research approach. The study's findings indicated that effective incentive management positively impacts worker productivity, as seen by the generated data.

In a research done by Yamoah (2013), the correlation between remuneration and employee productivity of staff was examined. To accomplish his goal, the researcher employed a case study methodology and subsequently implemented a descriptive survey research design to gather data. The data was examined using descriptive statistics. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to examine the considerable association between employee remuneration and productivity. The data, however, demonstrated a significant correlation between remuneration and production.

In their study, Ibojo and Asabi (2014) examined the impact of Welfare through Compensation Management on Employees' Productivity. The main objective was to determine the extent to which compensation management influenced employees' productivity and to explore the relationship between compensation management and improved productivity. To achieve this, the researchers used both primary and secondary sources of information. The utilisation of questionnaire was applied to group essential and suitable data from the respondents. The findings demonstrated a significant correlation between pay management and enhanced productivity. The study's findings ultimately confirmed a significant correlation between employee performance and the provision of quality welfare services. Furthermore, there was a beneficial and noteworthy correlation between enhanced employee productivity and salary. When staff members are motivated and satisfied, their performance increases, leading to enhanced production. However, it appears that welfare services are not enough for non-academic personnel at most institutions as employers often complain of shortage of cash and always cite difficulties in wage payment as an excuse for not putting the staff welfare into priority. Welfare services are crucial for effective service delivery since their insufficiency can adversely impact the productivity of non-academic workers. According to Jepkemoi (2014), providing employees with welfare benefits serves as a foundation for both their earnings and satisfaction, which in turn might potentially enhance their productivity and motivation.

The problem of this study, therefore, examined the relationship between staff promotion and welfare and non-academic staff job productivity in universities in Southwest, Nigeria.

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following research hypotheses were generated for this study:

1. There is no significant relationship between staff promotion and non-academic staff's job productivity in universities.

2. There is no significant relationship between staff welfare and non-academic staff's job productivity in universities.

## RESEARCH METHODS

The descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. The population for the study consisted of all 14,108 non-academic staff in the public universities in Southwest, Nigeria. The sample for this study consisted of 1200 non-academic staff in public universities (Federal and State) in the Southwest Nigeria. Multistage sampling procedure was used in the selection of the sample for the study. In the first stage, three states were selected using simple random sampling technique. The second stage involved the selection of two (2) universities from each state through stratified random sampling technique so that one federal university and state university were selected from each state. The third stage involved the use of proportionate sampling technique to select 1200 non-academic staff from the sampled six (6) universities. The Head of Departments/Units of each selected non-academic staff was selected through purposive sampling technique to assess productivity of non-academic staff

The data for this study were collected through the use of two sets of self – designed instruments. The first one was tagged Staff Promotion and Welfare Questionnaire (SPWQ) which was administered on the non-academic staff. The second one tagged Job Productivity Questionnaire (JPQ) was administered on the Heads of Departments/Units.

The SPWQ comprises two sections, A and B. Section A sought for the bio – data of the non-academic staff, while section B contained 13 items which elicited information on promotion, and staff welfare. The items in the questionnaire were on a 4-point Likert type scale with four options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree: Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1).

The Job Productivity Questionnaire (JPQ) comprised three sections A, B and C. Section A sought for the bio–data of the Heads of Departments. Section B contained items on the bio–data of the non-academic staff to be assessed and was completed by the researcher, while section C consisted of 16 items which elicited information on non-academic staff job productivity. The items in the questionnaire were on a rating scale with four options ranging from Excellent to Poor: Excellent (4), Good (3), Fair (2) and Poor (1).

The reliability of the instruments was carried out using test-re-test method and it was administered twice within an interval of two weeks. A reliability coefficient of 0.89 was obtained for SPWQ and 0.85 was obtained for the JPQ. The coefficients were considered high enough to make both instruments reliable for data collected.

The instruments for the study were personally administered by the researchers. The researchers sought the permission of the universities' authority to administer the questionnaire on the respondents in the universities sampled for the study. The researchers' personal visit to the tertiary institutions helped to reduce the difficulty of retrieving the instruments.

The data obtained for the study were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) at 0.05 level of significance.

## RESULTS

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between staff promotion and non-academic staff job productivity in universities. In testing this hypothesis, data on staff condition sub-variable of condition of service were collected from the responses of the respondents to items under Section B of SPWQ (item 1 – 5) in the questionnaire. Data on non-academic staff job productivity were collected from the responses of the respondents to items under Section C of JPQ (item 1 – 16) in the questionnaire. Both were compared for statistical significance using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 levels. The result is presented in table 1.

**Table 1: Relationship Between Staff Promotion and Non-Academic Staff Job Productivity in University in Southwest, Nigeria**

Variables	N	Mean	Stand Dev	r-cal	P-value
Staff Promotion	1189	11.73	1.66	0.579*	0.000
Non-Academic Staff Productivity	1189	46.26	2.87		

\*P<0.05

Table 1 showed that the r-cal value of 0.579 is significant at 0.05 level of significance because the P-value (0.000) < 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected. This implied that there was significant relationship between staff promotion and non-academic staff job productivity in universities. Staff promotion is moderately related to non-academic staff productivity.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between staff welfare and non-academic staff job productivity in universities.

In testing this hypothesis, data on staff welfare sub-variable of condition of service were collected from the responses of the respondents to items under Section B of SPWQ (item 6 – 13) in the questionnaire. Data on non-academic staff productivity were collected from the responses of the respondents to items under Section C of JPQ (item 1 – 16) in the questionnaire. Both were compared for statistical significance using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 levels. The result is presented in table 2.

**Table 2: Relationship Between Staff Welfare and Non-Academic Staff Job Productivity**

Variables	N	Mean	Stand Dev	r-cal	P-value
Staff Welfare	1189	15.54	3.62	0.577*	0.000
Non-Academic Staff Productivity	1189	46.26	2.87		

\*P<0.05

Table 2 showed that the r-cal value of 0.577 is significant at 0.05 level of significance because the P-value (0.000) < 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is



significant relationship between staff welfare and non-academic staff job productivity in universities. Staff welfare is moderately related to non-academic staff job productivity.

## **DISCUSSION**

The study revealed that there was significant relationship between staff promotion and non-academic staff job productivity in universities. It could be inferred that there will be improvement in staff job productivity if staff are promoted as and when due. The probable reason for this finding might be because promotion has influence on individual productivity as it induces good performance and increased remunerations. Promotion stimulates self - development and creates interest in training and development programmes (Gupta, 2011). Robbins (2013) maintained that promotion provide opportunities for personal growth, increased responsibility and increased social status. This result is consistent with previous findings of other scholars such as Evangeline and Thavakumar (2015) and Peter (2014) who all found a positive relationship between staff promotion and job productivity. Saharuddin (2016) showed that the variables of promotion and compensation have significant and positive impact on job satisfaction, morale and work productivity.

The finding on staff welfare and productivity revealed that there was significant relationship between staff welfare and non-academic staff job productivity in universities. It could be inferred that non-academic staff job productivity will be above average if staff welfare is not compromised. The probable reason for this finding could be because of the essence of staff welfare in any organization. This finding was in line and consistent with the findings of Yamoah (2013), Lagat et al. (2014), Ibojo and Asabi (2014), Osibanjo, et al (2014) and Nnorom, et al (2016) who all found out that staff welfare was positively related to job productivity. Sahoo and Mishra, (2012) suggested that employee benefits can be a source of competitive advantage.

## **CONCLUSION**

Sequel to the findings of this study, it was concluded that staff promotion and welfare were related to job productivity of non-academic staff in public universities in Southwest, Nigeria.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Staff welfare packages should be adequately implemented for better job performance
2. University management should from time to time conduct staff promotion for deserving non-academic staff when the need arises to improve job productivity

## **RREFERENCES**

Akande, F. B. A. (2014). Assessment of the Relationship Between Conditions of Service and Teachers' Job Performance in Secondary Schools in Kogi State, Nigeria. An Unpublished Masters Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

- Akinbode, J.F. (2006). Staff development and productivity *.Journal of the Institute of Personnel Management of Nigeria*, 12(2), 52-57.
- Amah, E. (2010). Human Resource Management. Port Harcourt, Amethyst Publishers.
- Arabi, S.M. (2000). Strategies, Plans and Guidelines to Achieve Job Productivity *Management Studies*, 5, 37 – 44
- Bamusananire, E. (2010). Human Needs Satisfaction and Teachers' performance in Secondary Schools in Gasabo District, Rwanda. Unpublished Masters of Education Degree, Makerere University
- Bull, E. (2005). *The Practice of Social Research, 6th edition*. Belmont: Wads Worth Publishing Co.
- Cascio, W.F. (2003). *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work, Life, Profits*. 6th ed. New-York: McGraw Hill.
- Dessler, G. (2008). *Human Resource Management*, (9th Ed) Prentice Hall.
- Doucouliafos, C. & Laroche, P. (2003). What Do Unions do to Productivity? A meta - analysis. *Industrial Relations*, 42, 650 – 691.
- Evageline, S. J. & Thavakumar, D. (2015).The Impact of Compensation, Performance Evaluation and Promotion Practices on Employees' Job Performance – A Study on Insurance Companies in Batticaloa District. 4<sup>th</sup> Annual International Research Conference, 49 – 67.
- Famade, O. A., Egbebi, J. O., and Akinkuowo, F. O. (2016).An assessment of various strategies in enhancing workers productive capacity in Nigeria's tertiary institutions *.African Educational Research Journal*, 4(3), 91-95.
- Gupta, C.B. (2011). *Human Resource Management*, Sultan Chand & Sons.
- Jepkemoi, K.B. (2014). Perceived Relationship Between Employee Welfare Programmes and Employee Performance at Kenya Pipeline Company. Unpublished Masters of Business Administration Thesis, Nairobi University Press.
- Lagat, A. C., Mutai, B. K. & Kosgey, I. S. (2014). Importance of Employee Welfare and Performance: The Case of the UASU at Egerton University, Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(7), 38 – 55.
- Mathis, R. L. & Jackson, J. H. (2000). *Human Resource Management* (11th ed.) USA: Thomson South – Western.
- Muheeb, R. (2014). Basic Motivation Strategies and Teacher Performance in Lagos State. Master of Education Degree University of Lagos.
- Mwiti, J.K. (2007). *The Role of Welfare Services in Motivation of Staff in Kenyan Parastatals: A Case study of Teachers Service Commission*, Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Nagar, K. (2012). Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction among Teachers during Times of Burnout. *VIKALPA*, 37(2), 39 – 45
- Nnorom, G. K., Akpa, V. O., Egwuonwu, T. K., Aintaro, A. A. & Shonubi, A. O. (2016). The Effect of Compensation Administration on Employee Productivity. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(8), 40 – 47.
- Oluchukwu, M. (2010). Recruitment Performance Pay and Wage Inequality–super. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(1), 1 – 49.
- Osinbanjo, A. O., Abiodun, A. J. & Fadugba, A. O. (2012). Executive Perception of the Impact of Flexitime or Organisational Performance: Evidence from the Nigeria

- Private Sector, *International Journal of Applied Behavioural Economics, IJABE*, 1(3), 16 – 27.
- Peter, C. G. (2014). Impact of Promotion to Employees' Performance at Dar Es Salaam City Council. An unpublished Masters' Thesis, Mzuimbe University.
- Priti S. (2009). Employee Welfare. Retrieved on July 1, 2019 <http://www.citehr.com/176307-employee-welfare.html#ixzz1zTZ8HheC>
- Robbins, P. S. (2013). *Organizational behaviour*, (12th Ed.) New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall of India. New Delhi.
- Saharuddin, S. ((2016). The Effect of Promotion and Compensation toward Working Productivity through Job Satisfaction and Working Motivation of Employees in the Department of Water and Mineral Resources Energy North Acch District. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 5(10),33 – 40.
- Sahoo, C. K & Mishra, S. (2012) Performance Management Benefits Organizations and their Employees. *Human Resource Management Digest*, 20(6), 3-5.
- Souza, A.C (2009). Conditions of Service: Implication for Nigerian Education. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 3(9), 136 –141.
- Teseema, E. & Soeters J. (2006). Challenges and Prospects of HRM in Developing Countries: Testing the HRM Link in Eritrean Civil Service, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17 (1), 86-105
- Ubom, I.U. (2002). Teachers Attitude, Conditions of Service and Job Performance Implications for Guidance Counselling. *A Journal of Basic Education in Nigeria*, 2(2), 67 – 73
- Yamoah, E. E. (2013). Relationship between Compensation and Employee Productivity. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*, 2(1),110 – 114.