Institutionalising the Effects of Remuneration and Welfare Packages on Employees' Performance in Public Universities in Nigeria

Ibrahim O Salawu[1] iD *& Abubakar S Yushau Alfakoro[1]** iD

[1]Kwara State university, Malete
*Corresponding Email:
abubakaralfakoro@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Employee remunerations and welfare packages naturally constitute the two major determinate factors that stimulate negative or positive reactions towards employee performance in an organisation.

Objective: The study examines the effects of remuneration and welfare packages on employee performance in Nigerian public universities.

Methodology: The researcher employed a mixed research method. A total of 100 questionnaires were administered to the academics and non-academic staff of the University of Ilorin and Kwara State University Malate through random sampling; hypotheses were tested using simple percentages and chi-square.

Results: This menace has resulted in many negative effects, such as strikes, protests, corruption, dismal performance, slow development, side work, and nonchalant attitude, among other factors, within the staff of Nigerian public universities.

Conclusion: Policies on remunerations should be reviewed, salaries and wages should be paid as when due; also, employees taking home pay should be capable of taking care of their needs, and welfare packages should be improved in order to improve employee performance for an effective, efficient and workable Nigeria public enterprises.

Keywords: Remuneration, University, Welfare, Staff, Employee, Performance.

Introduction

It's an indisputable fact in this 21st century that men are given the most consideration of the four (Ms) of human resources, namely machines, money, materials and men. This is because they control the other factors in the production or service processes. Human resources are the most essential asset any organisation could have and should be given the maximum priority (Ojeleye & Okoro, 2016). Inversely, the most notable compensation or reward the (Men) employee could ever get or receive from his organisation that makes them imperative among the 4Ms of human resources are often in the form of remuneration and welfare packages he/she could receive from the employer of labour. Notwithstanding, there are usually other determinants that constitute or determine employee performance in human resource management. Heneman (2005) asserted that employee performance is influenced by a multiplicity of variables, including factors such as working environment, job security, human relations, training and development, and employee reward policies etc.

It's generally agreed that most employees work for an organisation because of their remuneration and welfare packages, especially in developing countries. Remuneration and welfare packages are important in raising employee performance because they largely determine the qualities and basic necessities of life. Employees are open to discussing the matters of food, clothes, shelter and so on. However, any effect on employee salary and welfare packages will no doubt have a spillover effect on their level of performance, commitment, and motivation since they're the major contributors to the employees' state of life. Ideally, a country's public sector is saddled with the responsibility of providing essential services at an affordable rate, creating employment, promoting economic development, and improving citizens' economic conditions and standard of living.

For decades now, there have been several clamours and agitations by public and civil servants in Nigeria over poor quality education, low economic development and growth due to poor salary scale and poor welfare packages among public staff. Remuneration and welfare accorded to government employees is nothing to write off about despite the economic condition and hick in commodities prices in the market. However, employees through their respective labour unions have, over time, probed for improved conditions of services, made use of promises for improved service conditions, and used available mechanisms to press home their demands (Okeke, Nwele & Achilike, 2017). Despite their struggle, only efforts have been achieved, but nothing meaningful has been done to improve their living conditions. The consequence of such actions has always been the industrial actions of many workers with negative implications on productivity and output (Olaleye, 2012). Instead, there should be a constant increase in employee wages to satisfy their current needs and for other reasons such as inflation, economic growth, and productivity; the opposite is the case (Iqbal, 2013).

However, the Nigerian system is not working in terms of compensation workers receive from services rendered; salaries are not encouraging, and welfare packages are not visible. This risk has resulted in several negative effects, such as corruption among employees, which they asserted to low salaries, claiming that their remuneration is not enough to cater for their feeding to the point of providing clothes and shelter for their families. And there is no effort by the Ministry of Housing, agriculture, or Textile to provide houses, food and clothing for public workers compared to the private sector through its welfare package policies. Secondly, there has been poor productivity and development in the public sector as employees' salaries and welfare are not high enough to motivate them to put in more effort and work diligently, leading to a nonchalant attitude among public staff. Also, many government staff have decided to engage themselves in one form of business or another and work for the private sector due to poor salaries and welfare. There have been countless strikes and protests by labour unions in the country, which has always led to the closure of public enterprises. Poor wages are a constant source of frustration if labour and management are engaged in constant strife, resulting in decreased productivity, now making public employees search and cross to the private sector or another job for a more meaningful life and better service conditions (Nwachukwu, 2009).

It's against this backdrop I found it imperative and essential to conduct a study on what effect remuneration and welfare have on employee performance in public universities in Nigeria. This research paper is divided into five sections: the introduction, conceptual clarification, methodology, findings, conclusion and recommendations.

The objective of the study specifically includes:

- To determine the relationship between remuneration and employee performance in public universities.
- To investigate the relationship between welfare packages and employee performance in public universities.
- To ascertain the effect of strikes, corruption, and side works on public universities.

In addition to the objective, the research questions are as follows:

- Does remuneration affect employee performance in public universities
- How significant are welfare packages to employee performance in public universities
- What is the impact of strikes, corruption and side works on public universities
- Are labour unions active actors in influencing employee performance in the public sector

Research Gap

Many researchers have tried to inquire about the effect of remuneration on productivity. However, there was limited study on the effect of welfare packages on employee productivity, more importantly on employees of public universities in Nigeria. There has been limited answer to any questions about the genesis of constant strikes, poor quality education, brain drain, and lecture shortage in Nigerian public institutions. However, no doubt this paper will provide answers to such crucial questions.

Literature Review

The History of Nigeria Public Universities

The genesis for establishing public universities in Nigeria has been subjected to different conceptions based on divergent views from scholars. To some, the establishment of universities in Nigeria can be traced back to the 1925 memorandum on education policy in British tropical Africa, while others believe that it was through the effort of the nationalists; to others, it was during the colonisation period. Amango (2003) avers that since it was through education that all nationalists became popular, the effort towards creating universities was a strong move before independence in Nigeria and other African countries. Other writers asserted that the first learning institution in Nigeria was the Yaba higher college, even though there is some advanced study centre like the Veterinary Research Institute in Vom, Plateue Sate, agriculture plantation in Ibadan and engineering centre in Lagos (N, J Okoli, L, ogbon & R, N Ewor,). Lastly, some traced it to the Elliot Commission of 1943, culminating in the establishing of University College Ibadan (UCI) in 1948 (Jake, Otanko).

However, In April 1959, the Federal Government created an inquiry committee known as the Ashby Commission to give recommendations on the state of higher education in Nigeria. The Ashby Commission, among its recommendations, stated that Nigeria universities should be national in outlook and policy should be general (FRN, 1960:44). Prior to the submission of the report, the University of Nsukka was created by the eastern region weeks before the submission of the committee reports in 1960. Consequently, the implementation of the Ashby Report led to the establishment of the University of Ife in 1962 in the Western region, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria in 1962 in the Northern Region and the University of Lagos (1962) by the Federal Government. Later, the University of Benin was created when the mid-western region was created, bringing the total number to six, and it has been referred to as a first-generation university from 1960 to 1970.

The next set of universities was established during the third national development plan (1975-1980) under the then head of state general Yakubu Gawon in 1975. They include the University of Ilorin, Jos, Sokoto, Maiduguri, Calabar, Maiduguri, Port Harcourt and Ado Bayero University, Kano, known as second-generation universities. The third-generation universities were established between (1980-1990), which are mostly Technology Universities; they are the Federal Universities of Technology in Akure, Bauchi, Makurdi, Owerri, Makurdi, and Yola. By November 2010, the total number of Federal universities had come to 27 (FRN, 2010; Okojie, 2011). President Goodluck Jonathan, in December 2010, announced the establishment of nine federal universities they include federal university, Gusau, Ndufe-Alike, Duste –ma, Oye-Ekiti, Lafiya, Otuoke, Kashere, Lokoja, Wukari.

State universities emerged in Nigeria through the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria when educational matters were transferred from an exclusive list to a concurrent list by a military government decree in 1971. This results from providing education for all due to the expansion in population and a limited number of federal universities. The proliferation of state-owned universities gained momentum between 1979 and 1983. Eight State-owned universities were established; the first among them was the Rivers State Universities of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt, which came into being as the result of a conversion of the State College of Science. The total number of state universities in Nigeria in 2010 amounted to thirty-seven-seven (37) (FRN, 2010; Okojie, 2011).

Table 1.1 The List of Federal Universities in Nigeria.

S.N.	Universities	Year founded	Location
1.	University College (now UI) Ibadan	1948	Ibadan, Oyo state
2.	University of Nigeria	1960	Nsukka, Enugu state
3.	University of Lagos	1962	Akoka, Lagos state
4.	Ahmadu Bello University	1962	Zaria, Kaduna state
5.	University of Ife (now OAU)	1962	Ile-Ife, Osun state
6.	University of Benin	1970	Benin, Edo state
7.	University of Calabar	1975	Calabar, Cross River state
8.	University of Ilorin	1975	Ilorin, Kwara state
9.	University of Jos	1975	Jos, Plateau state
10.	Bayero University, Kano	1975	Kano, Kano state
11.	University of Maiduguri	1975	Maiduguri, Borno state
12.	University of Port Harcourt	1975	Choba, Rivers State
13.	Usman Dan-Fodiyo University, Sokoto	1975	Sokoto, Sokoto state
14.	Federal University of Technology, Owerri	1980	Owerri, Imo state
15.	Federal University Of Technology Yola	1980	Yola, Adamawa state
16.	Federal University of Technology, Akure	1981	Akure, Ondo state
17.	Federal University of Technology, Minna	1982	Minna, Niger state
18.	Nigerian Defence Academy (NDA) Zaria	1985	Zaria, Kaduna state
19.	University of Abuja	1988	FCT, Abuja
20.	Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi	1988	Bauchi, Bauchi state
21.	University of Agriculture, Makurdi	1988	Makurdi, Benue state
22.	University of Agriculture, Abeokuta	1988	Abeokuta, Ogun state
23.	University of Uyo, Uyo	1991	Uyo, Akwa Ibom state

24.	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture (MOUAU), Umudike	1992	Umudike, Abia State
25.	Nnamdi Azikiwe University	1992	Awka, Anambra State
26.	National Open University of Nigeria, Lagos	2002	Lagos state
27.	Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Efurun	2007	Efurun, Warri Delta state
28.	Federal University, Dutse	2011	Jigawa state
29.	Federal University, Dutsin-Ma	2011	Katsina state
30.	Federal University, Kashere	2011	Gombe state
31.	Federal University, Lafia	2011	Nasarawa state
32.	Federal University, Lokoja	2011	Kogi state
33.	Federal University, Ndufu-Aliko Ikwo	2011	Ebonyi state
34.	Federal University, Otuoke	2011	Bayelsa state
35.	Federal University, Oye-Ekiti	2011	Ekiti state
36.	Federal University, Wukari	2011	Taraba state
37.	The Police Academy	2012	Kano State
38.	Federal University, Birnin-Kebbi	2013	Kebbi state
39.	Federal University, Gusau	2013	Zamfara state
40.	Federal University, Gasua	2013	Yobe state

Sources: Adopted from NJ Okoli, L. Ogbondah & Ewor, R.N.

Table 1.2 The List of State Universities in Nigeria

S.N.	Universities	Year founded	Location
1.	Rivers State University of Science & Technology	1979	Rivers State
2.	Enugu State University of Technology, Enugu	1980	Enugu State
3.	Abia State University (ABSU), Uturu	1981	Abia State
4.	Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye	1981	Ogun State
5.	Imo State University, Owerri	1981	Owerri
6.	Ambrose Alli University (AAU), Ekpoma	1981	Edo State
7.	Lagos State University, Ojo, Apapa	1983	Lagos State
8.	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology Ogomosh	1988	Oyo State
9.	Kogi State University, Aiyigba	1988	Kogi State
10.	Ekiti State university, Ado-Ekiti	1988	Ekiti State
11.	Delta State University (DELSU) Abraka	1990	Delta State
12.	Benue State University (BSU), Markudi	1995	Benue State
13.	Eboyi State University (EBSU), Abakiliki	1996	Eboyi State
14.	Kano State University, Bagauda	1998	Kano State
15.	Adekunle Ajasin University of Technology, AkungbaAkoko	1999	Ondo State
16.	Anambra State University (ANSU), Uli	2000	Anambra State

17.	Kano State University of Technology, Wudil	2000	Kano State
18.	Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island	2000	Bayelsa State
19.	Adamawa State University (ADSU) Mubi	2002	Adamawa State
20.	Cross River State University of Technology (CRUTECH), Calabar	2002	Cross River State
21.	Nasarawa State University, Keffi	2002	Nasarawa State
22.	North-East University, Kano	2012	Kano State
23.	Kaduna State University, Kaduna	2004	Kaduna State
24.	Gombe State University	2004	Gombe State
25.	Plateau State Universssity, Bokkos	2005	Plateau State
26.	Ibrahim Babangida University, Lapai	2005	Niger state
27.	Kebbi State University, Aliero	2005	Kebbi State
28.	Bukar Abba Ibrahim University, Damaturu	2006	Yobe State
29.	Umaru Musa Yar'Adua University, Katsina	2006	Katsina State
30.	Osun State University, Osogbo	2006	Osun State
31.	Ondo State University of science and technology, Okitiputa	2008	Ondo State
32.	Tai-Solari University of Education, Ijebu-Ode	2008	Ogun State
33.	Taraba State University, Jalingo	2008	Taraba State
34.	Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt	2009	Rivers State
35.	Kwara State University	2009	Kwara State
36.	Sokoto state University, Sokoto	2009	Sokoto State
37.	Akwa Ibom State University of Science & Technology (AKUTECH), Uyo	2010	Akwa Ibom
38.	Bauchi State University, Gadau	2011	Bauchi State
39.	Technical University, Ibadan	2012	Oyo State
40.	Jigawa State University, Kassim-Hamsa	2013	Jigawa State

Source: Adapted from NJ Okoli, L. Ogbondah & Ewor, R.N

Concept of Remuneration, Welfare And Employee Performance

The concept of remuneration has been given diverse meanings and usage. However, it still connotes the terms pay, salary, wage or compensation received for service rendered. In the words of Sonnentag & Frese (2001), the concept of remuneration was coined from the word 'remuneration', which implies pay, compensation, bonus, or, to say, anything received or measured in monetary terms from a service rendered. Remuneration etymologically is perceived as the generality of income an employee receives, which includes a variety of payment systems that go in accordance with the started modalities of compensation by the organisation. This payment may include salary, wages, overtime, and over days.

Maicibi (2005) posits that the term remuneration signifies pay or compensation received by an individual for service rendered. He went further to point out the elements of remuneration, which include salary, wage bonuses, pension schemes, overtime allowances and responsibility allowances. Braton & Gold (2003) asserted that basic salaries are fixed payments for non-manual employees, usually expressed in annual terms, paid per month with generally no additions for productivity. Going

further, Card & Krueger (2010) view remuneration as the benefits or pay received by the employees from their employer in the form of salaries, wages, allowances, perquisites, bonuses, incentives, etc. Remuneration can mean a method of compensation or appreciation offered by an employer to his staff as the result of service rendered or their contribution to the creation of utility. The concept of salary and wage is one of the most known variants of remuneration, which refers to payments made to employees monthly, weekly, and sometimes hourly. However, Surbhi (2015) defined salary as a fixed amount paid to employees regularly for their performance and productivity.

In contrast, wages are the hourly payment given to labourers for the amount of work finished in a day. In a broader view, remuneration can be taken to mean an established payment system based on an agreement between two parties, that is, the employer and the employee, on how the employee is to be rewarded or compensated in commensuration with the service rendered or is participation in the production process. The compensation comes in the form of salary, wages, incentives, and bonuses, which an employee makes a living on. The major distinction between salary and wage is that the former is received at a fixed monthly period. In contrast, the latter is based on weekly, daily, or hourly.

Ideally, all employees are employed to perform an organisation's particular task or job. After the placement of each worker, standards and benchmarks are set to measure and evaluate employees' performance in order to compensate them according to their level of performance. Bataineh (2017) asserted that employee performance is the synergy between the effectiveness and efficiency of the employee's routine job description to meet the goals of the employers. Job performance connotes the task or function assigned to an employee to accomplish under some predetermined conditions and within a given available resources (Dar, Akmal, Akram &Khan, 2011). Productivity entails the ability to produce goods and services within a specified time concerning the resources provided to accomplish the task (Singh, 2009). Charity Tinofirei (2009) posited that performance is the mechanism to evaluate the level of work done by an employee. Performance is used in relation to quantity, quality, time, efficiency, and effectiveness of the job completed. Beyley, as cited in Wijayanti (2012), stressed that performance is used interchangeably with the word goals since the performance of an individual work will impact the organisational goal. Going further, Wright, Cropanzano and Meyer (2013) view employee performance as an essential component of human resource management since employees are saddled with the responsibility of carrying out all stages of the production process, which include manufacturing, processing, storage, transportation, marketing, purchasing, distribution, promotion of business, finance and accounting, human resource, research, and public relations among other functions. However, employee performance entails the ability of an employee to perform a given task according to the stated standard through effective and efficient utilisation of resources envisaged for its production. Employee performance is essential if an organisation maintains its efforts towards realising predesigned goals (Dessler, 2008).

The third concept discussed in this paper is the concept of welfare. Welfare refers to the ability to look after or cater for one's needs due to a mutual relation or agreement or according to someone's importance to that particular entity to entice or motivate that person to act or do more. Cowling (2002) states that welfare is an established mechanism towards commitment and motivation for the catering of employees. Gannon (2002) asserted that employee welfare is a general term used to denote multiple factors essential for employees' well-being. A welfare package may come as incentives or material things, including bonuses, extra pay, transportation allowance, housing allowance, wardrobe allowance, health insurance, overtime allowance, and so on. A bonus can be termed as a reward for achieving specific goals set by the company or for dedication to the company. Romanoff (2008) sees a bonus as a single payment made at the end of the performance period, typically a year, to reward extraordinary effort or achievement, while an incentive is a tangible or intangible reward that is designed to motivate a person or group to behave in a certain way. Tiwari (2014) carried out a study on employee welfare activities and their impact on employee efficiency at Rewa and concluded that the management is

required to focus more attention on the facilities provided to the employees in such a way that will increase productivity, satisfaction, performance level and profitability of the company. Also, Rao. et al. (2015) surveyed employee welfare after interviewing 60 respondents and found that welfare measures were considered a critical indicator which may influence employee performance.

Nexus Between Remuneration, Welfare And Employee Perform

There exists a strong relationship between remuneration, welfare and employee performance. Remuneration is what an employee receives for service rendered on a basic interval or period; on the other hand, welfare consists of those benefits or rewards outside the normal pay of an employee which motivates an employee to do more or above the benchmark due to rewards attached to it while performance is the output or activity an employee can perform within a given resource and time of accomplishment. Employee remuneration must be considered in relation to the basic needs of the employees so that the minimum salary/wage meets the needs of their lives (Kanzunnudin, 2007).

Incentives are extra employee payments to increase their motivation, commitment and productivity. It is also used to refer to payments made to employees apart from their normal pay with the rationale of raising employees' performance towards using their maximum potential in the production process (Banjoko, 2006). Nwokolo (2011) posits that poor employer and employee relations in an organisation often influence employee performance as they believe their employees do not compensate for their efforts by refusing to pay them the same rate. After all, the same government and everybody buys from the same market. Many employees have quit their jobs based on poor salary structures and welfare packages offered by their respective organisations.

Abu (2016) confirms that many employees have had leave left or changed their jobs due to poor welfare packages and a poor, conducive working environment. Rewards given to employees in the form of cash, welfare packages, social esteem, and security of work are very important factors in increasing employee performance. In a similar view, Suesi (2002) agreed that rewards in the form of cash and recognition are the key motivators in increasing employee performance. Going further, increases in salaries and wages usually attract and retain highly skilled personnel in the organisation since wages and salaries constitute the basic means of subsistence or living for an employee. An increase in remuneration motivates employees to channel their maximum efforts to the organisation's success, which comes in the form of increased effort, other things being equal (Georgiadis, 2013). Gayle and Brock (2004) asserted that employers provide employees with welfare facilities to keep their motivation levels high. An effective wage strategy is expected to contribute to maintaining the viability of the workforce, realising the vision and mission, and achieving work objectives (Umar, 2012). Mathew (2011) advocated that employee welfare measures serve as oxygen for the workers' motivation and increase the workforce's effectiveness.

Empirical Review

In a study conducted by Okeke, Nwele, and Achilike (2017) on the impact of effective wages and salary administration on civil service productivity in Anambra State, using simple percentage and Chi-square to test the hypothesis, the result indicated that employee remuneration has an effective impact in achieving high productivity in the civil service. Babagana and Dungus (2015) researched the effects of staff remuneration on their performance in Ramat Polytechnic Maiduguri Borno state. A questionnaire was used as the research instrument and was administered to 45 respondents, and the sample of the study was the academic staff of the polytechnic from the five schools within the polytechnic. The data was analysed using Pearson's Product Moment correlation and regression analysis using Microsoft Excel. The findings showed a strong positive relationship between staff remuneration and Ramat Polytechnic Maiduguri's performance. In a similar study, Kuye and Sulaimon (2011) found that remuneration administration schemes and employee performance are interwoven. This research indicates that most

organisations' relationship between remuneration and employee satisfaction is more consistent.

The work of Osterman (2010), with a preference for the production sector, examines the nexus between staff productivity and staff welfare using the Coca-Cola Company as a case study. Data were collected through secondary sources and analysed using the SPSS package to run the multiple regression. The result shows a positive relationship between the variables under study. Based on the findings, it was concluded that staff productivity is a function of staff welfare. Sajuyigbe, Olaoye, and Adeyemi (2013) conducted a study on the impact of rewards on employees' performance in selected manufacturing companies in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. Questionnaires were used to collect data from the hundred (100) participants through the purposive sampling method, and data were analysed by multiple regression. Results showed that reward dimensions jointly predict employees' performance, accounting for a 71% variance in performance. In their study, Olatunji and Sarat (2014) examined wage and salary administration as a motivational tool in Nigerian organisations, taking reference from Nestle Nigeria Plc. The study made use of a self-designed questionnaire. The chi-square technique was employed in analysing the data. The study found that wages and salaries serve as a motivational tool and that wages and salaries have a significant relationship with workers' performance in Nigerian organisations.

Underpinning Theory

Expectancy Theory

The idea behind the development of expectancy theory is derived from the valence –instrumentality – expectancy theory developed by Victor Vroom in 1964. The theory consists of three concepts, as mentioned above. Armstrong (2006) sees valence as value instrumentality that signifies that if an action is performed, it will automatically lead to another. Expectancy is the possibility or outcome expected from an action. The theory holds that individuals have a wide range of options to select from, which all have uncertain outcomes of actions. The valance serves as an instrument to control the actions so that their expectation from those actions will probably turn positive since the outcome is not certain. Valance also connotes emotional orientations; employees believe in the reward system, either extrinsic in the form of money or promotion or intrinsic motivation. The employee's behaviour towards his expectations is influenced by the preferences among the uncertain outcomes and the possibility of certainty in the outcome of his expectancy. Armstrong (2006) puts expectancy as a measuring technique concerning the possibility that a particular outcome will follow a certain action. The theory stresses that expectations from the organisation will determine the level of commitment of the employees not because of anything but because of the outcome that their actions may result to. For example, an employee may decide to work overtime because he knows he will be rewarded or paid for the extra working hours. Experience is an important instrument in the theory since workers' experience will determine if such behaviour or effort will yield a positive outcome. Vroom suggested individual behaviour results from conscious choice within options to maximise their pleasure and minimising their pain since individual employees' performance is based on personal factors such as personality, experience, skill and abilities. Going further, Armstrong (2006) asserted that expectancies can be used in relation to employee strength and commitment. Maximum strength will be directed at actions with the probability or possibility of a positive outcome. In contrast, minimal strength is directed by subjective certainty that a positive outcome will not follow employee behaviour. Expectancy theory contributes to motivation theory as it provides a means to measure and determine what employees need to make them give their full effort and commitment towards organisational goals.

Methodology

The research methodology adopted in this research work is the descriptive survey method. The method helps to get important information about events or research topics by asking individuals with

characteristics information so the researcher can know and measure their beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, understanding and points of view (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The target population for the study is the academics and non-academic staff of the University of Ilorin and Kwara State University Malate. The sample size was selected through a stratified sampling technique, which involved selecting units from a heterogeneous population (Castillo, 2009). A representative sample of 100 from the population was selected using stratified random sampling. The target population was stratified into two groups: academics and non-academic staff.

Structured questionnaires were used as the research instrument to collect information from respondents. The researcher developed the questionnaires in a Likert scale format of strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree and undecided to elicit information from the respondents. The information gathered from respondents through the questionnaires will be assessed and analysed using descriptive statistics involving frequency tables and simple percentages. Furthermore, inferential statistical tools for analysis, i.e., chi-square, will be used to test hypotheses. The formula of chi-square is given thus -

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

X^2 = *chi-square*

$\sum$ = *(sigma) sumation*

Fe = frequency expected.

The degree is, however, determined by testing on a 5% level of significance, i.e. 0.05

Table 2.1 Demographic of Respondents

Items	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	67	67%
Female	33	33%
		100%
Work Experience		
2 – 4	13	13%
5 -10	52	52%
10 – Above	35	35%
		100%
Age		
18 – 29	33	33%
30 – 39	25	25%
40 – Above	42	42%
		100%
Qualification		
O – Level	2	2%
NCE/ND	13	13%
BSC/ HND	19	19%
MSC/PHD	58	58%
PROF	8	8%
		100%

Table 2.2 Analysis of Research Questionnaires.

S.N.	Questions	Options					
		SA	**A**	**N**	**SD**	**D**	**Total**
1.	University staff are always more committed to duty if they know the government cares for their welfare.	24	63	1	10	2	100
		24%	63%	1%	10%	2%	100%
2.	Universities staff wholly depend on their wages and salaries	37	25	13	9	16	100
		37%	25%	13%	9%	16%	100%
3.	Do labour unions influence employee remunerations?	22	31	24	12	11	100
		22%	31%	24%	12%	11%	100%
4.	Does the government prefer to give bribes to a few labour leaders rather than pay a wage increase?	38	19	28	8	7	100
		38%	19%	28%	8%	7%	100%
5.	Inadequate wages and salaries paid to staff have impacted corrupt practices in public universities.	39	31	14	9	7	100
		39%	31%	14%	9%	7%	100%
6.	State university lectures should be paid the same salary as their federal counterpart	13	22	31	25	9	100
		13%	22%	31%	25%	9%	100%
7.	Lack of motivation gives room for inefficiency and poor performance in public universities	37	29	17	9	8	100
		37%	29%	17%	9%	8%	100%
8.	Are poor remuneration and poor welfare service the major problems of public universities?	32	21	14	19	15	100
		32%	20%	14%	19%	15%	100%
9.	An increase in remuneration and welfare package will increase employee performance in public universities	40	29	4	13	14	100
		40%	29%	4%	13%	14%	100%
10.	A harmonious relationship between labour and government leads to increased productivity	27	18	21	19	15	100
		27%	18%	21%	19%	15%	100%
11.	Do you engage yourself in other jobs or business?	14	22	8	27	29	100
		14%	22%	8%	27%	29%	100%
12.	Remuneration and welfare packages in the private sector are better than in the public sector	24	17	19	15	25	100
		24%	17%	19%	15%	25%	100%

Field Survey: 2022

Hypothesis Testing

Data from the questionnaires administered were analysed using simple percentages. Research data were presented in tabular forms, followed by discussions of the results obtained. The hypotheses of the study were tested using chi-square. The formula reads as follows:

$$X2 = \Sigma \, (FO – FT)^2 \, FT$$

Where X2 = chi – square

FO = observed frequencies

F.T. = expected frequencies

Rt = row total

Ct = column total

Gt = grand total

Also, the degree of freedom (df) of the hypothetical statement is given by the following formula:

Df = (c-1) (r-1)

Where

Df = degree of freedom

r = number of rows

c = number of columns

A degree is, however, determined testing on a 5% level of significance, i.e. 0.05

Decision Rule: Accept H1 if x2 calculated is greater than x2 critical.

Reject H1 if x2 calculated is less than x2 critical.

Test of Hypothesis

H0 : There is no relationship between remuneration, welfare package and employee performance in public universities.

HI : There is a relationship between remuneration, welfare package and employee performance in public universities.

In testing the hypothesis, data from Table 2.2, question number 9 relating to the response to the question were used to test the hypothesis and the results were presented and analysed below;

Sex	SA	A	N	SD	D	Total
Male	27	19	3	9	9	67
Female	13	10	1	4	5	33
	40	**29**	**4**	**13**	**14**	**100**

Source: Field survey 2022

Cells	Fo	Ft	Fo – Ft	(Fo – Ft)²	(Fo – Ft)² / Ft
E1	27	26.8	0.2	0.04	0.0015
E2	19	19.43	-0.43	0.1849	0.0095
E3	3	2.7	0.3	0.09	0.0333
E4	9	8.71	0.29	0.0841	0.0097
E5	9	9.4	-0.4	0.16	0.0170
E6	13	13.2	-0.2	0.04	0.0030
E7	10	9.6	0.4	0.16	0.0167
E8	1	1.32	-0.32	0.1024	0.0776
E9	4	4.3	-0.3	0.09	0.0209
E10	5	4.62	0.38	0.1444	0.0312

CALCULATED CHI-SQUARE

0. 2204

Source: Field survey 2022

Degree of freedom = (R-1) (C-1) (2-1) (5-1) (at 5% significance) 1×4 = 4 under 0.05.

X2 Calculated is 0.2204

Tabulated is 9.488

Decision Rule:

Reject Hi if the chi-square calculated value is greater than the chi-square X2 critical value, and do not reject Hi if otherwise.

Conclusion

Since X2 calculated (0.2204) is < X2 Tabulated (9.488), we reject the H0 hypothesis, which states that there is no relationship between remuneration, welfare package and employee performance in public universities. Accept the H1 hypothesis, which states that a relationship exists between remuneration, welfare package and employee performance in public universities.

Discussion of Findings

The findings from the concluded study are as follows.

Firstly, the study finds out that there is a strong significant relationship between employee remuneration and employer performance and also a strong relationship between employee welfare packages and employer performance.

Other findings include

- University staff tend to be more committed to their duty if they know the government care about their welfare.
- It was found that most public university staff depend on their wages and salaries.
- Inadequate wages and salaries have an impact on corrupt practices in public universities.
- Private universities' Welfare packages and remuneration are better than those of public universities.
- Most staff have engaged in side work due to low pay in public universities.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study above establishes that tertiary education is one of the most important aspects of learning in any country of the world. However, there has been a constant clamour for improvements in working conditions; the salary structure and welfare package for public university staff are very poor compared to other institutions in the public sector and their counterparts in the private sector. The consequences of these shenanigans have resulted in the problem itemised in the introductory part of the paper. There is a need for a careful check and study of these problems because the remuneration and welfare aspects of employees are integral components to maximum performance and productivity in any organisational setting. Therefore, employee remuneration and welfare should be given cognizant consideration.

We offer the following recommendations to find remedies to the problems associated with the effects of remunerations and welfare packages on employee performance in public universities.

1. There should be fair compensation for employees in public universities to motivate them,
2. Salaries should be reviewed constantly in order to cope with changes in the economic situation and their growing demands.
3. Public universities' staff should be given priority as other public staff are given in terms of better treatment, salary structure and quick payment.
4. There should be increased welfare packages for university staff in terms of better housing, free medical treatment, scholarships and incentives. Salary should be paid when due in order to avoid late payment and industrial strikes.

5. The government should monitor and have full details of university staff in order to know their respective performance and those that do engage in other jobs or business apart from their current jobs.

References

Aminigo, I. M (2003) Educational philosophy and national development. Port Harcourt: Hanging Garden Publishers.

FRN (1960) Investment in Education: The report of the commission on post-school certificate and higher education in Nigeria. Lagos

Abu MM (2016), The role of well structure welfare package on the daily output of construction workers in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research.*

Andreas Georgiadis (2015). Efficiency wages and economic effects of the minimum wage: Evidence from a low-wage labour market. *Oxford Bulletin of Economic and Statistics Volume* 75, Issue 6 p.962-979.

Armstrong, P.O (2006), Human resource management practice, Kogan.

Babagana, A. & Dungus, B. (2015). Staff remuneration and the performance of Ramat Polytechnic Maiduguri students from 1995 to 2011 *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences.* 3 (5)1-10

Banjoko, S (2006). *Managing corporate reward systems.* Pumark Nigeria Limited.

Bataineh, R. F., & Mayyas, M. B.(2017). The utility of blended learning in EFL reading and grammar: A case for model. *Teaching English with Technology,* Vol. 7, No 3. Pp 35-4. Retrieved 2ND August 2021 from http://www.tewtjournal.org/issues/volume2017/volume17-issue.

Bratton, J., &Gold, J. (2017). Human resource management: Theory and practice. https:doi.org/10.12737/1711-1

Card, D., and A.B. Krueger. 2(010). Minimum wages and employment: A case study of the fast-food industry in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. *American Economic Review,* 90(5), 1,397–1,420.

Charity Tinofirei. (2011). The unique affecting employee performance in non-profit organisations. Thesis: Magister Technologiae in the Subject of Public Management. University: South Africa.

Cowling A, Mailer C (2002). Managing human resources. 2nd Edition. London: Edward Arnold.

Dar, L., Akmal, A., Naseem, M.A. & Khan, K.U.D. (2011). The impact of stress on employees' job performance in the business sector of Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research.* 11(96):1-5.

Dessler, G. (2008). Human resource management. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Gannon MJ (2002). Organisational behaviour: A managerial and organisational perspective. USA: Little, Brown and Company Limited.

Gray JL, Starke FA (1988). Organisational behaviour: Concepts and applications. 3rd Edition. Columbia, Ohio: Merrill Pub. Company

Gayle & Broke (2018). Employee welfare schemes and worker performance: A study of selected insurance firms in Port Harcourt. *International Journal Foundation.*

Heneman, Hebert G., Donald P. Schwab, John A. Fossum, Lee D. Dyer. (1987).

Iqbal, S. (2013), Labour Fate: Diluting Inequality. Jakarta: Kompas.

Jako, Otonko (2012). University education in Nigeria: History, success, failure and the way forward. *International Journal of Technology and Inclusive Education* Vol 1, Issue 2, December 2012.

Kanzunnudin, M. (2007), Effect of wages and supervision of employee productivity: A case study on TPT Tonga Tiur Son Zenith District Kragan. Fokus Ekonomi, 2(1), 11-20.

Kuye, O.L. and Sulaimon, A.A. (2011) Employee involvement in decision making and firms performance in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria". *Serbian Journal of Management, University of Belgrade,* Serbia.Vol. 6, (1), p. I - I5.

Maicibi, N. A. (2005). Pertinent issues in management: Human resource and educational management. Kampala; Net Media. Publisher Ltd.

Nwachukwu, C. C. (2009). Human resource management, Port Harcourt: Davidstones Publishers Ltd.

Nwokolo, J.I. (2011). Minimum wage strike in Anambra State: *The Real Story the Nation,* Lagos: Vintage Press Ltd

N, J Okoli, L, Ogbondah & R, N Ewor. (2016). The history and development of public universities in Nigeria since 1914. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation.* ISSN 2489-0073 Vol. 2 No1, 2006.

Nwizu G. (2002). Studies in modern public administration. Enugu: Ngib Publishers Ltd.

Oyegun, R.O. (1985). The use and waste water in a Third World World city. *Geojournal.* Reidel Publishing Company, 10.2, 205-210.

Ojeleye, Y.C & Okoro, C.I. (2016). Job stress and employees' productivity in telecommunication sector of Nigeria (A study of Globacom, MTN, Airtel and Etisalat). *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Education and Research.*1 (5): 5-10

Olaleye, A. O. (2012). Implications of non-implementation of minimum wage in Ekiti State. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa Volume* 16, No, 2:121-129.

Olatunji, E. S., & Sarat, I. A. (2014). Wages and salaries administration as a motivational tool in Nigerian organisation (a case study of Nestle Nigeria Plc). *Journal of Business Theory and Practice,* 2(2),

Okeke, P. A., Nwele, J. O., & Achilike, N. (2017). Impact of effective wages and salary administration on civil service productivity in Nigeria: A Study of Anambra State. *Asian Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, 1(9), 421 – 438.

Osterman P (2010). 'Work Reorganisation in an era of Restructuring: Trends in Diffusion and effects on Employee Welfare: Assessed Online on 15 October 2010 at http://web.mit.edu/osterman/www/workreorg.pdf. 247 - 26.

Romanoff, K. (2008). What is the difference between a bonus and an incentive? Retrieved on 25th August 2016 from http://theperfectpayplan.typepad.com/the_salary_sage/2008/07/what-is-the-dif.html

Sajuyigbe, A. S., Olaoye, B .O. & Adeyemi, M.A (2013). Impact of reward on employee performance in selected manufacturing companies in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce.* 2(2); 27-32

Surbhi, S. (2015). Differences between salaries and wages. Retrieved on 24th August 2016 from .http://keydifferences.com/difference-between-salary-andwages.html#ixzz4IG1CT6Vu

Sonnentag, S. (2001). Expertise at work: Experience and excellent performance. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.). International review of industrial and organisational psychology (pp. 223–264). Chichester: Wiley

Tiwari U. (2014). *A Study on Employee Welfare Facilities and Its Impact on Employees Efficiency at Vindha Telelinks Ltd. Rewa (MP) India.* Abhinav Publication: Volume 3, Issue 11

Tjahyanti, S. (2013). Effect of quality of work life on the productivity of employees. *Media Bisnis,* 5(1),19.

Umar, A. (2012). Effect of wages, motivation, and job satisfaction on the performance of workers in the manufacturing industry in the city of Makassar. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen,* 10(2), 406-418.

Wright, Thomas A, Cropanzano, Russell. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83(3), 486-493. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.3.466