Journal of the Nigerian Association of Mathematical Physics
***Volume 32, (November, 2015*), pp 245 – 248**
© J. of NAMP

A Statistical Analysis of the Impact of Employees Welfare Service Scheme on Organisational Productivity

Nwosu Chibuzo Charles and Nwosu C. A

Department of Statistics, Anambra State University, Uli.

Abstract

The study dwelled on the impact of employees welfare service scheme on organisational productivity. The study was carried out on the non-academic staff of Anambra State University Uli. The work examined various ways an employee can be motivated in order to increase work performance and also various behavioural tendencies at work place. In the methodology, the method of data collection adopted were the primary and secondary source of data collection. The sample size was 300 non-academic staff, the sampling technique used for the work is the simple random sampling technique. In the analysis a (2x5) contingency table for "M" independent random sample was used in the analysis of the data. From the results obtained it was discovered that poor performance of the non-academic staff in the university can be attributed to the poor welfare services provided within the institution. For instance performance related pay increase, insured health services, good facilities, fringe benefits, security, welfare scheme, these services were discovered to be scare in the motivational techniques and this results to low organisational productivity. It was generally concluded that for great work performance employee's economic, social and behavioural cornerstone should be known for corporate culture, good communication, job satisfaction, effectiveness fairness etc, to be ensured within the organization.

Keywords: Welfare package, motivation, productivity, contingency table, fringe benefits

1.0 Introduction

This research dwelled on the impact of employee welfare services on non-academic staff of Anambra State University Uli. Almost all organization adopt different welfare measures for their employees. According to Aswathappa [1], welfare can be referred to as the physical, emotional, mental and moral –well-being of an individual, thus anything that helps an individual to attain this state is a welfare measure. Broadly speaking welfare measure can be considered as anything that is done for the comfort of the employees. The main purpose behind providing welfare measures is to motivate the employees and make them more committed towards work.

Welfare being a corporate attitude or commitment that reflects in the expressed care for employees at all levels, underpinning their work and the environment in which it is performed [2]. Specifically, Coventry and Barker [3] asserted that staff welfare includes providing social club and sports facilities as appropriate, supervising staff and works canteens, running sick – clubs and saving schemes, dealing with superannuation, pension – funds and leave grants, making loans on hardship cases, arranging legal aids and giving advice on personal assistance to staff transferred to another area and providing fringe benefits, (such as payment during sickness, Luncheon vouchers and other indirect advantages).

Productivity on the other hand, means goods and services produced in a specified period of time in relation to the resources utilized [4]. It is however, contended by Cohen *et al* [5] to be more than a narrow economic measure and outside the organization. In effect, productivity suggests effectiveness and efficiency of the employees.

One of the most biggest challenges faced by entrepreneurs, managers, leaders, organisations and institutions in general towards achieving effectiveness and complexity that dwells in human behaviour and the dynamics of organisational circumstance many management or the government go about managing public workers in such manners as could undoubtedly produce sub-optimal results thereby jeopardizing the chances of the organisation realizing the set goals and objective efficiently. The reward system may be inappropriate, the knowledge of the workers motivational cornerstones may be

Corresponding author: Nwosu Chibuzo Charles, E-mail: charlesnwosu345@gmail.com, Tel.: +2348064314368

inadequate, management may simply be naive or unable to apply powerful behavioural principles to bring out the best in people, be they individuals, teams, units or the entire organisation. There is a general feeling of workers low productivity in both the public and private sectors of the economy. Attitude to work is said to be poor. There exist continuous and spiral demand for wage increases, better conditions of services and general workers welfare. More often than not workers are at loggerheads with their management or with the government over one grievance or another, valuable man hours or work periods are lost over some short or long drawn disputes. These issues are injurious to high productivity since labour is needed for organisational productivity. Harbison [6] has succinctly explained that human resources is no capital, nor income, nor material resources but what constitutes the ultimate basis for the wealth of nations. Capital and natural resources are passive factors of production. Human beings are the active agents who accumulate capital, exploit natural resources, build social economic and political organizations and carry forward national development. Clearly an organisation which is unable to develop the skills and knowledge of its people and to utilize them effectively in the national economy will be unable to develop anything else.

However, past researches have shown that low productivity are recorded in almost all public sector organizations in Nigeria [7] and findings from other studies revealed that low productivity associated with Nigeria's public servants could be curbed if they are provided with some financial incentives [8].

However while these studies have shown the importance of financial incentives in boosting the productivity of public servants in Nigeria, little or nothing is known about the extent to which non-financial incentives could also be utilized in achieving the same purpose.

It is on this note that this work becomes relevant using both the financial and non-financial incentives of Locke's [9] goal setting theory of motivation in knowing whether both types of incentives can effect the productivity profile of a sample of non-academic workers in Anambra State University Uli.

2.0 Material/Methods

Data for the study were collected from the non-academic staff of Anambra State University Uli using primary and secondary source of data collection. For the purpose of the study a survey research design was used in order to be able to obtain preliminary information on the subjects matter of the study. From the respondents, consisting of the non-academic workers of Anambra State University Uli. The work selected a sample size that will adequately represent the population of the non-academic staff of Anambra State University Uli. The study therefore is based on a sample size of 300 workers, which were randomly selected from the various faculties and offices of the university. The method of sampling used in this study is the simple random sampling technique in which each member is selected entirely on the basis of chance. Every element in the population has an equal chance of being included in the sample and all possible samples of a given size are equally likely to be selected. This approach provided equal opportunity for any non-academic staff in the university to be a respondent irrespective of his/her work duty in the institution. A (2x5) contingency table for "M" independent random sample was used in the analysis of the data. The chi- square analysis was used in determining the result.

Table 1:

Welfare service	**Insured health services**	**Adequate working environment**	**Satisfactory allowance**	**Good faculties**	**Fringe benefits**	**Total Fj**
Favoured	$f1_1$	$f1_2$	$f1_3$	$f1_4$	$f1_5$	f1.
Unfavoured	$f2_2$	$f2_2$	$f2_3$	$f2_4$	$f2_5$	f2.
Total f.i	f.1	f.2	f.3	f.4	f.5	f.

Where $f1_{1....}f1_{5\,=}$ the observed frequencies for the favoured.

$f2_{1\,....}\,f2_5$ = the observed frequencies for the unfavoured.

f.i = the row total

f.j = the column total

3.0 Test Statistics

$$X^2 = \sum_{\boldsymbol{j=1}}^{\boldsymbol{n}} \frac{(fij-eij)^2}{eij} \qquad (1)$$

Where fij = observed frequencies in the i.jth cell.

e

ERROR: syntaxerror
OFFENDING COMMAND: --nostringval--

STACK:

76
4350
4