

Staff Welfare And Organisational Performance: An Impact Analysis Of The Nigeria Police Academy Wudil

S.M. Itodo PhD

Public Administration department, Faculty of
Administration, Nasarawa State University, Keffi
Phone: +234 8033138464, 080555562496

Abang, Stanley E

Economics and Management Science Department,
Faculty of Social and Management Science,
Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil Kano State-Nigeria.
E-mail: enoabang@gmail.com
Phone: +234 08055953472, 09064138524

pp 76-86

ABSTRACT

This study set forth to examine the impact of staff welfare on the performance of the officers and men of Nigeria Police Academy Wudil. The study relied mostly on primary documentation (data) where questionnaires were designed and administered to the respondents in line with the objectives of the study. The study adopted simple percentage, descriptive statistics, tables and the Spearman's rho statistical tools in presenting and analyzing the data collected the study. The result shows a positive long run relationship between staff welfare, staff Turnover and staff productivity. Welfare package is necessary for high productivity of the officers and men of the Nigeria Police Academy, Wudil. Base on the findings of this study it was recommended that Pragmatic efforts should be made to enhance the personnel job capabilities through training; to improve working conditions of the employees and their general welfare in order to elicit job satisfaction and motivation for increased performance. Also to reduce the incident of staff turnover, the personnel basic needs and working condition should be provided as at when due.

Keyword: Motivation, performance, staff turnover, staff welfare

1.0 Introduction

Welfare is a corporate attitude or commitment reflected in the expressed care for employees at all levels, underpinning their work and the environment in which it is performed (Cowling & Mailer, 2002). Specifically, Coventry and Barker (2008), assert that staff welfare includes providing social club and sports facilities as appropriate, supervising staff and works' canteens, running sick clubs and savings schemes; dealing with superannuation, pension funds and leave grants, making loans on hardship cases; arranging legal aid and giving advice on personal problems; making long service grants; providing assistance to staff transferred to another area and providing fringe benefits (such as payment during sickness, luncheon vouchers and other indirect advantages).

Performance, on the other hand, means goods and services produced in a specified period of time in relation to the resources utilized (Singh, 2009). It is, however, contended by Cohen, Lucy, Huge, Thomson and Edmond (1995) to be more than a narrow economic measure, as it also measures how well the group performs its required tasks to satisfy its customers inside and outside the organization. In effect, productivity suggests effectiveness and efficiency of the employees, in terms of resources utilization and the quality of output.

Apparently, there are some scholarly works on staff welfare and productivity (Owusu-Acheaw, 2010; Osterman, 2010; Singh, 2009; Cowling & Mailer, 2002; Coventry & Barker, 2008), but they mostly dwelt on industrial settings to the neglect of service organizations typified in government ministries, parastatals and security formations. There is therefore the need to extend frontiers of knowledge on the aforementioned theme that this study focused on staff welfare and productivity, using the Nigeria police force as a case in point. Specifically, the paper attempt to provide answers to questions such as: awareness of staff welfare in the force, existence of staff welfare in the force and the perceived nexus between staff welfare, staff performance and staff turnover in the force. The researcher assume that security personnel in the Nigeria police force are performing below the set standard, the suspicion derives from the observed physical appearance in terms of the personnel mode of dressing, poor standard of living, poor or no accommodation facilities, inadequate state of health facilities (both in physical structure and equipment); the deteriorated office buildings (with walls noticeably cracked and the roofs destroyed in most police stations in Nigeria) and furniture (table, desks and boards); absence of recreational facilities; no visible effort to reduce the prevalent high rate of poverty in the personnel families, delay in salary payment, promotion, little or no training and re-

training of personnel, no functional working equipment among others.(Iheanacho & Amgbare, 2010) The researcher argues that the below standard performance is a function of ineptitude of the management and a depressed staff morale owing to neglected attention to the welfare services of personnel.

Staff are the most valuable assets of any organization, they form the pivot on which other resources revolve and transform to finish and semi-finish product for human satisfaction.(Iheanacho & Amgbare,2010) Every organization needs committed and dedicated staff that can help drive the organization vision and mission. To achieve this, a sound welfare package to motivate the staff becomes imperatives. This research work examines the impact of staff welfare on the productivity of officers and Men of the Nigerian police academy. The researcher attempted to provides answers to questions such as:

- i. Is there any relationship between staff welfare and the productivity of officers and men of Nigeria Police personnel?
- ii. To what extent does staff welfare affect staff turn-over?

The main objective of this paper is to examine the impact of staff welfare on the productivity of officer and men of the Nigeria Police personnel.

Specifically, the objectives of the study are:-

1. To examine the relationship between staff welfare and productivity of officers and men of the Nigeria Police personnel.
2. To examine the relationship between staff welfare and staff turn-over

The following Null hypotheses are postulated for validation in the cause of this research work.

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between staff welfare and the performance level of the officers and men of the Nigeria Police personnel.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between staff welfare and staff turn-over in the force

Review of Related Literature

2.0 Introduction

There is a general awareness amongst discussants about staff welfare. The components of staff welfare identified by the discussants included training, free medical treatment, protection against occupational hazards, provision of traveling allowances, monetary incentives, recreational facilities, training and re-training, prompt payment of salaries, bonus and convenience. Consistently, Cowling (2002) have pointed that welfare is a resume of a corporate attitude or commitment to the care of the employees. This is worrisome in light of its possible negative

effect on employee productivity. The absence of an attractive welfare package apparently results to mediocrity and poor job performance on the part of the personnel. This becomes complicated with the existing poor working environment revealed by data, in terms of inadequate office accommodation, furniture and insufficient working materials that could reduce morale or job satisfaction of the personnel.

2.1 Concept of Staff Welfare

Gannon, (2002), opined that, staff welfare is an all-encompassing term covering a wide range of facilities that are essential for the well-being of your employees. At its most basic, every employer is required by law to provide essential amenities such as toilets, wash stations and clean drinking water for employees. Most employees also hope to find additional facilities such as a cloakroom and somewhere clean to eat and drink during breaks. For larger companies, this could range from a vending machine to a dining room or canteen, perhaps with a separate coffee area. Welfare is a corporate attitude or commitment reflected in the expressed care for employees at all levels, underpinning their work and the environment in which it is performed (Cowling 2002).

Coventry (2004) assert that staff welfare includes providing social club and sports facilities as appropriate, supervising staff and works' canteens, running sick clubs and savings schemes; dealing with superannuation, pension funds and leave grants, making loans on hardship cases; arranging legal aid and giving advice on personal problems; making long service grants; providing assistance to staff transferred to another area and providing fringe benefits (such as payment during sickness, luncheon vouchers and other direct and indirect support to the employee).

Organizations provide welfare facilities to their employees to keep their motivation levels high. The employee welfare schemes can be classified into two categories viz. statutory and non-statutory welfare schemes. The statutory schemes are those schemes that are compulsory to provide by an organization as compliance to the laws governing employee health and safety. These include provisions provided in industrial acts like Factories Act 1948, Dock Workers Act (safety, health and welfare) 1986, Mines Act 1962. The non-statutory schemes differ from organization to organization and from industry to industry.

According to Abu (2016), employee welfare is any effort by the employer to make life worth living for workmen. Welfare is a comprehensive term including various service, benefits and facilities

offered to employees by their employers through such generous fringe benefit that makes their life worth living and thereby motivate them to give their best at work.

Welfare includes anything that is done for comfort and improvement of employees and is provided over above the wages. Welfare helps in keeping the morale and motivation of the employees high so as to retain the employees for longer duration. The welfare measures need not be in monetary terms only but in any kind/forms. Employee welfare includes monitoring of working conditions, creation of industrial harmony through infrastructure for health, industrial relations and insurance against disease, accident and unemployment for the workers and their families. Employee welfare entails all those activities of employer which are directed towards providing the employees with certain facilities and services in addition to wages or salaries. The very logic behind proving welfare schemes is to create efficient, healthy, loyal and satisfied labour force for the organization to enhance performance level (Iheanacho & Amgbare, 2010)

2.1.2 Concept of Motivation

Every organisation is concerned with what should be done to achieve sustained high levels of performance through its workforce. This means giving close attention to how individuals can best be motivated through means such as incentives, rewards, leadership etc. and the organisation context within which they carry out the work (Armstrong, 2006). The study of motivation is concerned basically with why people behave in a certain way. In general it can be described as the direction and persistence of action. It is concerned with why people choose a particular course of action in preference to others, and why they continue with chosen action, often over a long period, and in the face of difficulties and problems (Mullins, 2005). Motivation can therefore be said to be at the heart of how innovative and productive things get done within an organisation (Bloisi et al., 2003). It has been established that motivation is concerned with the factors that influence people to behave in certain ways.

Organizational success is dependent upon members being motivated to use their full talents and abilities, and directed to perform well in the right areas. According to Mullins (2005), a major international study by Proudfoot Consulting revealed that, the most important reason for productivity loss was poor working morale. This includes absence of positive team spirit, low motivation, and poor sense of belonging, people feeling undervalued and poorly rewarded. It is in view of these that Allen and Helms (2001) suggested that different types of reward

practice may more closely complement different generic strategies and are significantly related to higher levels of perceived organisational performance (Mullins, 2005). With a positive motivation philosophy and practice in place, productivity, quality and service should improve because motivation helps people towards achieving goals, gaining positive perspective, creating the power for change, building self-esteem and capability, and managing their development and helping others.

A person's motivational, job satisfaction and work performance is determined by the strength of these sets of needs and expectation and the extent to which they are fulfilled. Some people for example may choose to forgo intrinsic satisfaction and social relationships for a short term in return for high economic rewards and others vice versa. This goes to confirm Horlick (nd) assertion that the vast majority of people regard money as an important and a motivator at work but the extent of motivation depends upon the personal circumstances and the other satisfactions they derived from work (Mullins, 2005). According to Amman(2000) motivation is defined as the process of arousing enthusiasm in an employee so that he/she can performs his/her duties with pleasure and higher interest and pursuance of the organizational and personals goals. Celestine (2004) also defined motivation as the energizing force that induce or compel and maintains behaviors. He further said that, motivation is an internal psychological process which presence or absence is inferred from observed performance.

The researcher alien with the views of the various scholars cited above and the bibliography review in the cause of the research exercise of the importance of motivation in enhancing high productivity and performance of staff in any organization. But the management of the study area seems to have ignored the role of staff motivation as explain by the scholars cited above and has fail to designed and administered good and sustained welfare package for the officers and men of the force as evidence by the frequent delay in payment of salaries, delay in promotion, poor working equipment, poor condition of service among other thereby reducing the productivity level of the officers and men of the force.

2.1.3 Concept of Staff Turnover

Staff turnover refers to the number or percentage of workers who leave an organization and are replaced by new employees. Measuring employee turnover can be helpful to employers that want to examine reasons for turnover or estimate the cost-to-hire for budget purposes (Bature, 2009). Labour turnover occurs when staff leaves on organization and need to

be replaced by new recruits. The term is commonly used to refer only to wastage or the number of employees leaving an organization. It is also the analysis of the number staff leaving an organization mostly on the bases of poor welfare packages and poor conducive working environment. (Abu, 2016).

According Gannon (2002), Staff turnover refers to the number or percentage of workers who leave an organization and are replaced by new employees. Measuring employee turnover can be helpful to employers that want to examine reasons for turnover or estimate the cost-to-hire for budget purposes. Blanket references to turnover can be confusing; therefore, specific definitions and calculations for employee turnover may be useful to human resources practitioners.

Comparison

Although different types of turnover exist, the general definition is that turnover occurs when the employment relationship ends. Turnover and attrition -- terms that are sometimes used interchangeably or together when describing the departure of an employee -- are different. Attrition generally refers to the end of the employment relationship due to retirement, job elimination or employee death, and is distinguishable from turnover because when attrition occurs, the position is not filled with a new employee.

Involuntary Turnover

Employee termination for poor job performance, absenteeism or violation of workplace policies is called involuntary turnover -- also referred to as termination, firing or discharge. It's involuntary because it wasn't the employee's decision to leave the company. Layoffs could also be considered involuntary terminations, though layoff procedures usually are handled differently from termination. Some layoffs have certain federal and state provisions that aren't afforded to employees who are fired because of performance or policy violations.

Voluntary Turnover

When an employee leaves the company of her own volition, it's called voluntary termination. Employees give a number of reasons for leaving their jobs. They may be accepting employment with another company, relocating to a new area or dealing with a personal matter that makes it impossible to work. When an employee voluntarily terminates the employment relationship, she generally gives the employer verbal or written notice of intent to resign from her job.

Desirable and Undesirable Turnover

Turnover often has a negative connotation, yet turnover isn't always a negative event. For example,

desirable turnover occurs an employee whose performance falls below the company's expectations is replaced by someone whose performance meets or exceeds expectations. It's desirable because poor job performance, absenteeism and tardiness are costly -- replacing a poor performer with an employee who does his job can improve the company's profitability. Desirable turnover also occurs when replacing employees infuses new talent and skills, which can give an organization a competitive advantage. Conversely, undesirable turnover means the company is losing employees whose performance, skills and qualifications are valuable resources.

2.2 Empirical Issues

Several studies (Owusu-Acheaw, 2010; Osterman, 2010; Singh, 2009; Colwling and Mailer, 2002) have been done recently to amplify existing organizational theories. Consistent with the scientific methods, expediency requires a frequent observation of organizational behaviour and the use of relevant scholarly findings as precursors for further collection of data to validate or repudiate earlier assumptions about organizational behaviour. The work of Osterman (2010) focuses on the production sector, where he examine the nexus between staff productivity and staff welfare using Coca-Cola as a case in point where secondary data were collected and analysis using SPSS package to run the multiple Regression and the result shows a positive relationship between the variables under study and base on the finding it was concluded that staff productivity is a function of staff welfare. Abu (2016), conducted a study on the role of employee total output per day and the reward system, using Berger construction company Abuja as a case study, dueling more on primary data, the chi-square statistical tool was used test the hypotheses which reveal a strong relationship between the variable, which states that employee output increases as their daily pay increases.

2.3 Theoretical framework

Quality of Work Life (QWL), epitomized in staff welfare, is the degree to which the employees are able to satisfy important personal need through their experiences in the organization (Singh, 2009). It involves physical, mental, moral and emotional well-being of the employee (Aswathappa, 2004), conceptualized by Singh (2009) as occupational health which together with suitable working time and appropriate salary increase motivation and satisfaction. Singh's positive correlation of working time and salary with productivity is doubtful. He generalized on what is rather sometimes the case, as if it is always the case. Gray and Starke (1988) argued that in spite of the assumption of the Hawthorne experiment that a positive work

environment makes for an increased productivity, there is a proviso. There are intervening variables that include task and technology, individual group, organizational and environmental factors. Explicitly, if tasks to be performed are poorly designed, production will be low; if an individual's abilities with respect to the task are low; high motivation cannot lead to high productivity; informal groups within formal structures moderate compliance of their group members to task needs, in order to achieve group (employees' personal) needs; the existence of interactive entities (customers, clients, middle management etc.) influence speed in the organization task performance.

Correspondingly Trist and Bamford (1951), using the Longwall Shift Cycle method of coal-getting in a coalmine (which was a socio-technical system adjudged to be excellent as it had intrinsic good work practices), observed that it resulted rather to a decline in productivity. It neglected considerations for the employees' needs, which are aspects of welfare. In some organizations, job behaviours have a more direct relationship to rewards than in others (Gray and Starke, 1988), due perhaps, as argued by Gannon (2002) and Reynolds (2001) to the employees' needs (such as urgent need for money to meet certain obligations or the absence of this) and the comparison of his reward with that of his colleagues that perform similar task. The relativity of pay (salary and bonuses) in task performance has also been observed by other scholars such as Kohn and Schooler (2009), who observed that, as social class increases, the need for money declines.

Similarly, Lawler (2001) asserts that the importance of pay decreases with age and it is more important to males than females. A part explanation to Lawler's findings is that younger persons have comparatively numerous needs to pursue than their elderly counterparts, so also with the males especially as they traditionally assume headship of their homes.

Nevertheless, Mckersie and Hunter (2003) found that in comparison with American and Japanese industries, labour productivity in Britain was anywhere between one-half and one third, due to low remuneration (in Britain) amongst other reasons. This is a quintessence of a direct relationship between reward and productivity, which exists in several other articles. Occupational health as highlighted by Singh (2009) and Aswathappa (2004) amongst other scholars is inextricable from welfare, especially when the latter is perceived in the words of Cowling and Mailer (2002) as 'the support that can reasonably be expected by employees from their employer'. It appears a truism that the absence of health and safety at workplace makes the employees easy victims of occupational hazards that could depress morale and

productivity. It is therefore, obligatory on employers by law to provide a safe workplace for employees (Cole, 2006) to increase efficiency and productivity of workers (Nwachukwu, 2007) and to guard against a possible accusation of negligence arising from injuries to employees (Okereke, 2007). It has been observed, however, that the relationship between safe workplace and increased productivity of workers is not direct, as was earlier put in this paper in respect of positive work environment and productivity. An interviewing variable, the authors argue in the form of motivation, could be identified. Mitchell (2008) points that there is consensus amongst most theorists that 'ability to work' goes hand in glove with 'motivation' to produce performance, as ability of the employees to do the job does not mean that they would do it.

Most managers have recognized the vital role job satisfaction (satisfaction of members of the organization) plays on productivity (Cohen, Fink, Gadon and Willitts, 1995; Mitchell, 2008), but job satisfaction and motivation whichever that precedes the other is akin to the riddle of the 'egg and chicken', which one that comes first. According to Ibbetson and Whitmore (2007), several researches suggest that people must find their work satisfying in order to be motivated to do a satisfactory job. This contrasts with the wisdom of the foremost theorists on management and productivity. Theory X of McGregor (Upton, 2001; Ibbetson and Whitmore, 2007) conceives an average worker as naturally lazy, hates work and might avoid work such that he has to be motivated through monetary incentives for increased productivity or negatively sanctioned (coerced, threatened with punishment) for poor task performance.

In criticism, the thesis lacked hindsight of the influence of job satisfaction on production. It portrayed the employee as an 'economic man', whose motivation was attributed to a single phenomenon (money) and has therefore been faulted by Gray and Starke (2008) as "gross oversimplification of human motivation" with the orchestrated emphasis on money as a motivator widely criticized by scholars that include Lawler (1971) and Kohn and Schooler (1969). Yet, McGregor's Theory X is widely applied by several managers. It has been observed that employees in most organizations in Nigeria are denied wages or experience cuts in wages or threats thereunto for poor job performance (due to reasons that include inability to submit returns within specified timelines). McGregor's Theory Y, on the other hand, assumes that people at work can be self-motivated (Ibbetson and Whitmore, 1977) as motivation is the basis for commitment to duty and is relative to environment (Upton, 2001). In support, Maslow (Cole, 2002) highlighted on a hierarchy of five needs

(physiological, safety, esteem, social and self-actualization) each of which can motivate a worker towards increased output, depending on his circumstance at a particular point in time. Piven (2007) classified needs into existence, relatedness and growth in contrast to Maslow. Correspondingly, however, the 'existence needs' are in tandem with Maslow's lower level (physiological, safety and esteem needs) 'relatedness needs' are Maslow's social needs, while 'Growth needs' are Maslow's high-level needs (self-actualization or self-fulfillment needs). The constituents of the environment determine the level of productivity. Typically, Patterson et al. (2004) found that company production was more strongly correlated with those aspects of climate that had stronger satisfaction loadings. Invariably, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are intrinsic features of the climate/environment. According to Shafritz and Russell (2001), Herzberg argued that positive elements (the 'satisfiers') are job content factors such as a sense of achievement, recognition, interest in the work itself and advancement.

Conversely, the 'dissatisfiers' or 'hygiene factors' are associated with the workers relation to the environment in which he performs his task, such as the company policies, ineffective administration among others. The balance between satisfaction and dissatisfaction determines the level of motivation the worker obtains. Herzberg's work suggested that the addition of motivators will lead to greater employee job satisfaction (Gray and Starke, 1988), but Mitchell (2008) argues that numerous reviews of literature show that performance (productivity) are only weakly related and that very little evidence exists that satisfaction causes increased productivity. Accordingly, many people can be excited with a high remuneration, interpersonally pleasant job and yet lack the requisite skill for effective job performance. In brief, there should be an adequate blend of ability to do a work, job satisfaction and motivation for a satisfactory job performance. Consistently, Gray and Starke (1988) explain that satisfying an individual does not automatically lead to job motivation, but could make the employee to remain with the organization and to exhibit job behaviours that are indicative of job motivation

3.0 Methodology

A cross-sectional survey design was adopted, in which one hundred and sixty nine (169) questionnaires were design and administered to a population of two hundred and ninety-four (294) officers and men of the academy which are divided into three strata; AIG-ASP, Inspectorate and Rank and File using Taro Yemmes and stratifies proportionate sampling method formular to draw the sample thus:

Taro Yamane's formulae:
$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where:

N = Population of the study (294)

n = Sample size?

e = Margin of error (5%)

Therefore:

$$\frac{294}{1+294(0.05)^2} =$$

$$\frac{294}{1+294(0.0025)} = 169$$

$$n = 169$$

While

Stratifies proportionate sampling formulae is given thus:

$$n_1 = \frac{n(N^1)}{sp^1} \dots \dots \dots \frac{nn(N^n)}{sp^n}$$

Where:

n = Sample size of stratum n₁, n₂, n₃-----n_n

N = Population of stratum N₁, N₂, N₃-----N_n

Sp = Population of the study

Therefore:

Stratum 1 Officer (AIG-ASP) 64

Stratum 2 Inspectorates 94

Stratum 3 Constable-sergeant 136

To obtain a representative sample of each of the stratum, the above formulae is adopted thus:

$$\text{Stratum 1} \quad \frac{64(169)}{294} = 37 \text{ officers}$$

$$\text{Stratum 2} \quad \frac{94(169)}{294} = 54 \text{ inspectors}$$

$$\text{Stratum 3} \quad \frac{136(169)}{294} = 78 \text{ Rank and file}$$

Total = 169

Out of the one hundred and sixty-nine questionnaires administered to the respondents, only one hundred and fifty four (154) were returned for analysis, indicating a 91% response rate. The questionnaires were divided into sections: section "A" sought information on demographic characteristics of the respondents, while section "B" sought information in line with the hypothesis and objectives of the study. The response scale was presented on a five point's likert-scale ranging from Strongly Agree (SD=1) Disagree (D=2), Undecided (U=3), Agree (A=4) and Strongly Agree (SA=5).

Result and Discussions

The data collected from the respondents were analyzed using tables, frequency counts and simple percentage in ranking the attitudinal responses of the officers and men of the police academy, for the purpose of making inferences. Spearman's rhostatistical tool was employed to test the hypotheses formulated for this study in line with the objectives of the study.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

Response	Questionnaire Administered	Questionnaire Not Return	Questionnaire Return	Total %
AIG-ASP	37	2(5.4%)	35(94.5%)	21.8
Inspectorates	54	4(7.4%)	50(92.5%)	31.9
CPL-SGT	78	9(11.5%)	69(88.4%)	46.1
Total	169	15	154	100

Source: Survey data 2018

Table 4.1 show that out of the thirty-seven (37) questionnaire that were administer to the Officers (AIG-ASP) of the academy, 94.5% were correctly filled and return to the researcher for analysis while 5.4% were not return, meaning that majority of the officers return the questionnaires administered to them by the researcher. Fifty-four (54) questionnaires were administered to the inspector's cadre, out of which 92.5% were return for analysis and four (4) representing (7.4%) were not return. While out of seventy-eight (78) questionnaires administered to the rank and file only sixty-nine representing 88.4% were able to fill and return their questionnaires to the researcher for analysis while 11.5% weren't well fill and not return to the researcher for analysis.

Demographic characteristic of the respondents

Table 4.2: Demographic characteristic of the respondents

Gender	Frequency	%
Male	102	66.2
Female	52	33.8
Total	154	100

Source: Survey data 2018

The above table shows the gender of respondents, male personnel are 66.2% while female personnel are 33.8%. The implication is that male respondents are more than female.

Table 4.3: Academic Qualification of the Respondent

Educational qualification	AIG-ASP	Inspectorate Cadre	Rank & File	Total/ Percentage%
SSCE/GCE	11 (13.2%)	31 (37.3%)	41 (49.3%)	83 (53.9%)
NCE/OND	8 (29.6%)	6 (22.22%)	13 (48.14%)	27 (17.5%)
HND/B.sc	10(38.46%)	9 (34.61%)	7 (26.92%)	26 (16.9%)
Masters/Ph.D	6 (60%)	2 (20 %)	2 (20%)	10 (6.5%)
Others	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	6 (75%)	8 (5.1%)
Total	35	50	69	154 (100%)

Source: Survey data 2018

Table 4.3 above shows the academic Qualifications of the respondents. The first row shows that 11(13.5%) officers between the rank of AIG-ASP, 31(37.3%) Inspectors and 41(49.3%) Rank and file are holders of SSCE/GCE, representing a total of 53.9% of the study population. While 29.6% AIG-ASP, 22.22% Inspectors and 48.14% Rank and file are NCE/OND holders, representing 17.5% of the study population. A breakdown of row three shows that 38.46% of the rank of AIG-ASP, 34.61% Inspectors and 26.92% Rank and file holds HND/B.sc representing 16.9% of the study population while 6.5% of the total study population are master/Ph.D holder with the breakdown thus:6 (60%) AIG-ASP, 2(20%) Inspectors and 2(20%) Rank and file . On the other hand,8 personnel representing 5.1% of the study population are holders of other qualifications other than the ones mention above.

Table 4.4 There is link between staff welfare and staff performance

Respondent	AIG-ASP	Inspectorate	Rank & File	Total	%
SA	2	7	9	18	11
A	3	7	7	17	9
SD	4	9	14	27	16.9
D	35	50	69	154	100
Source: Survey data 2018					
Total					

Table 4.4 seek the views of the respondent on the nexus between staff welfare and staff productivity, fifty-five (55) respondents representing 38.3% who are in the majority strongly agreed that there exist a nexus between staff welfare and staff performance level while 9% and 11% disagreed and strongly disagreed that there is no link between staff welfare and staff productivity and 16% of the respondents are indifferent.

Table 4.5 There are good welfare package put in place by the police force in the academy to encourage personnel high performance level

Respondent	AIG-ASP	Inspectorate	Rank & File	Total	%
SA	2	10	10	22	14.2
A	4	9	9	22	14.2
SD	5	7	19	31	20.1
D	21	12	17	50	32.4
U	3	12	14	29	18.8
Total	35	50	69	154	100

Source: Survey data 2018

The table above seems to show a seemingly even distribution in terms of the percentage responses from the respondents where 32.4% who are in the majority strongly disagreed that there is a good welfare package put in place by the police authority to encourage personnel performance while 14.2% strongly agreed that there exist good welfare package to motivate the personnel for high productivity and twenty nine (29) personnel representing 18.8% were indifferent.

Table 4.6 Welfare package is necessary for personnel productivity in the Police force

Respondent	AIG-ASP	Inspectorate	Rank & File	Total	%
SA	22	26	26	74	48
A	4	14	24	42	27.2
SD	2	2	4	8	5.1
D	3	4	10	17	11
U	4	4	5	13	8.4
Total	35	50	69	154	100

Source: Survey data 2018

In table 4.6 above 48% of the respondent strongly agreed that welfare package is very necessary for optimum productivity by the officers and men of the Nigeria police force while 11% disagree that welfare package bear any link with personnel performance level in the police force. Thirteen respondents representing 8.4% were indifferent

Table 4.7 There exist a nexus between Staff welfare package and Staff turnover in the Nigeria Police force

Respondent	AIG ASP	Inspectorate	Rank & File	Total	%
SA	20	22	30	72	46.8
A	6	18	22	46	29.9
SD	2	2	4	8	5.1
D	4	4	7	15	9.7
U	3	4	6	13	8.4
Total	35	50	69	154	100

Source: Survey data 2018

Table 4.7 reveals the response of the respondent on the nexus between staff welfare and staff turnover, where 46.8% of the respondent strongly agreed that there exist a relationship between staff welfare package and staff turnover in the Nigeria police force while 9.7% stated otherwise and 8.4% were indifferent.

Table 4.9 There is a long run relationship between Staff productivity, staff turnover and staff welfare package

Respondent	AIG-ASP	Inspectorate	Rank & File	Total	%
SA	24	25	36	85	55.1
A	8	17	25	50	32.4
SD	2	4	3	9	5.8
D	2	1	2	5	3.2
U	1	3	3	7	4.5
Total	35	50	69	154	100

Source: Survey data 2018

Table 4.9 seek response from the respondent on the long run relationship between staff productivity, staff turnover and staff welfare package, where 55.1% of the respondent strongly agreed the a long run relationship exist between staff productivity, staff turnover and staff welfare in any organization whereas 5.8%strongly disagreed on the long run relationship between these three variables and 4.5% were indifferent about the long run relation relationship between the variables.

4.3 Hypotheses testing

Having presented the data collected for this research work using descriptive statistics, tables and sample percentage, the Spearman's rho statistical tool is used to test the hypotheses formulated for this study.

HO1: There is no significant relationship between staff welfare and the productivity level of officers and men of the Nigeria Police personnel.

Table 4.6: Observed Frequency Table

Staff Welfare	Productivity Level
85	55
50	37
9	18
5	17
7	27
154	154

Source: Survey data 2018

Table 4.7: Correlations

	Staff Welfare	Staff Productivity
Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.900 *
Staff Welfare Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.037
Spearman's rho N	5	5
Correlation Coefficient	.900 *	1.000
Staff Productivity Sig. (2-tailed)	.037	.
N	5	5

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 20.0 software

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between staff welfare and staff turn-over

Table 4.8: Observed Frequency Table

Staff Welfare	Productivity Level
85	72
50	46
9	8
5	15
7	13
154	154

Source: Survey data 2018

Table 4.9: Correlations

	Staff Welfare	Staff Productivity
Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.600 *
Staff Welfare Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.025
Spearman's rho N	5	5
Correlation Coefficient	-.600 *	1.000
Staff Productivity Sig. (2-tailed)	.025	.
N	5	5

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Researcher's Computation using SPSS version 20.0 software

4.4 Discussion of Major Findings

Having tested the hypotheses formulated in chapter one using the Spearman's rho statistical tool, the interpretation of the analysis is given thus:

The result from table 4.7 shows that there is a significant positive relationship between staff

welfare and staff performance level of officers and men of the Nigeria Police personnel in the academy, as indicated by the sig. level of 037. Based on this, the null hypothesis one is rejected and the alternative accepted which states that, there is a significant relationship between staff welfare and staff performance. The result from table 4.9 shows that there is a significant negative relationship between staff welfare and staff turn-over rate, as indicated by the sig. level of 025. Based on this, the null hypothesis two is rejected, which states that: There is a significance relationship between staff welfare and staff turns - over

5.1 Conclusion

Good welfare package has a strong influence on the performance level of the officers and men of the police force. To enhance job commitment on the part of the police personnel, mostly in the academy the management team of the force should design appropriate and adequate welfare packages for the officers and men of the force for high performance.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research work the following recommendations were made for improvement in the implementation of appropriate welfare package for the police force.

- Pragmatic efforts should be made to enhance the personnel job capabilities through training; to improve working conditions of the employees and their general welfare in order to elicit job satisfaction and motivation for increased performance by the officers and men of the force.

- To reduce the incident of staff turnover, the personnel basic needs and working condition should be provided as at when due in the academy.

REFERENCES

- Abu M.M (2016), The Role of well structure welfare package on the daily output of construction workers in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*.
- Acheaw (2010) Measuring the impact of training, demonstrate the measureable results and return on investment. "International Journal of multi-disciplinary Review.
- Allen and Helms (2001), Motivation and staff performance. A review of empirical literature Europe
- Amma D.E.(2000), Principles and practices of Human Resource management. McGraw-Hill Incorporated
- Armstrong, P.O (2006), Human Resource Management Practice, Kogan.
- Aswathappa (2004) Pay, Productivity and Collective Bargaining: International journal of business and management.
- Barelson T, Steiner S (1985). How to find Out: Management and Productivity. Oxford:
- Bature N. (2009), Human Resource Management. Chartered Graphic Press, Gwagwalada Abuja
- Bloisi W, Cook CW, Hunsaker PL (2003). Management and Organisational Behaviour, McGraw-Hill, pp.169-208.
- Celestains R,N(2004), Interpersonal skills training for quality service interactions" Industrial and Commercial Training Vol. 29 (3) ,pp:70-77
- Cohen AR, Fink SL, Gadon H, Willitts RD (1998). Effective Behaviour in Organizations: Cases, Concepts and Student Experiences. 6th Edition. USA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Cohen P. et al (1995). Managerial Economics. Great Britain: Mac. Pub.
- Cole G (2006). Management Theory and Practice. Berwick Upon Tweed: Martins the Printer Limited.
- Coventry W. G.(2004), Approach to motivation. U.J publisher
- Coventry, W.F. and Barker, J.K. (2008). Management. International Edition: Heinemann Professional Publishing.
- Cowling A, Mailer C (2002). Managing Human Resources. 2nd Edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- Famutimi, A.U (2014) Modern approach in human Resource management in the 21st century- Stand publisher Oyo
- Gannon MJ (2002). Organizational Behaviour: A Managerial and Organizational Perspective. USA: Little, Brown and Company Limited.
- Gray JL, Starke FA (1988). Organizational Behaviour: Concepts and Applications. 3rd Edition. Columbia, Ohio: Merrill Pub. Company.
- Ibbetson JFR, Whitmore DA (2007). The Management of Motivation and Remuneration. London: Business Books.
- Kohn M, Schooler C (1969). 'Class Occupation and Orientation'. Am. Sociol. Rev., 346: 659-678.
- Lawler E (2001). Pay and Organizational Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Pub.
- Mckersie RB, Hunter LC (2003). Pay, Productivity and Collective Bargaining: Great Britain: Macmillan, St Martins Press.
- Mitchell TR (2008). People in Organizations: Understanding their Behaviour. USA: McGraw-Hill Incorporated.
- Nwachukwu CC (2007). Management Theory and Practice. Nigeria: Afr. First Pub. Ltd.
- Muchins S. V.(2005), Studies in Organizational Design. The Dorsey Press, Richard and Inwin.
- Okereke CI (2005). 'Corporate Negligence and Dimensions of Liability'. J. Bus. Finan., 2(1): 46-53.
- Omideyi, W.T (2012). An empirical review of staff

- motivation and organizational performance in the manufacturing industries. *International journal of social and management science*. Vol.8
- Osterman P (2010). 'Work Reorganization 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/work-reorg.pdf>.
- Owusu-Acheaw M (2010). 'Staff Development and Employee Welfare Practices and their Effect on Productivity in Three Special Libraries in Ghana'. Assessed Online on 14 May, 2010 at <http://ajol.info/index.php/glj/article/view/33975>. Patani Local Government Council Updated Staff Register, June 2009.
- Patterson M, Warr P, West M (2004). *Organizational Climate and Company Production: The Role of Employee Affect and Employee Level*. London: Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Pergamom Press Limited.
- Piven FF (2007). *Labuor Parties in Post-Industrial Societies*. United Kingdom: Polity Press and Blackwell Pub.
- Reynolds L (2001). *The Structure of Labour Markets*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.
- Ritzer G (2000). *Modern Sociological Theory*. R.R. Donnelley and Sons Company.
- Sanderson M (1989). *Pay, Productivity and Collective Bargaining*. London: Macmillan St Martins Press.
- Shafritz and Rusell (2001), Nexus between organizational performance and staff welfare. *Personnel management review Malaysia* No,4 vol.4
- Upton Q.T.(2001), Motivation and organizational survival in the 21st century. *Business and Management journal Ghana* vol.4 (12-25)