

**LABOUR TURNOVER AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED PLASTIC
MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN ANAMBRA STATE**

MARCEL CHINEMERE OKEKE Ph.D. ETHELMARY Ph.D, DR & MRS CHIZOBA NUEL OKEKE

Business Administration Department, Chukwuemeka Oduegwu Ojukwu University
Igbariam Campus & Federal Polytechnic Oko

ABSTRACT

This work examined the relationship between labour turnover and organizational performance in selected plastic manufacturing companies in Anambra State. It adopted survey research design. Related literature review was based on conceptual, theoretical and empirical frameworks. The study was anchored on equity theory. Data were collected from primary sources. Primary data were collected with item structured questionnaire based on five point Likert scale. Six (6) plastic manufacturing firms selected randomly from the three (3) senatorial zones of Anambra State were studied. The population of the study was one thousand two hundred and eighty five (1285) employees of the companies under study. A sample size of two hundred and forty six (305) was determined with Taro Yamane (1964) formula. The instrument was subjected to face and content validity and its reliability was determined through test-retest Method. Data generated were presented with tables, percentages and frequencies. Data were analyzed with chi-square statistical tool. Major findings indicated that there were significant positive relationships between dependent and independent variables. The study revealed that pay (salary) dissatisfaction, employee training and development, employee absenteeism and employee motivation significantly affect organizational performance. The study concluded that there is significant positive relationship between labour turnover and Organizational performance in the selected plastic manufacturing companies in Anambra State. Based on the findings, the study recommended an upward salary review, improved training and development programmes, constant check on employees and appropriate disciplinary measures and employee motivation to reduce the incidence of employee turnover.

INTRODUCTION

In the present work, organizational performance is the dependent variable (y) while labour turnover is the independent variable (x). Organizations have an important role in our daily lives and therefore, successful organizations represent a key ingredient for developing nations. Consequently, economists and business managers consider organizations and institutions similar to an engine in determining the economic, social and political progress (Gavrea, lilies and Stegereari, 2011). The performance of an organization determines its sustainability in the competitive business world. Continuous performance is the focus of any organization because it is only through performance that organizations are able to grow and progress. Therefore organizational performance is one of the most important variables in the management indicator or organizational effectiveness and productivity. Although the concept of organizational performance is very common in the academic literature, its definition is difficult because of its many meanings. According to Hendry (2012), organizational performance is a multi-dimensional concept whose complexity makes it difficult to be defined from simple perspective. However, Upadhaya, Munir and Blount (2014) asserted that organizational performance encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: financial performance (profits), return on assets, return on investment; product market performance (sales, market shares); and shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added). Organizational performance has developed to be the most important issue that every organizational management is concerned about, as it determines the ability of an organization to continue with its operation.

Labour turnover is a common phenomenon in business organizations, particularly now that Nigerian economy is in recession. In view of the economic realities in the country, there is the tendency for business organizations to lose their employees often. According to Benedict, Josiah, Ogungbenle and Akpeti (2012), labour turnover is the rate at which an employer gains and loses employee and that turnover is measured for individual companies and for their industries as a whole. Moreover, Mabindisa (2013) noted that staff turnover includes employees who retire and employee who are discharged. Employee leaves the department over a set period and usually expressed as a percentage of total workforce numbers (Molefakgotla, Ntebogang and Kattego, 2014). Employees tend to leave an organization as a result of certain factors including salary (pay) dissatisfaction, absenteeism, lack of training and development, lack of motivation, work environment and so on. Labour turnover has many implications for the organization, employee and the society at large. Organizations with high labour turnover are bound to incur high cost of recruitment and training of new staff and reduced productivity. Employees who leave their present job without hope of a new

one are bound to remain unemployed and without pay until new jobs are found. This leads to untold hardship and frustration on the individuals who may result to social vices such as armed robbery, kidnapping, substance abuse, prostitution and child trafficking.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Research has established that labour turnover causes reduced production, increased scraps, increased cost of hiring and increased work disruptions (Benedict, Josiah, Ogungbenle and Akpeti 2012). Many studies have been conducted on labour turnover and organizational performance using different variables. Molefakgotla et al (2014) used 3 variables, Akinruwa, Ajayi, and Akeke, (2014) used 8 variables, Mabindisa, (2013) used 5 variables. These studies reported conflicting findings on the causes of labour turnover. Mabindisa concluded that salary was the major cause of turnover while Benedict, Josiah, Ogungbenle and Akpeti, 2012 concluded that reduced production had the foremost effect on labour turnover as it significantly affects output and profit. These controversies from the findings of most studies on employee turnover and organizational performance make it imperative for further studies. These studies were carried out in different sectors banking, electricity, telecommunication, and education or research institute. None was carried out in plastic manufacturing sector in Anambra State hence the motivation for the present research on plastic manufacturing industries in Anambra State.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the study is to examine the relationship between labour turnover and organizational performance. The specific objectives are to identify how employee pay (salary) dissatisfaction influences organizational performance, evaluate the extent employee training and development affects organizational performance, assess how employee motivation reflects on organizational performance and finally to establish how employee absenteeism determines organizational performance.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- I. How does employee pay (salary) dissatisfaction influence organizational performance?
- II. To what extent does employee training and development affect organizational performance?
- III. How does employee motivation reflect on organizational performance?
- IV. To what extent does employee absenteeism determine organizational performance?

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

- Ho₁:** Pay (salary) dissatisfaction does not significantly influence organizational performance.
- Ho₂:** Employee training and development does not significantly affect organizational Performance.

Ho₃: Employee motivation does not significantly reflect on organizational performance.

Ho₄: Employee absenteeism does not significantly determine organizational performance.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY: This study will be beneficial to investors, shareholders, managers, Governments, the academia and the general public by expanding knowledge on the predictor variables and employees' productivity

SCOPE OF THE STUDY: It is restricted to the factors revolving around employee pay (salary) dissatisfaction, employee training and development, motivation and employee absenteeism as foremost determinants of labour turnover in organizations

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Organizations have an important role in our daily lives and therefore, successful organizations represent a key ingredient for developing nations. Consequently, economists and business managers consider organizations and institutions similar to an engine in determining the economic, social and political progress (Gavrea et al., 2011). Continuous performance is the focus of any organization because through performance, organizations are able to grow and progress. Therefore, organizational performance is one of the most important variables in the management research and arguably the most important indicator of organizational growth. Organizational performance is one of the most important concepts in management research. Although the concept of organizational performance is very common in the academic literature, its definition is difficult because of its many meanings (Hameed, 2011). However, Lebars and Euske (2010) provided a set of definitions to illustrate the concept of organizational performance thus:(a) performance is a set of financial and non-financial indicators which offer information on the degree of achievement of objectives and results; (b) performance is dynamic requiring judgment and interpretation; (c) performance may be illustrated by using casual model that describes how current actions may affect future results; (d) performance may be understood differently depending on the person involved in the assessing of the organizational performance ;(e) to define the concept of performance is necessary to know its elements characteristic to each area of responsibility ;and (f) to report an organization's level, it is necessary to be able to quantity the results .Kirby(2011) noted that organizational performance can be considered as an actual outcome of an organization measured against the output targets or goals. Hendry (2012) opined that performance in organizations is a multi-dimensional concept whose complexity makes it difficult to be defined from a single perspective due to the fact that performance is a multi-faceted organizational concept which cannot be measured using a single measurement tool. Upadhaya, Munir and Blunt (2014) noted that organizational performance

encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: (a) financial performance (return on assets, return on investment); (b) product market performance (sales, market share); and (c) shareholder return (total shareholder return economic value added). Dozier (2016) considered organizational performance as an actual outcome of an organization measured against the outcome targets or goals. With regard to performance measurement in organizations, Muhammad et al. (2014) indicated that measuring performance in organizations is necessary as it seeks to assess the value that employees bring into the organizations.

LABOUR TURNOVER

The concept of employee turnover is one of the most explored concepts in the field of organizational behaviour. The escalation of employee in the rate of employee turnover is a major concern for businesses and is clearly impacting on organizational performance (Gavrea et al., 2011). Labour turnover however refers to how many employees in an organization leave their position in a designated time period usually over the period of a year. Hendry (2012) considers staff turnover as the rate at which workers leave and be replaced by others within an organization. Similarly, CIPD (2014) refers to staff turnover as the proportion of employees who leave organization over a set period (usually 1-year basis), expressed as percentage of the total workforce numbers. Talent Management Alliance (2013) asserted that staff turnover can either be voluntary or involuntary whereby in voluntary employees leave the organization at will while in involuntary, the employer terminates the employment contract of the employee at attaining retirement. In most cases, labour turnover is costly as it reduces the output and disruptive, as it requires that schedules and programmes should be modified (Mabindisa, 2013).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Over the years, a significant amount of research has been done to investigate the causes and effects of employee turnover on organizational performance. Two theories are related to the present study and they are Equity Theory (Adams, 1965) and Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964). However, the study is anchored on Equity Theory. One thing that is common for humans is to compare themselves with others. In this case, one theory that conies forth in evaluating one's self and each other is the Equity theory. The Equity theory developed by Adams (1965) is based on the idea that employees basically expect a fair balance between their inputs and outputs. This implies that the employees are likely to be de-motivated in relation to their employer and the job if they happen to believe that their inputs (efforts, loyalty, hard work, commitment, ability, adaptability, tolerance, flexibility, skills) are greater than their outputs (salary benefits, recognition, reputation responsibility, sense of achievement, sense of advancement/growth, job satisfaction).

The Equity theory of employee motivation describes the relationship between how fairly an employee perceives how he is treated and how hard he is motivated. Equity theory focuses on determining whether the distribution of resources is fair to both relational partners. Equity is measured by comparing the ratio of contribution, (or cost) and benefits (or rewards) for each person (Gervero, Peter and Walid, 2014). Adams (1964) through this theory asserted that employees seek to maintain equity between inputs that they bring to a job and the outcomes that they receive from it against the perceived inputs and out puts. The belief is that people value fair treatment that causes them to be motivated to keep fairness maintained within relationships of their co-workers and the organization (Gill and Stone, 2010). The structure of equity in the work place is based on the ratio of inputs to outcomes. Inputs are the contributions made by the employee for the organization. The basic idea behind the Equity theory is that employees in an attempt to balance what they put into their jobs and what they get from them will unconsciously assign values to each of the various contributions. In addition to their time, employees contribute their experience, their gratifications, and their capability plus their personal strengths such as acumen and ambition. An employee reflects on how much effort he has expended and compares this to what he has got from it as pay. After this individual evaluation of this input-output ratio, the employee will compare his ratio to the input- output ratios of others especially peers. If the employee considers his input-output ratio to be equal to ratios of other relevant employees, a state of equity exists (Muogho, 2013) and the employee becomes satisfied with his job. When the employee is satisfied with his pay for instance, absenteeism is reduced and his tendency to withdraw from the job is minimized. When the employee is satisfied, he will have a feeling that he is treated fairly. In this situation of equity, the employee is seemingly content and will not act to in-balance the conditions (Spector, 2011).

Naturally, when an employee perceives unequal ratios between him and his counterparts, there will be a state of inequity and dissatisfaction. The equity theory is concluded for the study because it is interesting to see how employees compare themselves to each other. These comparisons can lead to labour turnover when some employees perceive not to be treated fairly. When this happens, the employee may take some turnover actions which may impact on the organizational performance. Important thing about equity theory is that it shows that believes, perceptions and attitudes influence the employee's motivation and job satisfaction. When the comparison is fair the employee will reach satisfaction, and if not, he will be dissatisfied (Muogbo, 2013). As a consequence, the employee may exhibit some turnover attitudes such as absenteeism, tardiness and eventual withdrawal from the organization.

EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

Gavera, lilies & Stregeren (2011) studied determinants of organizational performance; the case of Romania with descriptive survey design. The variables were internal environment such as strategy, leadership, employee, structure, quality, performance measurement individual and development, information technology and corporate governance, while external environment includes client, suppliers, competitors, business uncertainty, data were analysed with product moment correlation. Financial and non-financial performance comprised 10 variables. Result showed that only structure variable had insignificant relationship with the overall score of performance Molefakgotla, Ntebogang and Kattego, (2014) investigated the impact of staff turnover on performance: a case of North West provincial department of South Africa using descriptive survey design. Data were presented with descriptive statistics and analyzed with chi-square. These variables of style turnover such as lack of competitive salary package, lack of opportunity to earn performance bonus like overtime, no good training and developing opportunity, lack of recognition and reward for good performance, lack of promotion for good performance, lack of opportunity to work independently, lack of up to date technology to perform jobs. Findings indicated that majority of employees were dissatisfied due to many reasons thereby causing lots of voluntary resignations among employees. Low productivity resulted from ignorance of managers about the causes of dissatisfaction. 3 variables were used; intent to leave the departments, employees' intention to resign and causes of staff turnover.

Benedict, Josiah, Ogunbenle and Akpeti, (2012) studied the effect of labour turnover in Brewery Industry in Nigeria. Design was cross sectional survey using percentages. Findings showed that the effect of labour turnover were reduced production, increased cost of recruitment increased work disruption, increased scrap and overtime, and additional labour turnover/ it concluded that reduced production had the foremost effect on labour turnover as it affects output and profit.

Akinruwa, Ajayi and Akeke (2014) investigated the effect of labour turnover in the Nigerian banking industry using survey design. Data were presented with SPSS and analysis was done with multiple regressions. The variables included retrenchment, leadership style, training, job insecurity, work load, and unrealistic target. Findings indicated that excessive work load had negative relationship with performance while others had positive relationship.

Akafor and Boateng, (2015) studied impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation in Ghana using descriptive survey design. Data were analyzed with ANOVA. 3 variables reward and motivation, academic/ administrative staff perception about reward and motivation,

and the challenges of reward implementation in private tertiary institutions. Findings indicated that reward had a positive impact on work motivation but no significant relation between reward and job satisfaction. Both academic and administrative staff perceived reward as fair.

Osabiya (2015) in Nigeria investigated the effect of employee motivation on organizational performances using descriptive survey design. Findings revealed that there is obvious difference between properly motivated employees than those who are not because they are more committed to productivity.

Ampommah and Cudijor (2015) studied the effect of employee turnover on organizations a case study of Electricity Company of Cape Coast Ghana with survey design. 3 variables included job insecurity, demographic and personal characteristics of employees, job dissatisfaction, organizational work environment, promotion, alternative employment. 3 variables included: causes of employee turnover in organizations, measures to reduce turnover: develop people, recognize good performance, build trust, effect of turnover on employee performance Positive effects are open up promotion channels for employees, introduce new ideas and skills in organizations, replacement of poor performance. Negative effects: additional costs of recruitment and replacement, poor quality of work deficiently in attracting new staff, loss of skill manpower.

Mabindisa,. (2013) studied the impact of staff turnover on organizational effectiveness and employee performance with survey design. SPSS V. 15 and regression were used. Findings suggested that salary is the primary cause of staff turnover. It highlighted that high staff turnover increases workload of employees, it discovered that it causes reduction in effective service delivery to the customers it reduces that unhealthy customer relations causes staff turnover. Variables used included organizational effectiveness and employee performance.

Amed, Sabia Amhad and Billar (2016) investigated the impact of employee turnover on organizational effectiveness in television sector in Pakistan using survey design. Correlation and regression were used for data analysis. With survey design Variables included (1) firm stability (2) pay level (3) industry (4) work situation (5) training/supervision. Findings indicated that there is significant relationship between employee turnover and organizational effectiveness.

Tiwari (2014).studied the impact of absenteeism and labour turnover on organizational performance at the ITA, nani, Allahabad in India with survey design. Variables included factors responsible for absenteeism/labour turnover, attitude of management towards workers problems, attitude of employees towards their jobs, opinion of employers and labour regarding absenteeism/labour turnover Findings indicated that 3 items 3 variables were very goods.

Nyanga (2015) studied the assessment of employee turnover o organizational efficiency a case study of international livestock research institute Nairobi Kenya using survey design Variables included actual reasons for turnover, impact of turnover, and possible mitigation of turnover. Data analysis was done with SPSS. Findings showed that the institute experienced high cases of employee turnover arising from lack retention, strategies. High rate of turnover impacted negatively on the institute. Lack of training reduced employees' skill development. Management was not concerned with workers training and skill development which reduced employee exposure.

Gap in literature Research has shown many causes of employee turnover and those which are foremost in determining employee satisfaction and performance. Conflicting findings from each study establish the gap which this study attempts to fill by combining them to determine the degree of effect derived from each variable. This study identifies reward dimensions, career development dimensions, structure dimensions, and organizational commitment dimensions as foremost variables for it analyses and contribution to knowledge since no previous study had jointly used them

METHOD

RESEARCH DESIGN

This work adopted survey research design

AREA OF THE STUDY

This work covered the 3 senatorial zones of Anambra State. Six (6) plastic manufacturing companies were randomly selected in stratification of 2 from each zone as listed in Table 1.

POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The population size for the study was 1285 obtained from the Nominal rolls or pay rolls of the 6 plastic manufacturing companies selected as presented in Table I.

Table 1: Distribution of Population to the 6 Selected Plastic Manufacturing Companies

Determination of Sample Size

The sample size for the study was determined using Taro Yamana (1964) formula which states as follows:

$$n = N$$

$$1 + N(e)^2 \text{ where:}$$

n = sample size to be determined

N = Population of interest (1285)

e= significant level 0.05

$$\text{Therefore } n = 1285 = 1285$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 1+N(e)^2 &= 1+1285(0.05)^2 = 1+(1285) (0.0025) \\
 &= \frac{1285}{1+32125} = \frac{1285}{4.2125} \\
 &= \underline{\underline{305.044}}
 \end{aligned}$$

n = 305.

Thus, the sample for the study included supervisors, paid managers, owner-managers and the employees of the selected plastic manufacturing companies in the 3 senatorial zones of Anambra State.

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

Primary and secondary data were used in the survey and primary data collection was by the use of well-structured, closed-ended questionnaire and interviews. Secondary data collection was from the companies' payrolls or from literature.

Three hundred and five (305) copies of self-administered questionnaire were distributed to the respondents. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that the respondents would not find it difficult to fill in the answers. The respondents were expected to indicate by ticking (V) the option to which he/she agreed with the statement in the items. The Likert scale was used which enabled the researcher to understand the respondents' degree of agreement with each statement. The sample of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix I.

VALIDATION OF TEST OF INSTRUMENTS

To validate the questionnaire constructed for the study, it was submitted to the supervisor for appropriate review, corrections and criticisms. This was to ensure that the terms and statements made in the questionnaire were prepared in compliance with the recommended corrections.

METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

Data were presented with summary statistics of tables, frequencies and percentages while analysis was done with the chi-square method using the formula:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$$

Where χ^2 = Chi-square

O_i = Sum of observed frequency

E_i = Expected frequency

MODEL SPECIFICATION AND JUSTIFICATION

χ^2 chi-square is used to determine the goodness of fit of the variables. The χ^2 chi-square statistic is commonly used for testing relationship on categorical variables or to determine whether there is significant relationship between two categorical variables.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter focuses on the presentation and analysis of data collected from the questionnaire distributed to the employees of six (6) plastic manufacturing companies in Anambra State. Total of 305 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the target sample. Out of this number, 212 copies were retrieved from the respondents giving a percentage of 86.2% which was still significant for the study. From this, a total of 93 respondents did not either return their questionnaire or the questionnaire was carelessly completed or mutilated or with multiple answers which invalidated them. Therefore, this represented only 30% of the sample. The data are presented in tables and analyzed with Chi-square χ^2

In this section, data presentation is done in two sections - section A deals with demographic factors and section B deals with the presentation of data from responses related to employee turnover on organizational performance with respect to employee pay (salary) dissatisfaction, training, employee absenteeism and development and motivation.

Section A: Analysis of Demographic Factors

This section analyses the demographical details of the respondents using appropriate baseline computations. **Please see appendix for all tables**

Table 2: Age responses for each category

As indicated in Table 2 above total of 5.2% of the respondents who participated in this study were below 25 years old, while 41.04% of respondents were between 26 - 30 years old. A total of 32.07% respondents were between 31 -35 years old. However, 16.5% of respondent were between the ages of 36 - 40 years old and the remaining 5.2% of respondents were between ages of 40 and above.

Table 3 Gender (sex) of Respondents

Table 3 above illustrates the gender (sex) of respondents. A total of 64.6% of respondents who participated in this study were male employees and 35.4% of respondents were female employees.

Table 4: Marital Status of Respondents

From Table 4 above, a total of 38.8% of respondents were married while 1.9% of the respondents were divorced. A total of 55.7% of respondents who participated in this survey were single whereas 3.8% of the respondents were widowed.

Table 5 Academic Qualifications of Respondents

Table 5 above indicates that a total of 9.4% of the respondents had only FSLC, 47.6% of the respondents were holders of WAEC/NECO/NABTEB and 31.1% of the respondents were holders of ONE/NCE. A total of 10.4% of respondents were holders of HND/B.Sc/BA/B.Ed/B.Eng/B.Tech, while 1.4% of them were holders of M.Sc/MA/MBA/M.Eng/M.Tech. However, a total of none of the respondents were holders of Ph.D degree.

Table 6: Length of Service of Respondents

Table 6 above illustrates the length of service of the respondents in their various organizations. A total of 42.9% of respondents had been in service between 0 - 5 years, while 35.8% of the respondents had been in service between 6 - 10 years. A total of 11.8% of respondents had served between 11-15 years in their respective organizations whereas a total of 9.4% of respondents had been in service for up to 16 years and above.

Section B: Individual and Job Factors on Organizational

This section deals with the presentation and analysis of data gathered with questionnaires from respondents of the 6 selected plastic manufacturing companies with respect to the four specific objectives of the present study viz; employee pay (salary) dissatisfaction, training and development, motivation and absenteeism.

Table 7 Salary Satisfaction

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages.

Table 7 shows that 33.25% of respondents on average strongly agreed with the items, 22.43% merely agreed, 3.38% were undecided (neutral), 26.89% disagreed and 14.14% strongly disagreed. This shows that 55.68% agreed with all the items while 40.94% of the respondents disagreed with all the items.

Table 8: Employee Training and Development

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages.

Table 8 indicates that 33.98% of respondents on average strongly agreed 41.18% agree, 2.58% had no opinion, 18.15% disagreed and 4.13% strongly analysis shows that 75.16% of respondents agreed with all items and 22.28% strong.

Table .9 Employee Motivations

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages.

Table .9 shows that 22.4% of the respondents strongly agreed with all the items, 26.93% merely agreed, 3.53% undecided, 30.08% disagreed and 17.08% strongly disagreed. In this context 49.33% of respondents agreed with all the items whereas 47.16 disagreed.

Table 10 Employee Absenteeism

Table 10 shows that 26.8% of the respondents strongly agreed with all the items, 19.35% merely agreed, 4.6% undecided, 29.8% disagreed and 19.45% strongly disagreed. In this case 46.15% of respondents agreed with all the items whereas 49.25 disagreed.

Test of Hypotheses

In this study, three hypotheses were empirically tested. This was aimed at verifying the validity of the proposition and to find out the relationship existing between the variables under study. Hence chi-square often denoted as X^2 , was used to test the research hypothesis.

Hypothesis One

Ho₁: Pay (salary) dissatisfaction has no significant relationship with organizational performance.

H₁: Pay (salary) dissatisfaction has a significant relationship with organizational performance.

In testing this hypothesis, responses from table 4.7 is used.

Computation of Expected Frequency

$$Fe = \frac{RT \times CT}{GT}$$

Where Fe = Expected Frequency

RT = Row Total

CT = Column Total

GT = Grand Total

Table 11 Contingency Table for Hypothesis One

Quest	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	87	92	9	14	10	212
2	(88.75)	(92.25)	(7.25)	(14.25)	(9.5)	212
3	(88.75)	(92.25)	(7.25)	(14.25)	(9.5)	212
4	(88.75)	(92.25)	(7.25)	(14.25)	(9.5)	212
	(88.75)	(92.25)	(7.25)	(14.25)	(9.5)	
Total	355	369	29	57	38	848

Source: Field Survey, 2017

Table 12 Computation of Chi-Square Distribution Table

Cells	Fo	Fe	Fo-Fe	(Fo - Fe) ²	(Fo-Fe) ² /Fe
A1	87	88.75	-1.75	3.1	0.03
A2	92	92.25	-0.25	0.0625	0.00
A3	9	7.25	1.75	3.1	0.42
A4	14	14.25	-0.25	0.0625	0.00
A5	10	9.5	0.5	0.25	0.26
B6	69	88.75	-19.75	390.1	4.40
B7	109	92.25	16.75	280.6	3.04
B8	12	7.25	4.75	22.56	3.11
B9	12	14.25	-2.25	5.06	0.36
B10	10	9.5	0.5	0.25	0.03
C11	102	88.75	13.25	175.6	1.98
C12	86	92.25	-6.25	39.06	0.42
C13	4	7.25	-3.25	10.56	1.46
C14	12	14.25	-2.25	5.06	0.36
C15	8	9.5	-1.5	2.25	0.94
D16	97	88.75	8.25	68.06	0.77
D17	82	92.25	-10.25	105.1	1.14
D18	4	7.25	-3.25	10.6	1.46
D19	19	14.25	4.75	22.56	1.58
D20	10	9.5	0.5	0.25	0.03
Total					21.79

Source: Authors Computation

Therefore, chi-square calculated = 21.79

Determination the Critical

$$Df = (R-1)(C-1)$$

$$Df = (4-1)(5-1)$$

$$Df = (3)(4)$$

$$Df = 12$$

Level of Significance = 5% = 0.05

Therefore the, Critical value $X^2 = 21.026$

DECISION

The decision rule state that null hypothesis should be rejected if the chi-square calculated (21.79) is greater than the critical value of chi-square (21.026), otherwise accept. Since the computed chi-square is greater than the critical value of chi-square is greater than critical value, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis which states that pay (salary) dissatisfaction has a significant relationship with organizational performance.

HYPOTHESIS TWO

Ho₃: Employee training and development has no significant relationship with organizational Performance.

Hi: Employee training and development has significant relationship with organizational Performance.

In testing this hypothesis, table 4.8 is used.

Computation of Expected Frequency

$$Fe = \frac{RT \times CT}{GT}$$

Where Fe = Expected Frequency

RT = Row Total CT = Column Total GT = Grand Total

The figures in brackets are the expected frequency for each of the options.

Table 13 Contingency Table for Hypothesis Two

Question	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	99 (95.25)	74 (87.25)	8 (5.5)	21 (15.25)	10 (8.75)	212
2	101 (95.25)	87 (87.25)	6 (5.5)	8 (15.25)	10 (8.75)	212
3	92 (95.25)	89 (87.25)	4 (5.5)	20 (15.25)	7 (8.75)	212
4	89 (95.25)	99 (87.25)	4 (5.5)	12 (15.25)	8 (8.75)	212
Total	381	349	22	61	35	848

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 14 Computation of Chi-Square Distribution Table for Hypothesis 2

Cells	Fo	Fe	Fo-Fe	(Fo - Fe) ²	(Fo - Fe) ² / Fe
A1	99	95.25	3.75	14.1	0.1
A2	74	87.25	-13.25	175.6	2.0
A3	8	5.5	2.5	6.25	1.1
A4	21	15.25	5.75	33.1	2.2
A5	10	8.75	1.25	1.6	0.2
B6	101	95.25	5.75	33.1	0.3
B7	87	87.25	-0.25	0.06	0.0
B8	6	5.5	0.5	0.25	0.05
B9	8	15.25	-7.25	52.6	3.4
B10	10	8.75	1.25	1.7	0.2
C11	92	95.25	-3.25	10.6	0.1
C12	89	87.25	1.75	3.1	0.0
C13	4	5.5	-1.5	2.25	0.4

C14	20	15.25	4.75	22.6	1.5
C15	7	.8.75	-1.75	3.1	0.35
D16	89	95.25	-6.25	39.1	0.4
D17	99	87.25	11.75	138.1	1.6
D18	4	5,5	-1.5	2.25	0.4
D19	12	15.25	-3.25	10.6	0.7
D20	8	8.75	-0.75	0.6	0.1
Total					22.1

Source: Authors Computation

Table 14 Computation of Chi-Square Distribution Table for Hypothesis 3

Chi-square calculated = 22.1

Determination the Critical Value

$$Df = (R - 1)(C - 1)$$

$$Df = (4 - 1)(5 - 1)$$

$$Df = (3)(4)$$

$$Df = 12$$

Level of Significance = 5% ~ 0.05

Therefore the, Critical value $X^2 = 21,026$

DECISION

The decision rule state that null hypothesis should be rejected if the chi-square calculated is greater than the critical value of chi-square, otherwise accept. Since the computed chi-square is greater than the critical value of chi-square i.e. 22.1 is greater than 21.026, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis which states that employee training and development has a significant relationship with organizational Performance.

HYPOTHESIS THREE

Ho₂: Employee motivation has no significant relationship with organizational performance. **Hi:** Employee motivation has significant relationship with organizational performance.

This hypothesis will tested using data on tables 4.9.

Computation of Expected Frequency

$$Fe = \frac{RT \cdot CT}{GT}$$

Where Fe — Expected Frequency

RT = Row Total

CT = Column Total

GT = Grand Total

The figures in brackets are the expected frequency for each of the options.

Table 15 Contingency Table for Hypothesis Three

Questio	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	106	82	9	4	11	212
	(97.75)	(81.75)	(7.5)	(13.5)	(11.5)	
2	106	101	0	3	2	212
	(97.75)	(81.75)	(7.5)	(13.5)	(11.5)	
3	68	72	12	.35	25	212
	(97.75)	(81.75)	(7.5)	(13.5)	(11.5)	
4	111	72	9	12	8	212
	(97.75)	(81.75)	(7.5)	(13.5)	(11.5)	
Total	391	327	30	54	46	848

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 16 Computation of Chi-Square Distribution Table

Cells	Fo	Fe	Fo-Fe	(Fo - Fe) ²	(Fo - Fe) ² / Fe
A1	106	97.75	8.25	68.06	0.7
A2	82	81.75	0.25	0.06	0.0
A3	9	7.5	1.5	2.25	0.3
A4	4	.13.5	-9.5	90.25	6.7
A5	11	11.5	0.5	0.25	0.0
B6	106	97.75	8.25	68.06	0.7
B7	101	81.75	19.25	370.6	4.5
B8	0	7.5	-7.5	56.25	7.5
B9	3	13.5	-10.5	110.25	8.2
B10	2	11.5	9.5	90.25	7.8
C11	68	97.75	-29.75	885.1	9.1
C12	72	81.75	-9.75	95.1	1.2
C13	12	7.5	4.5	20.25	2.7
C14	35	13.5	21.5	462.3	34.2
C15	25	11.5	13.5	182.3	15.8
D16	111	97.75	13.25	175.6	1.8
D17	72	81.75	-9.75	95.1	1.2
D18	9	7.5	1.5	2.25	0.3
D19	12	13.5	-1.5	2.25	0.2
D20	8	11.5	-3.5	12.25	1.1
Total					104.0

Source: Authors Computation

Table 16 Computation of Chi-Square Distribution Table

Chi-square calculated = 104.0

Determination the Critical Value

$$Df=(R-I)(C-I)$$

$$Df=(3)(4)$$

$$Df= 12$$

Level of Significance = 5% = 0.05

Therefore the, Critical value $X^2 = 21.026$

DECISION

The decision rule state that null hypothesis should be rejected if the chi-square calculated is greater than the critical value of chi-square, otherwise accept. Since the computed chi-square is greater than the critical value of chi-square (104.0) is greater than the critical value (21.026), we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis which states that employee motivation has a significant relationship with organizational performance.

HYPOTHESIS FOUR

Hoi: Employee absenteeism has no significant relationship with organizational performance.

Hi: Employee absenteeism has a significant relationship with organizational performance.

In testing this hypothesis, responses from table 4.10 will be used.

Computation of Expected Frequency

$$Fe = \frac{RT \times CT}{GT}$$

Where Fe - Expected Frequency'

RT = Row Total

CT = Column Total

GT = Grand Total

The figures in brackets are the expected frequency for each of the options.

Table 17 Contingency Table for Hypothesis four

Questi	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	24	23 (41)	9	77_ (61.25)_	79	212
2	(56.75) 69	12	(9.75) 12	109	(41.25) 10	212
3	(56.75) 37	(41) 47	(9.75) 14	(63.25) 48	(41.25) 66	212
4	(56.75) 97	(41) 82	(9.75) 4	(63.25) 19	(41.25) 10	212
Total	227	164	39	253	165	848

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 18 Computation of Chi-Square Distribution Table

Cells	Fo	Fe	Fo-Fe	(Fo - Fe) ²	(Fo - Fe) ² /Fe
A1	24	56.75	-32.75	1072.6	18.9
A2	23	41	-18	324	7.9
A3	9	9.75	-0.75	0.56	0.06
A4	77	63.25	13.75	189.1	3.0
A5	79	41.25	37.75	1425.1	34.5
B6	69	56.75	12.25	150.1	2.6
B7	12	41	-29	841	20.5
B8	12	9.75	2.25	5.1	0.52
B9	109	63.25	45.7	2093.1	33.1
B10	10	41.25	-31.25	976.6	23.7
C11	37	56.75	-19.75	390.1	6.9
C32	47	41	6	36	0.9
C13	14	9.75	4.25	18.1	1.9
C14	48	63.25	-15.25	232.6	3.6
C15	66	41.25	24.75	612.6	14.9
D16	97	56.75	40.3	1620.1	28.5
D17	82	41	41	1681	41
D18	4	9.75	5.75	33.1	3.4
D19	19	63.25	44.25	1958.1	31
D20	10	41.25	31.25	976.6	23.7
Total					300.58

Source: Authors Computation

Therefore, chi-square calculated = 300.58

Determination the Critical Value

$$Df = (R-1)(C-1)$$

$$Df = (3)(4)$$

$$Df = 12$$

Level of Significance = 5% = 0.05.

Therefore the, Critical value $\chi^2 = 21.025$

DECISION

The decision rule state that null hypothesis should be rejected if the chi-square calculated (21.79) is greater than the critical value of chi-square (300.58), otherwise accept. Since the computed chi-square is greater than the critical value of chi-square is greater than critical value, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis which states that employee absenteeism has a significant relationship with organizational performance.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This work examined labour turnover and organizational performance in some selected plastic manufacturing companies in Anambra State; Six (6) plastic manufacturing companies in the 3

senatorial zones of Anambra State were examined. Data were sourced from the employees of these plastic manufacturing companies. The data generated were analyzed using simple percentage analysis and chi-square statistical technique. The study revealed that pay (salary) dissatisfaction significantly influences organizational performance. This implies when employees feel dissatisfied with their salaries, labour turnover increases thereby affecting performance negatively. The finding agrees with that of Parvin and Kabir (2011) that salary and other factors such as efficiency in work, fringe benefit, supervision, and co-worker relation are the most important factors contributing to job satisfaction and invariably enhance organizational performance. It also agrees with the findings of Akafor and Boateng, (2015) which indicated that reward had a positive impact on work motivation. It shows that reward (including pay) and recognition has great impact on motivation of the employees for optimal performance.

The study also found that employee training and development significantly influences organizational Performance. This implies that training and development has significant relationship with organizational performance. This is in line with the findings of Akinruwa, Ajayi and Akeke (2014) that training have a positive relationship with performance.

Finally, the study found that employee motivation significantly affects organizational performance. This finding implies that when employees are motivated, the rate of their turnover will reduce but when they are not motivated, high rate of labour turnover will be experienced. Therefore, in order to improve organizational performance, employees need to be motivated in order to reduce high rate of employee turnover. This agrees with the findings of Osabiya (2015) which revealed that there is obvious difference between properly motivated employees than those who are not because motivated employees are more committed to productivity. It means that there exists relationship between employee motivation and organizational performance and that extrinsic motivation given to worker in an organization has a significant influence on the worker's performance.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In synopsis, the findings of the study are:

1. Pay (salary) dissatisfaction has significant relationship with organizational performance.
2. Employee training and development has significant relationship with organizational Performance.
3. Employee motivation has significant relationship with organizational performance.
4. Employee absenteeism has significant relationship with organizational performance.

CONCLUSION

This work examined the relationship between labour turnover and organisational performance in some selected plastic manufacturing companies in Anambra State. Data were sourced from the employees of these plastic manufacturing companies. The data generated were analyzed using simple percentage analysis and chi-square statistical technique. The study revealed that pay (salary) dissatisfaction significantly influences organizational performance. The study also found that employee training and development significantly influences organizational Performance. Finally, the study found that employee motivation significantly affects organizational performance. This finding implies that when employees are motivated through salary and training/development, the rate of their turnover will reduce but when they are not motivated, high rate of labour turnover will be experienced. Therefore, in order to improve organizational performance, employees need to be motivated in order to reduce high rate of employee turnover. The study therefore concludes that there is a significant relationship between labour turnover and organizational performance in the selected plastic manufacturing companies in Anambra State.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the study recommends that:

1. Employees' salary should be increased regularly to reflect current economic realities in order to reduce the incidence of labour turnover in organizations.
2. Similarly, training and development should be provided to employees in order to encourage them to stay in the organization.
3. Organizations should look into the factors that contribute to employee absenteeism in order to find out how to effectively reduce it.
4. Organizations should ensure that employees are effectively motivated in order to reduce the incidence of labour turnover.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequality in social exchange In: L. Berkovitz (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 2, New York. Academic Press, pp. 267-293.
- Ahmed, P.Z; Sabir, S; Khosa, M; Ahmad, I & Bilal, M. A (2016) Impact of Employee Turnover on Organisational Effectiveness in Tele Communication Sector of Pakistan IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 18, Issue 11. Ver. V (November. 2016), PP 88-96 www.iosrjournals.org DOI: 10.9790/487X-1811058896 www.iosrjournals.org
- Akafo, V & Boateng, P.A. (2015) Impact of Reward and Recognition on Job Satisfaction and Motivation European Journal of Business and Management www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online) Vol.7, No.24, 2015 112
- Akinruwa, T. E., Ajayi, S. O. & Akeke, N.I. (2014). Effect of Labour turnover on Performance of Nigerian Banking Industry (A case of Ado-Ekiti Metropolis, Ekiti State). *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(28): 125-132.
- Ampomah, P. & Cudjor, S. K (2015) The Effect of Employee Turnover on Organizations (Case Study of Electricity Company of Ghana, Cape Coast) Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies ISSN: 2313-7401 Vol. 2, No. 1, 21-24, 2015 <http://www.asianonlinejournals.com/index.php/AJSSMS>
- Benedict, A. C., Josiah, M., Ogungbenle, S.K. & Akpeti, E. (2012). The effect of Labour turnover in Brewery Industries in Nigeria (A case study of Nigerian Breweries Pic. and Bendel Brewery Ltd. in Benin City). *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 4(2): 114-123.
- Boamah, R. (2014). The effect of motivation on employee's performance: Empirical evidence from Brong Ahafor Education Directorate. Msc Thesis, Department of Management Science, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Uganda.
- CIPD. (2014). Employee turnover and Retention. (Online). <http://www.cipd.co.uk/hr-resources//actshots/employee-turnover-retention.aspx>>. Retrieved. March 20, 2014.
- Dozier, B. (2016). Impact of staff turnover on organizational performance: A case study of Beitbdgge Town Council. *International Energy Policy: strategic paper*. United Nations.
- Gainsford, P. (2017). *Salt and Salary: Were Roman Soldiers paid in salt? Modern Myths About the Ancient World*. London, Kiwi Hellenist.
- Gavrea, C., lilies, L. & Stegoreari, R. (2011). Determination of Organizational Performance: The case of Romania. *Management and Marketing Challenges for the knowledge Society*, 6(2): 285-200.

- Gill, D. & Stone, R. (2010). Fairness and desert in tournaments. *Games and Economics*.
- Guerrero, L.K., Peter, A. A. & Walid, A. A. (2014). *Close Encounters: Communications in Relationship*. 4th ed. Los Angeles, CA, Sage Publication Inc. p. 263.
- Hameed, A. A. W. (2011). Employee development and its effect on Employee Performance: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2 (13, special issue): 224.
- Hendry C. (2012) Impact of staff turnover on organisational performance: A case study of Beitbridge town council. Accessed from Barbra Doziers blog 22/2/2016
- Kirby, J. (2011). Towards a theory of High Performance. *Harvard Business Review*. July/August, pp. 30-38.
- Lebens, M. & Euske, K. (2010)., *A Conceptual and Operational delineation of Performance .•Business Performance Management*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Mabindisa, V. (2013). Impact of Staff turnover on Organizational Effectiveness and Employee Performance at the Department of Home Affairs in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. MSc Thesis, Department of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Management Science, Durban University of Technology, South Africa.
- Molefakgotla, A.M., Ntebogang, D.M. & Kattego, T. (2014). The Impact of Staff turnover on Performance: A case of North West Provincial Department of South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(23): 117-129.
- Muhammad, N.T., Muhammad, &. & Riaz, A. (2014).The Impact of Employee Turnover on the Efficiency of the Organization .*Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(9) : 1-27,Institute of Interdisciplinary Business Research.
- Muogbo, U. S. (2013). The Impact of Employee Motivation on Organizational Performance (A study of some selected firms in Anarnbra State, Nigeria). *The International Journal of Engineering and Science*, 2(7): 70-81.
- Nyaga, R (2015) Assessment Of Employee Turnover On Organizational Efficiency: A Case Study Of International Livestock Research Institute (Ilri) A Research Project Report Submitted to the Chandaria School of Business in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science in Organizational Development (EMOD)
- Osabiya, B. J. (2015) The effect of employees' motivation on organisational performance. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research* Vol. 7(4) pp. 62-75, May 2015 DOI: 10.5897/JPAPR2014.0300 Article Number: 721D2F153302 ISSN 2141-2480 <http://www.academicjournals.org/>

- Parvin, M.M. & Kabir, M.M.'N. (2011). Factors affecting Employee Job satisfaction on Pharmaceutical Section in Bangladesh. *Australian Journal of Business Management Research*, 1(9): 113-123.
- Spector, P.E. (2011) *Industrial and Organizational Behaviour*. 5thed., Hoboken, N.J., Wiley.
- Talent Management Alliance. (2013). Talent Management Strategies to drive business growth in APAC and the Middle East. *People in the Energy East Proceedings*, 18th to 19th March, 2013.
- Tiwari, V. (2014). Impact of Absenteeism and Labour Turnover on Organizational Performance at the Ita, Nani, Allahabad, India. *Abhinav National Monthly Referred Journal of Research in Commerce and Management*, 3(10): 9-15.
- Upadhaya, B; Munor, R & Blount, Y (2014) Association between performance system and organisational effectiveness. *International journal of operation & production management* vol 34 issue 7(2)
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *The Expectancy Motivation Theory*. London. Yale School of Management.

APPENDICES I

Table 1: Distribution of Population to the 6 Selected Plastic Manufacturing Companies

S/n	Company and Address	Staff Strength
1	Ezenwa Plastic Industries Nig. Ltd., No. 85 Amobi St., Onitsha	227
2	Ano Plastic and Metal Industries Ltd., Km 7 Osha-Owerri Rd., Onitsha	192
3	Chicason Plastics, a subsidiary of Chicason Group of Companies, Umudim, Nnewi	245
4	Jezco Plastic Industries, Awka Rd., Ekwulobia	241
5	Ozalla Plastic Enterprises Ltd., Plot 253 Awka Industrial Estate, Awka	184
6	Willytraco Industries Nig.Ltd,32 Bishop Okoye Avenue, Ukpo	196
Total		1285

Sources: Field Survey 2017 Adapted from Individual Company Payroll.

Table 2: Age Responses for each Category

S/n	Factor	Total	%
a).	Below 25 years	11	5.2
b).	26-30	87	41.04
c).	31-35	68	32.07
d).	36-40	35	16.5
e).	40 and above	11	5.2
Total		212	100

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 3 Gender (sex) of Respondents

S/n	Sex	Total Count	%
a).	Male	137	64.6
b).	Female	75	35.4
Total		212	100

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 4: Marital Status of Respondents

S/n	Marital Status	Total Count	%
a).	Married	82	38.8
b).	Divorced	4	1.9
c).	Single	118	55.7
d).	Widowed	8	3.8
Total		212	100

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 5 Academic Qualifications of Respondents

S/n	Qualification	Total Count	%
a).	FSLC	20	9.4
b).	WAEC/NECO/NABTEB	101	47.6
c).	OND/NCE	66	31.1
d).	HND/B.sc/BA/B.Ed/B.eng/B.Tech.	22	10.4
e).	M.Sc/MA/MBA/M.Eng./M.Tech	3	1.4
f).	Ph.D	-	-
Total		212	100

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 6: Length of Service of Respondents

S/n	Length of Service	Total Count	%
a).	0-5 years	91	42.9
b).	6-10 years	76	35.8
c).	11-15 years	25	11.8
e).	16 years and above	20	9.4
Total		212	100

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Employee pay (salary) dissatisfaction, training and development, motivation and absenteeism

Table 7 Salary Satisfaction

s/n	Item	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	I am satisfied with my current salary	14 (6.6)	10 (4.7)	9 (4.2)	87 (41.1)	92 (43.4)	212 (100)
2	My monthly salary is above N25,000	69 (32.5)	12 (5.7)	12 (5.7)	109 (51.4)	10 (4.7)	212 (100)
3	My salary is paid as at when due	102 (48.1)	86 (40.6)	4 (1.8)	12 (5.7)	8 (3.8)	212 (100)
4	My salary is lower than that of my grade in other organization	97 (45.8)	82 (38.7)	4 (1.8)	19 (9.0)	10 (4.7)	212 (100)
Total		282	190	29	227	120	848
Total Percentage		(133)	(89.7)	(13.5)	(107.2)	(56.6)	(400)
Average Percentage		(33.25)	(22.43)	(3.38)	(26.8)	(14.14)	(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Table 8: Employee Training and Development

S/n	Items	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
1	There are T & D programmes in the organization	99 (46.7)	74 (34.9)	8 (3.8)	21 (9.9)	10 (4.7)	212 (100)
2	I attend training regularly	8 (3.8)	87 (41.1)	6 (2.8)	101 (47.6)	10 (4.7)	212 (100)
3	The training improves my skills ,	92 (43.4)	89 (42.0)	4 (1.9)	20 (9.4)	7 (3.3)	212 (100)
4	The training programmes enhance my job performance	89 (42.0)	99 (46.7)	4 (1.8)	12 (5.7)	8 (3.8)	212 (100)
	Total	288	349	22	154	35	848
	Total Percentage	(135.9)	(164.7)	(10.3)	(72.6)	(16.5)	(400)
	Average Percentage	(33.98)	(41.18)	(2.58)	(18.15)	(4.13)	(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages.

Table .9 Employee Motivations

S/n	Items	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Total
5	There are clear reward system based on performance in the organization	4 (1.8)	82 (38.7)	9 (4.3)	106 (50)	11 (5.2)	212 (100)
6	There are promotion mechanisms based on performance	106 (50)	3 (1.0)	0 (0)	101 (47.6)	2 (0.9)	212 (100)
7	Staff are motivated for hard work	68 (32.1)	72 (34.0)	12 (5.6)	35 (16.5)	5 (2.3)	212 (100)
8	Motivational programmes of the organization enhances my productivity	12 (5.7)	72 (34.0)	9 (4.2)	111 (52.4)	8 (3.7)	212 (100)
	Total	190	229	30	353	46	848
	Percentage Total	80.6	107.7	14.1	120.3	68.3	(400)
	Average Percentage	22.4	26.93	3.53	30.08	17.08	(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2017.

Note: Figures in parenthesis are percentages.

Table 10 Employee Absenteeism

S/ Item	SA	A	UD	D	SB	Total
1 Poor salary makes me to intend to absent from duty	24 (11.3)	23 (10.8)	9 (4.2)	77 (36.3)	79 (37.4)	212 (100)
2 Poor working conditions make me to stay away from job.	69 (32.5)	12 (5.7)	12 (5.7)	109 (51.4)	10 (4.7)	212 (100)
3 Stress and work load cause me to be absent from work	37 (17.6)	47 (22.2)	14 (6.6)	48 (22.6)	66 (31.0)	212 (100)
4 Family problem cause my frequent absent from my job	97 (45.8)	82 (38.7)	4 (1.8)	19 (9.0)	10 (4.7)	212 (100)
Total	227	164	39	253	165	848
Total Percentage	(107.2)	(77.4)	(18.3)	(119.3)	(77.8)	(400)
Average Percentage	(26.8)	(19.35)	(4.6)	(29.8)	(19.45)	(100)

Source: Field Survey, 2017.