



## Influence of Employee Motivation and Work Environment on Quality of Life of Non-Academic University Staff in Osun State, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Damilare. A. Fagbenro, <sup>2</sup>Adekunle A. Kenku (Ph.D) & <sup>3</sup>Wali, J. Ogechi

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology,  
Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife,  
Osun State, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author: [Dareinui2008@yahoo.com](mailto:Dareinui2008@yahoo.com)*

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology,  
Nassarawa State University  
Nassarawa, Nigeria

<sup>3</sup>Department of Management  
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education  
Port-Harcourt, Nigeria

### **Abstract**

*The study examined the influence of employee motivation and work environment on quality of life of Obafemi Awolowo University non-teaching staff. The study adopted an ex-post facto research design using the purposive sampling technique. Data were collected from non-academic staff in Obafemi Awolowo University. The sample for this study consists of 275 respondents comprising 141 Males (51.3%), and 134 females (48.7%). Their age ranged from 24 to 59 years with a mean age of 35 years (SD = 5.36). Three standardized psychological scales were used which were Employee Motivation Scale, Work Environment Scale and Quality of life scale. Data collected were analysed using t-test for independence measure and Multiple Regression analysis. Results showed that there was significant difference between the quality of life of non-academic staff with low ( $X = 70.59$ ;  $SD = 11.29$ ) employee motivation and High ( $X = 79.36$ ;  $SD = 11.97$ ) employee motivation, ( $t = -3.961$ ;  $df = 273$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Furthermore, There was significant difference between the quality of life of non-academic staff with good ( $X = 78.04$ ;  $SD = 17.33$ ) work environment and bad ( $X = 69.84$ ;  $SD = 11.20$ ) work environment, ( $t = -3.961$ ;  $df = 273$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Finally, there was a significant joint influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff ( $R^2 = .210$ ,  $F(2,272) = 36.160$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The study concludes that work environment and work motivation jointly influence quality of life among non-academic staff in Ile-Ife Osun state; it is highly recommended that professional psychologist should develop work environment that is stimulating and conducive for all employees within the University with appropriate work motivation that will be desire for all employees.*

**Keywords:** Quality of life, Work environment, employee motivation, Non-academic staff

### **Introduction**

Recently, the concept of quality of life has attracted the attention of many social scientists and health care providers. Traditionally, researchers in the discipline of psychology have been interested in the concept of quality of life as a measure of the social effects of policies and practice. World health organization WHO (2002) defines quality of life as individual's perceptions of their position in life in context of the culture and value systems in which they live



and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns. Quality of life is an indicator of not only how well an individual functions in daily life, but also how the individual's perceptions of health status influence his or her life (Chan, Li, Chung, Po, & Yu, 2004). Phillips (2006) postulate that quality of life is a multifaceted phenomenon determined by the cumulative and interactive impacts of numerous and varied factors like housing conditions, infrastructure, access to various amenities, income, standard of living, satisfaction about the physical and social environment.

More so, quality of Life is the combination of objectively and subjectively indicated well-being in multiple domains of life considered salient in one's culture and time, while adhering to universal standards of human rights. Quality of Life also has a bearing on individuals' life situations but it is not the sum total of these though the conditions and perceptions of individuals to their economic and social situation play a key role. Many factors contribute to quality of life which includes adequate and fair remuneration, safe and healthy working conditions and social integration in the work organization that enables an individual to develop and use all his or her capacities; it holds that people are the most important resource in the organization as they are trustworthy, responsible and capable of making valuable contribution and they should be treated with dignity and respect (Straw & Heckscher, 2004).

Non-academic staff constitutes the group of administrative resources in the university system through which university goals are attained. They constitute the line staff whose interest other stakeholders must guarantee for the attainment of University goals. In the last one decade, Nigerian University system has run ceaselessly without the usual holiday breaks for staff to refresh unless interrupted by sporadic strikes. This has contributed to many non-academics staff suffering lower productivity, decreased service as well as not too impressive remunerations (Mamedu, 2016). The resultant effect of the pressures mounted on staff have contributed heavy workload that is continually increasing with the associated increase in stress, which appears to be a major threat to their quality of life (Adekola, 2012). It is also no longer news that university employee especially the non-academic staff are currently not happy with their general wellbeing (Adekola, 2012). This can be seen from physical, mental and psychological appearance. This situation has attained a worrisome stage which urgent attention need to be given to it and this can be done through investigating the likely variables that cause this problem through empirical investigation. Based on this assertion, this present study is aimed at investigating some psychological variables that can influence employee quality of life. Some of the variables are employee motivation and work environment.

Research has established that employee motivation has a great tendency to improve positive mental health, (Nelson & Quick 2003; Onu, Akinlabi, & Fakunmoju, 2014). Manzoor (2012) defined motivation as a procedure that initiates through a physiological or psychological want that stimulates a performance that is intended at an objective. Motivation in the words of Rainey (2012) is the degree to which a person is moved or aroused to act. It is therefore, a set of psychological processes that trigger the arousal, direction and persistence of individual's behaviour towards attainment of set targets (Greenberg & Baron, 2003; Robbins & Judge, 2008). Motivation can either be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivations are derived from within the individual. Intrinsic rewards are those rewards that can be called psychological motivations and examples are individual achievement of goal, recognition, receiving appreciation.

Ajila (1997) stated that an intrinsically rewards person will be committed to his work to the extent of which the job inherently contains tasks that are rewarding to him or her on the other hand extrinsic motivation are those reward which comes from external source which can be pay,



bonus and reward. An employee can be sufficiently satisfied with his job when his problems, needs and aspirations are identified and possible solutions given by the organisation to satisfy them. These needs arise as a result of numerous responsibilities that an employee shoulders in the society which urge him to act in a certain manner geared towards satisfying them. It can therefore be said that employee motivation in the workplace either intrinsic or extrinsic could go a long way in determining whether employee will have a good or poor quality of life.

Another variable that is of important to this study is work environment. Kohun (2002), defines work environment as the totality of forces, actions and other influential factors that are currently and, or potentially contending with the employee's activities and performance. Job environment could be described as the physical, geographical, professional surroundings or conditions wherein employee interacts with colleagues and equipment in order to carry out some specific activities. Meanwhile, it is increasingly becoming expedient to focus on perceived work environment or instead of work environment since the feelings and behaviour attached to perceive the work environment could be subjective in nature. The idea of the individual difference, which is human's second nature, plays a vital role in the way we comprehend, interpret and react to human environment. Thus having a perceived work environment refers to how employee believes or perceives how his immediate work environment should look like. Essentially, work environment is expected to be conducive, hazard free, well ventilation, etc. because hazardous environment tends to influence employees' involvement and performances (Bakotic, & Babić, 2013). Therefore work environment perceived by employee as not conducive could make employee unhappy and invariably could reduce the overall quality of life of employees. It is form this foregoing that this study examined the influence of work motivation and work environment on quality of life.

## **Statement of the Problem**

Quality of life especially of non-academic staff has continued to be a source of concern to professional industrial and organisational psychologist, social scientist and concerned stakeholders in Nigeria. The important of this set of employee in the university system cannot be overemphasized. In recent time, it has been asserted, that non-academic staff's attitude to work is poor, which have often resulted in declined in their work productivity. It has also been observed that non-academic staffs in general are no more putting their best in performing their duties. This could be attributed to many factors which include irregular payment of salary, bonus and fringe benefit, conducive work climate and job insecurity. This have make most workers find it hard to cater for the basic needs of their family such that majority of these staffs find it hard to pay the school fees of their children, pay house rent, while some even find it difficult to transport themselves to their places of work. All these problems have make staffs to become threatened, anxious, and uncomfortable in their various duties such that it has seriously affected their overall quality of life.

It is important this problem be urgently looked into considering the important role that this set of employee play in the university system as the persistence of this problem will continue to bring setback to non-teaching staff productivity. The desire state if this problem is promptly attended to will bring a committed work-force that will give its best to the university productivity and satisfaction to one's overall quality of life. Past studies have investigated many factors on quality of life, but there is still dearth of literature on the influence of work motivation and work environment on quality of life especially among non-academic staff in Osun state Nigeria. This gap in literature motivated the conduct of this study.



## Purpose of the study

The main purpose of this study is to examine the influence of employee motivation and work environment on quality of life of Obafemi Awolowo University non-teaching staff. The specific objectives of this study include the following:

1. examine the influence of employee motivation on quality of life of non-teaching staff of Obafemi Awolowo university
2. determine the influence of work environment on quality of life of non-teaching staff of Obafemi Awolowo university
3. investigate the joint influence of employee motivation and work environment on quality of life of non-teaching staff of Obafemi Awolowo university

## Null Hypotheses

1. Non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation does not significantly score lower on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation
2. Non-academic staff who reported poor work environment does not significantly score lower on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported good work environment
3. There is no significant joint influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff

## Methodology

The study adopted an ex-post-facto research design. The predictor variables in this study are employee motivation and work environment while the criterion variable is quality of life. The population of the study consists of junior and senior non-academic staff of Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife, Osun state Nigeria. The study adopted a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling is the procedure in which the investigator identifies individuals who are considered to be typical of the population and select them as the sample. Therefore the researcher recruited only non-academic staff who volunteered within the study area. A total of 275 participants were used in the study. For gender, 141 (51.3%) were males while 134 (48.7%) were females. Their age ranged from 24 to 59 years with a mean age of 35 years (SD = 5.36). For educational qualification, 25(9.1%) were SSCE holders, 46(16.7%) were OND/NCE certificate holders, 154(56%) were B.Sc/HND certificate holders, 44(16%) were M.Sc certificate holders, and 6(2.2%) were Ph.D holders. For union group, 114(41.5%) were NASU, 107(38.9%) were SSANU, and 54(19.6%) were NATTS. For marital status, 29(10.5%) were single, 223(81.1%) were married, 11(4%) were widowed, 10(3.6%) were separated, and 2(0.7%) were divorced.

The instrument for the collection of data was a structured questionnaire, which consists of four (4) sections: Section A, sought for the demographic characteristics of the respondent such as age, gender, educational qualification, union type and marital status. Section B was measured using the 18-item Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) developed by Maxima (2009). Some of the sample items read "For the satisfaction I experience from taking on interesting challenges" and "Because this job is a part of my life". Participants were asked to indicate on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (does not correspond at all) to 7 (corresponds exactly). The author of the scale reports a Cronbach alpha of 0.80. In this study a Cronbach alpha of .96 was reported for this scale. Section C was measured using the 10 item Working Environment Scale-10 (WES-10) developed by Rossberg, Eiring and Friis (2004). Some of the items on the scale read "How often does it happen that you are worried about going



to work"? The scale was scored on a five point scale of 1-Not at all, to 5- to a very large extent. In this study a Cronbach alpha of .82 was reported for this scale.

Section D was measured using the 26 item World Health Organization Quality of Life Questionnaire-Short Version (WHOQoLBREF). The scale has four domains of QOL are physical health domain, psychological health domain, social relationships domain and environmental domain. Some of items on the scale read “ How satisfied are you with your sleep?” It was scored as 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = A moderate amount, 4 Very much, 5 = an extreme amount. In this study a Cronbach alpha of .94 was reported for this scale. The researcher seeks permission from the Obafemi Awolowo University management before administering the questionnaire to the participants. Thereafter the researcher informed the participants on the purposes and objectives as well as the importance of the study. Also, the researcher assures each participant that their responses were confidential. Directions on how to complete the questionnaire was also explained during the distribution of the questionnaire by the researcher. The distribution and collection of the questionnaire took three weeks in different offices and department where these participants do their daily work. A total number of 300 copies of questionnaires were distributed to the respondents but only two hundred and seventy five questionnaires was retrieved while twenty five copies of the questionnaires either have incomplete responses or were not returned. Finally, the collected questionnaires were subjected to appropriate statistical analysis.

## Result

**Null Hypothesis 1:** Non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation does not significantly score lower on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation. This hypothesis was tested using t-test of independent analysis.

**Table 1: Summary of independent t-test comparing level of work motivation of non-academic staff on quality of life among non-academic staff**

Employee Motivation	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	df	t	Sig.
Low	190	70.59	11.29	273	-3.961	p<.05
High	85	79.36	11.97			

Results from Table 1 showed that there was a significant differences between non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation and non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation on Quality of Life ( $t = -3.961$ ;  $df = 273$ ;  $p < .05$ ). A further observation of means revealed that non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation ( $X = 79.36$ ;  $SD = 11.97$ ) scored higher on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation ( $X = 70.59$ ;  $SD = 11.29$ ).

**Null Hypothesis 2:** Non-academic staff who reported poor work environment does not significantly score lower on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported good work environment. This hypothesis was also tested using t-test of independent analysis.

**Table 2: Summary of independent t-test comparing level of work environment of non-academic staff on quality of life among non-academic staff**

Work Environment	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	df	T	Sig.
------------------	---	-----------	----	----	---	------



Poor	159	69.84	11.20	273	-4.461	p<.05
Good	116	78.04	17.33			

Results from Table 2 showed that there was a significant differences between non-academic staff who reported poor work environment and non-academic staff who reported good work environment on Quality of Life ( $t = -4.461$ ;  $df = 273$ ;  $p < .05$ ). A further observation of means however reveal that non-academic staff who reported good work environment ( $X = 78.04$ ;  $SD = 17.33$ ) scored higher on Quality of Life than non-academic staff who reported poor work environment ( $X = 69.84$ ;  $SD = 11.20$ ).

**Null Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant joint influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff. This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis.

**Table 3:** Summary of multiple regression analysis showing the influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff

Variables	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P	$\beta$	t	Sig
Work environment	.458	.210	36.160	0.05	.444	5.793	p<.05
Employee motivation					.020	.254	p>.05

Table 3 showed that there was a significant joint influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff ( $R^2 = .210$ ,  $F(2,272) = 36.160$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with 21% explanation of the variability on the dependent variable. Only work environment had a significant independent influence on quality of life ( $\beta = .444$ ;  $t = 5.793$ ;  $P < .05$ ).

### Discussion of the Findings

The first hypothesis stated that Non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation will significantly score lower on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation revealed that there was a significant differences between non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation and non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation on Quality of Life meaning that non-academic staff who reported high employee motivation scored higher on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported low employee motivation. This result finding is in line with study done by Adejuwon and Oladeye (2013) Mazerolle (2008) and Ganguly (2010). The reason why this findings was so is because motivation among nigeria workers is a very important drive and every employee are always happy when they get moivation in form o either intrinsic or extrinsic in the workplace.

The second hypothesis stated that Non-academic staff who reported poor work environment will significantly score lower on quality of life than non-academic staff who reported good work environment revealed that that there was a significant differences between non-academic staff who reported poor work environment and non-academic staff who reported good work environment on Quality of Life meaning that non-academic staff who reported poor work environment have lower quality of life than non-academic staffs who have good work



environment. This finding is in accordance with Ojekou and Dorothy, (2015), Harter (2002) and Arokiasamy (2013). The reason why this finding was so is because conducive work environment is often cherished by university employees which invariably contribute significantly to their state of wellness and productivity in the workplace.

The third hypothesis stated that there will be joint and independent influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff revealed that there was a significant joint influence of work environment and employee motivation on quality of life among non-academic staffs. This finding was similar with Noah and Steve (2012) and Nwankwo and Sydney-Abor, (2013). The justification for this finding could be unconnected with the fact that employees always have healthy quality of life if they are well motivated either intrinsic or extrinsic at work coupled with the fact that they are able to operate under a conducive and friendly work environment devoid of distraction.

## Conclusion

The present study have been able to empirically investigate the impact of work environment and work motivation on quality of life among non-academic staff of Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife Osun state Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study, the study concluded that work motivation and work environment have significant influence on quality of life among non-academic staff.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were put forward:

1. It is recommended that professional psychologist should develop work environment that is stimulating and conducive for all employees within the university with appropriate work motivation that will be desire for all employees.
2. University management should always make the work environment a priority such that enquiry should be sent out to all non-academic staffs from time to time in order to know which employee are not satisfied with the work environment and appropriate mechanism should be put in place to improve upon it.
3. The study also recommends that Federal government of Nigeria should always motivate non-academic staffs on a regular basis, such motivation can be in form of intrinsic such as praises, award or extrinsic such as money, gift and other momentary value.

## References

- Adejuwon, G. A., & Oladeye, E. (2013). Self -efficacy, job stress and motivation as predictors of psychological wellbeing among operation officers of Nigeria security and civil defence corps. *Nigerian Journal of Psychological Research*, 4, 35-77
- Adekola, B (2012). Work Burnout Experience among University Non-Teaching Staff: A Gender Approach. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 35-78
- Ajila C. O. (1997). Job Motivation and Attitude to Work as Correlates of Productivity among Workers in Manufacturing Companies in Lagos State, Nigeria



- Arokiasamy, A. R. (2013). A study on employee quality of life in the hotel industry in Malaysia. *International Journal of Management and Strategy*, 4(6), 34-45
- Bakotic, D., & T. Babić, H. (2013). Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(2), 23-35
- Chan, D., Li, U., Chung, D., & Yu, R. (2004) Quality of life among patients with Type 2 diabetes mellitus: Psychometric evaluation and crosscultural comparison.
- Ganguly, R. (2010). Quality of work life and work motivation of university employees. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 9, 2229 – 3795
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, R. A. (2003). *Behaviour in Organizations* (8th ed). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall
- Harter, J. K. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(2), 268.
- Kohun, S. (2002). *Business environment*. Ibadan: University Press
- Mamedu O. P. (2016). Quality of Work-life and University Goal Attainment Perception by Academic Staff in the South-south Geo-political Zone of Nigeria. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 4,(20), 1323-1336
- Manzoor, Q. (2012). Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Management and strategy*, 1, (3), 2157-6068.
- Maxima, I. (2009). *Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mazerolle S. M. (2008). Antecedents of quality of life in National Collegiate Athletic Association. *Journal Athletic Training*, 43 (5), 505–512
- Nelson D., & Quick J. (2003). *Organizational Behavior: Foundation, Realities and Challenges* (4th Edition). Australia: Thomson South- Western
- Noah, Y., & Steve, F. (2012). Work Environment and Job Attitude among Employees in a Nigerian Work Organization. *Journal of Sustainable Society*, 1(2), 36-43.
- Nwankwo, E., & Sydney-Abor, N. (2015). The relationship between work environment and length of service on quality of life among secondary school teachers. *Case Studies Journal* 3(3), 3-7



# **African Journal of Educational Archives**

*Vol.5, Issue 1, July –Sept. 2018. ISSN:P2536-748X,E-2536-7498*

Ojekou, P., & Dorothy, O. (2015). Effect of Work Environment and quality of life among Nurses in a Teaching Hospital in Nigeria. *Open Journal of Nursing*, 5, 948-95

Onu, C., Akinlabi, B., & Fakunmoju, S. (2014). Motivation and Job Performance of Non-Academic Staff in Private Universities in Nigeria (Babcock University as A Case Study). *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 3(2), 039-054.

Phillips, D. (2006). *Quality of Life: Concept, Policy and Practice*. Oxon: Routledge Publisher. PP 1-39.

Rainey, H. G. (2012). Work Motivation. In: R. T. Golembiewski (ed), *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour*. London: *Marcel Dekker*, 4, 19-39.

Rosberg, L., Eiring, R., & Friis, E. (2004). Working Environment Scale-10 (WES-10). *Experimental Aging Research*, 27, 67-81

Straw, K., & Heckscher, R. (2004). Choosing a Robust Quality of Work Life. *Business Forum*, 27(2), 7-10.

World Health Organization (2002). *Constitution of the World Health Organisation*. Geneva: World Health Organization, Switzerland.