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Abstract
This study focuses on human resource development unit activities on staff performance in Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority. Structured questionnaires were used to collect data from 94 respondents using stratified proportionate sampling technique. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, standard deviation, means and percentages, while inferential statistics like chi-square and correlation were used in testing the hypotheses of the study. The result shows that most (57.4%) of the respondents were men and 17.0% of them were engaged in other occupation. Furthermore, (95.7%) of the respondents asserted that human resource development unit develop the key competency that enables the individual staffs to perform well on current and future jobs through planned learning activities. However, (95.8%) of the respondents opined that the unit is seen as strategic partner in developing and attaining organizational goals and strategies while, (90.4%) viewed it as a unit that improved employee’s skill, knowledge and attitude effectively. Also (91.5%) of the respondents were of the opinion that it provides a form of incentives to the employees. Results of chi-square analysis showed a significant association between other occupations of respondents ($x^2 = 7.125, P < 0.05$) and staff performance while Pearson Product Moment Correlation showed that there is no significant relationship between incentives given to staffs ($r = -0.01, P > 0.05$) and staff performance. The study concludes that human resources development unit’s activities are effective to both the junior and senior staff in the organisation. It is recommended that government should equip and fund the human resource development unit of, Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority, so that the activities of the unit will be much felt by the employees.
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1.1 Introduction.
There are three resources being used in business, which is the engine of economy and industrial growth. These resources are natural, financial and human resources, of which human resources are the most important. Basically, human resources are those who will utilize other resources for the overall development of a given organization. It is organised in hierarchy. Certain people will be at the top, these are the groups charged with the responsibilities of utilizing other human resources who are at the bottom of the organization hierarchy (Budhwar et al, 2001).

Human Resource is the set of individuals who make up the workforce of an organization and business sector of an economy.” Human capital” is sometimes used synonymously as human resources, although human capital typically refers to a more narrow view, i.e. the knowledge the individuals embody and can contribute to an organisation. Likewise, other terms sometimes used include “manpower”, “talent” or simply” “people” (Elwood F, Holton H, James W, Trott, Jr. 1996).

In work organisation across the world, emphasis is placed on human resource development unit. Human resource development is an integral unit use for training in an organization, and career development efforts to improve individual, group, and organization effectiveness. It develops the key competencies that enable individuals in the organization to perform current and future jobs through planned learning activities. Groups within an organization use human resource development to initiate, manage and change and also, ensure a match between individual and organisational needs (Kelly, 2006).

Human resource development professionals provide programmes to orient, train, and develop staffs by improving skills, knowledge, capabilities, and competencies required to perform well on the job. By offering programs designed to promote personal and professional career growth, they enable organizations to improve efficiency, productivity and profitability.

The objectives of human resource development unit activities on staff performance include planning development programs based on identified performance gaps by enabling individuals to achieve short-term and long-term career goals and enabling individuals and supporting succession planning by implementing leadership development programs. The unit also helps organizations comply with local, state and federal regulations (Robert Craig, 1996).

Staff Performance management is an integrated system, including organizational design, work planning, assessments and feedback designed to maximize performance at the individual, team, unit and organizational levels to motivate and to develop staff. Award and recognition systems form part of this system. They provide for monetary and non-monetary awards in recognition of meritorious performance and other noteworthy
accomplishments. Performance standards and expectations, based on an up-to-date position description, should be clearly communicated to employees at the time of appointment to the position and as they change thereafter. Employees should also receive adequate training necessary to effectively perform the duties and responsibilities of their position. Employee evaluations provide both management and employees with information regarding personal performance and can assist in identifying training needs and communicating expectations. Incentive is an act or promise for greater action. It also served as a stimulus to greater action. Incentives are something which is given in addition to wages (Prendergast, 1999). It means additional remuneration or benefit to an employee in recognition of achievement or better work. Incentives provide a spur or zeal in the employees for better performance. It is a natural thing that nobody acts without a purpose behind. Therefore, a hope for a reward is a powerful incentive to motivate employees. Besides monetary incentive, there are some other stimuli which can drive a person to better job performance these includes, job satisfaction, job security, job promotion, and pride for accomplishment (Swanson, 2008). Therefore, incentives really can sometimes work to accomplish the goals of the organisation. The need for incentives can be many among which are; increase productivity and inculcate the zeal and enthusiasm towards work.

1.2 Statement of Problems:
The issue of poor performance of staffs in an organisation has been of much concern to all and sundry. It has been realised that lack of hygiene factors such as job satisfiers, job enrichment programmes, job situation and motivational factors such as compensation, rewards, incentives, and facilities has affected staff performance to work. Hence, many factors have been attributed to staff’s poor performance there is no much emphasis on human resource unit activities of agricultural organisation. This study therefore, attempted to investigate the activities of human resources development unit on job performance in an organisation like Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority. This organisation is expected to concentrate on the development and management of water resources potential of Osun, Oyo, Ogun and Lagos states that is, all the areas drained by Ogun, Oshun and Sasa rivers, including their tributaries in the south-west geo-political zone of the country, Nigeria. This study will also be of relevance to the organization in achieving improved human resource development unit activities which will increase the productivity of workers in the organization, and strengthen the relationship between human resource staffs and other employees within the organisation. It will further improve staffs’ attitude to work and their performances, thereby leading to achievement of predetermined organizational goals.

1.3 Objectives of the study:
The broad objective of the study is to assess the influence of human resource development unit activities on staff performance in Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority of Ogun State, Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study were to:
1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of the employees.
2. identify the activities of human resources development units on staff performance.
3. assess the perception of employee about human resource development units on staff performance.
4. ascertain forms of incentives used to motivate staff in the organisation.

1.3.1 Hypotheses of the study: The hypotheses for this study were tested in null form as follows:
H01: There is no significant association between socio-economic characteristics of respondents and staff performance.
H02: There is no significant relationship between staffs incentives and staff performance.

1.4 Methodology:
The study was conducted in Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority (OORBDA) located in Odeda Local Government Area of Ogun State Nigeria, at Alabata, Old Abeokuta-Ibadan road. It is one of the twelve River Basin Development Authorities established by the Federal Government under decrees number 25 and 31 of 1976 and 1977 respectively. It is a parastatal of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resource. Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority was formally launched on July 4th 1977 in Abeokuta. The headquarters of the authority is located on 236 hectares of land, along Alabata road, off Ibadan-Abeokuta highway, Abeokuta in Ogun State, and there are three (3) area offices located at Oshogbo (Osun State), Ibadan (Oyo State), and Ikeja (Lagos State) as well as Liaison office at Gwarinpa in Abuja. Odeda Local Government was created in 1976; it is composed of very few semi-urban centres and several small and scattered settlements with a population of 109,499 out of the total 3.7 million population of Ogun State as estimated in 2006 census figure provision. The rainfall pattern of the area is bimodal with an average rainfall of 1283mm, average relative humidity of 73.3% and temperature ranges between 20°C-30°C. The area has tropical climate that enjoy two major seasons, rainy season, April-October and dry season, November-March. The people in the local government are predominantly farmers and they cultivate arable and cash crops.

The study population involved both junior and senior staffs in the five departments of Ogun-Oshun River
basin development Authority. These are the Board of Directors, Engineering Department, Planning and Design, and Services Department in the organisation. The total numbers of staffs in all the departments are three hundred and six (306) which comprises of two hundred and fifty two (252) senior staffs and fifty four (54) junior staffs.

1.4.1 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size:
To ensure an even distribution of the sample for this study, proportionate stratified sampling technique was used to select ninety four (94) respondents from the population of staff in the entire five department which comprises of forty seven (47) senior staffs and forty seven (47) junior staffs in the five department of the organization.

1.4.2 Data Collection Procedure:
Information and data for this study were sourced primarily through the use of structured questionnaires. The questionnaire was divided into two sections: The first section sourced for socio-economic characteristics of the staffs while the second section focused on questions to test and assess the influence of human resources development unit activities on staff performance in the organisation. The secondary data were collected from Ogun Oshun River Basin Development Authority headquarter at Alabata, Abeokuta. Also relevant literature, journals, books were collected from the state and federal ministry of agriculture and water resources. The data collected were, socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, which include variables like age in year, sex, household size, family type, education and marital status etc. Data were also obtained on activities of human resource development unit on staff performance which was measured using 3 points scale of agree, undecided and disagree basis. Also, respondent’s identification on forms of incentives used to motivate staff in the organisation such as recognition, respect, benefits and rewards, interesting work etc. were sourced for using the five type likert scale of Strongly Agree (1), Agree (2) Undecided (3), Disagree (4), Strongly disagree (5). Furthermore, staff performance statement such as reliable as a staff, always time conscious when working, follow instructions at work, motivated to work, adhere to company policy etc were also sourced for using the 4 point scale of not at all, occasionally, often, and very often basis.

1.4.3 Method of Data Analysis:
Data were analysed with the used of descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics used includes means, frequency counts, percentages and standard deviation, while chi-square and pearson product moment correlation were the inferential statistics used for testing the stated hypotheses of the study.

1.5 Results and Discussion:
1.5.1 Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents
Table 1 show that, 57.4% of the respondents were males while 42.6% of them were females. This information indicates that most of the staffs in the study area were males. Also, the table indicates that 37.2% of the respondents were less than or 30 years of age, while 26.6% of them were between the ages of 31-40 years old. This indicates that most of the staffs in this study area were still young and active in their day to day working responsibility. Table 1 also shows that 37.2% of the respondents were single, while 61.7% were married with some of them having many kids and high family responsibility. The staffs in this study area (72.3%) were mostly Christians, while (25.5%) were Muslims and (43.6%) of them having a household sizes of between 1-4 people. On qualification, the result shows that most of the respondents 68.1% were bachelor’s degree holder, and just a few 11.7% of them with master’s degree certificate. The implication of this finding is that respondents were qualified for their job and were also in their formative stage of learning on the job and delivery. This confirms Kelly (2006) remark that the capacities of individuals depends on their access to education. The findings of the study also shows that 56.4% of the respondents have spent up to 1-5 years in the organisation, while, 17.0 % of them have spent 20 years and above. This indicates that most of the staffs in this organisation were young in their prime age range of about five years working experience.

1.5.2 Activities of human resource development (HRD) unit on staff performance
Table 2, shows that (95.7%) of the respondents agreed that human resource development unit develops the key competencies that enables individual to perform current and future jobs through planned learning activities while (85.1%) agreed that the unit ensures a match between individual and organisational gaols. The result revealed that,(93.6%) of the respondents agreed that it provides programme to orientate, train, and develop staffs by improving skills, knowledge, capabilities and competencies required to perform well on the job. Also, (86.2%) of the respondents agreed that the unit helps organisation to improve efficiency, productivity and profitability. It was observed that (80.9%) of the respondents agreed that it offers programme designed to promote personal and professional career. Furthermore, the result in table 2 shows that (81.9%) of the respondents agreed that it offers programme designed to promote personal and professional career.

1.5.3 Respondents’ perception of human resource development (HRD) unit activities on staff performance
The result in table 3 reveals that 95.4% of the respondents agreed that human resource development unit is a strategic partner in developing and attaining organisational goals and strategies. On communication, 70.2% of
them were of the opinion that the unit are not good communicators. Also, (90.4%) of the respondents agreed that it uses employee skills, knowledge, and attitude effectively. Also, 76.6% of the respondents disagreed that the unit does not help employee understand how their work relates to the mission and values of the organisation. Furthermore, 88.3% of them agreed that it helps employee to feel more highly motivated on the job. Again, table 3 reveals that 72.4% of the respondents disagreed that the unit does not increase employee’s job satisfaction. This result implies that human resource development unit activities are very effective on every staffs in the organisation this facilitate the development of national human capacities building to achieve sustainable, inclusive, equitable development and at the same time, enhance well-being of individual as stated by Swason (2006)

1.5.4 Forms of incentives used to motivate staffs

Results in table 4 shows that 89.4% of the respondents noted that human resource development unit provided good working place environment. Also it was observed from the result that 70.2% of them noted that human resource development unit makes provision of interesting work for the staffs while 91.5% of the respondents noted that it provides carrier advancement opportunity within the organisation. Furthermore, 91.5% of them noted that the unit gives recognition and respect as a form of incentives to the employees and 95.7% of the respondents noted that the unit provides training and development to the employees which motivated them to work, and 79.8% of them noted that it provides internal communication for the employees. Also, the data obtained reveals that 83.0% of the respondents noted that it provides benefits and rewards to the staffs. The implication of this research finding is that human resource development unit provides all forms of incentives both monetary and non-monetary to the employees, which make them more efficient in their job and happy with their work as observed in the course of this research work.

1.6 HYPOTHESES TESTING

1.6.1 Ho₁: There is no significant association between socio-economic characteristics of respondents and staff performance.

The first hypothesis that, there is no significant association between socio-economic characteristics and staff performance was tested using chi-square with the result in table 5. The socio-economic characteristics of the respondents are age, sex, marital status, religion, household size, occupation, education, qualification, rank and year of service. The result of the Chi-square analysis in table 5 shows that there is no significant association between respondents sex ($\chi^2=1.129, P > 0.05$), age ($\chi^2 = 5.582, P > 0.05$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 0.961, P > 0.05$), religion ($\chi^2 = 9.178, P > 0.05$), family size ($\chi^2 = 1.946, P > 0.05$), level of education ($\chi^2 = 3.938 P > 0.05$), qualification ($\chi^2 = 4.600, P > 0.05$), rank ($\chi^2 = 0.36, P > 0.05$), and years of service ($\chi^2 = 3.212, P > 0.05$) and staff performance. However, respondents other occupation ($\chi^2 = 7.125 P < 0.05$) had significant association with staff performance. This implies that other occupation that the staffs in this organisation engaged in such as trading and farming has influence on their job performance.

1.6.2 Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between staff incentives and staff performance

The result of the hypothesis that ‘there is no significant relationship between staff’s incentives and staff performance’ tested using Pearson product moment correlation is presented in table 6 below. This result shows that there is no significant relationship between staff’s incentives and staff’s performance ($r = -0.01, p > 0.05$) which implies that with or without incentives given to staff in Ogun-Oshun River Basin Development Authority their performances are still very efficient within the organisation.

1.7 Conclusion and Recommendations:

The study showed that the influence of human resource development unit activities is effective to both junior and senior staffs in the organisation. It was also observed from the respondents’ opinion that with or without incentives given to the staffs, their performances are still the same. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made to enhance the influence of human resource development unit activities on staff performance in the organization: Creation of new jobs within the organisation relating to the vision of the organisation and provision of cross functional assignment for the staffs so as to give staffs more knowledge and skills to perform well on the job given to them. Provision of adequate support for the staffs and ability to show empathy to staffs so as to make them feel safe and secure within the organisation. Provision of financial assistance and freedom to employees in the way they do their works so as to make them feel good on the job and be more independent in the way they do their individual work. Adequate training on the job should be provided to staff based on their years of working experience within the organization. Government should equip and fund the human resource development unit of this parastatal in particular and others in general in the ministry of agriculture and water resources, so that their activities will be much felt by their employees and improve their job performance.
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TABLE 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents, n = 94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDOW/WIDOWER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTIANITY</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAMIC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADITIONAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARMING</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADING</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERTIARY</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASCE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACHELOR’S DEGREE</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTER’S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service(years):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and above</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: Activities of human resource development unit on staff performance, n = 94.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>AGREE (n)</th>
<th>UNDECIDED (n)</th>
<th>DISAGREE (n)</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit develops the key competence</td>
<td>90(95.7)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit provides programme to develop staffs</td>
<td>88(93.6)</td>
<td>5(5.3)</td>
<td>1(1.1)</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit conducts orientation Session</td>
<td>86(91.5)</td>
<td>6(6.4)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit implements leadership seminar</td>
<td>82(87.2)</td>
<td>9(9.6)</td>
<td>3(3.2)</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit promotes personal &amp; professional career</td>
<td>76(80.9)</td>
<td>14(14.9)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit ensures a match between individual and organizational needs</td>
<td>80(85.1)</td>
<td>14(14.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit informs all employees about changes</td>
<td>77(81.9)</td>
<td>13(13.8)</td>
<td>3(3.2)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit helps in supporting work planning &amp; performance review Process</td>
<td>77(81.9)</td>
<td>12(12.8)</td>
<td>5(5.3)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit promotes personal &amp; professional career</td>
<td>76(80.9)</td>
<td>14(14.9)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit select ideas from employees</td>
<td>70(74.5)</td>
<td>16(17.0)</td>
<td>8(8.5)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit helps in coaching &amp; mentoring managers</td>
<td>69(73.4)</td>
<td>17(18.1)</td>
<td>8(8.5)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit organises on-the-job learning &amp; supporting internal candidate</td>
<td>68(72.3)</td>
<td>22(23.4)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit posts job opportunities</td>
<td>66(70.2)</td>
<td>24(25.5)</td>
<td>3(3.2)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit revises job description</td>
<td>56(59.6)</td>
<td>32(34.0)</td>
<td>6(6.4)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit creates new job within the organization</td>
<td>58(61.6)</td>
<td>28(29.8)</td>
<td>10(10.6)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit organises cross-functional assignment</td>
<td>50(53.2)</td>
<td>39(41.5)</td>
<td>5(5.3)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2013.*

### TABLE 3: Respondents perception of human resource development unit activities on staff performance, n=94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>SA (n)</th>
<th>A (n)</th>
<th>U (n)</th>
<th>SD (n)</th>
<th>D (n)</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit are seen as strategic partner</td>
<td>45(47.9)</td>
<td>45(47.9)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does not provide adequate support</td>
<td>6(6.4)</td>
<td>15(16.0)</td>
<td>6(6.4)</td>
<td>44(46.8)</td>
<td>43(24.5)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit improve staffs skill, knowledge and attitude effectively</td>
<td>30(31.9)</td>
<td>55(58.5)</td>
<td>6(6.4)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>1(1.1)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit has the ability to manage change</td>
<td>33(35.1)</td>
<td>51(54.1)</td>
<td>8(8.5)</td>
<td>1(1.1)</td>
<td>1(1.1)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit helps employee to feel more highly motivated</td>
<td>34(36.2)</td>
<td>49(52.1)</td>
<td>5(5.3)</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit are unit that increases organisational capacity</td>
<td>37(39.4)</td>
<td>47(50.0)</td>
<td>3(3.2)</td>
<td>5(5.3)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does not help employees understand how their work relates to the mission and values of the organisation.</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>11(11.7)</td>
<td>7(7.4)</td>
<td>47(50.0)</td>
<td>25(26.6)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit are seen as a unit that has listening ear</td>
<td>29(30.9)</td>
<td>52(55.3)</td>
<td>9(9.6)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does not save cost</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>18(19.1)</td>
<td>6(6.4)</td>
<td>44(46.8)</td>
<td>22(23.4)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does not encourage work and team spirit</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>19(20.2)</td>
<td>3(3.2)</td>
<td>40(42.6)</td>
<td>28(29.8)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does increase employees job satisfaction</td>
<td>7(7.4)</td>
<td>16(17.0)</td>
<td>3(3.2)</td>
<td>40(42.6)</td>
<td>28(29.8)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit are seen as a unit that have empathy</td>
<td>29(30.9)</td>
<td>45(47.9)</td>
<td>16(17.0)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit are seen as change agent</td>
<td>25(26.6)</td>
<td>47(50.0)</td>
<td>13(13.8)</td>
<td>7(7.4)</td>
<td>1(1.1)</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit are not good communicators</td>
<td>2(2.1)</td>
<td>19(20.2)</td>
<td>7(7.4)</td>
<td>38(40.4)</td>
<td>28(29.8)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does not act as an administrator</td>
<td>4(4.3)</td>
<td>25(26.6)</td>
<td>12(12.8)</td>
<td>29(30.9)</td>
<td>24(25.5)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD unit does not increase level of employee performance</td>
<td>7(7.4)</td>
<td>14(14.9)</td>
<td>10(10.6)</td>
<td>36(38.3)</td>
<td>27(48.7)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field survey, 2013.*

*Note, the figures in bracket are in percentages.*
TABLE 4: Forms of incentives used to motivate staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision of good working place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of interesting work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of recognition to staffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of respect to staffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of training and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of internal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of benefits and rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of financial assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of freedom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of appraisals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5: Chi-square analysis between selected socio-economic characteristics of respondents and staff performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.582</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>9.178</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>3.938</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>3.212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2013

TABLE 6: Correlation coefficient between staff’s incentives and staff performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>R-VALUE</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2013

S = Significant at ≤ 0.05
NS = Not Significant at > 0.05