Global Research Journal of Humanities and Public Administration

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

EMPLOYEE RETENTION AND ORGANISATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY IN THREE SELECTED PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH WESTERN STATES OF NIGERIA

Eke, Obike Tony, M Sc, MBA,

Department of Business Administration

Bells University of Technology, Lagos State University

tonyekeobike40@gmail.com, tonyresearcher@gmail.com

+234-7062694725, +234-8177634858

ABSTRACT

Research Objective: The study examined the relationship between employee retention and organisational productivity in three selected private universities in South Western States, Nigeria. Specific objectives were to: examine the impact of compensation practices, career development opportunities, work environment, leadership support, job security and fair promotion opportunities on organisational productivity in the selected private universities.
Methodology: A descriptive survey design was adopted using a structured questionnaire administered to 791 respondents with a response rate of 86% (680/791x100 = 85.96). Descriptive statistics was used to analyse the demographic data. Inferential statistics was used to test the six hypotheses at a 5% level of significance.
Findings: H_{0_1}(β_1= 1.570, t = 19.645, P = 0.000) has a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities. H_{0_2} (β_1= .414, t = 6.260, P = 0.000) showed a significant impact. H_{0_3} (β_1= 1.390, t = 15.436, P = 0.000) revealed a significant impact. H_{0_4} (β_1= 1.158, t = 24.847, P = 0.000) also proved it has a significant impact while H_{0_5} (β_1= 1.239; t = 32.923, P = 0.000) recorded a significant impact. Lastly, H_{0_6}proved that (β_1= 1.682, t = 44.920, P = 0.000) has a significant impact on organisational productivity as well.

Conclusion: Employee retention had a significant effect on organisational productivity among the selected private universities.
Recommendation: Management of private universities in conjunction with relevant stakeholders should embrace the outlined retention strategies to further improve their productivity.
Key words: Employee retention, Organisational productivity, Private Universities.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Employee retention is a critical challenge in the educational sector, because staff represent the core drivers of teaching quality, research productivity and administrative efficiency (Kumari & Afroz, 2023). Universities compete locally and internationally for skilled workforce. Employee retention means an organisation's capacity to sustain its workforce by creating conditions that encourage staff to stay (Akinwale & George, 2022). Organisational productivity reflects the extent to which a company utilises its resources to achieve set goals. In universities, productivity includes; financial outcomes, teaching effectiveness, research output, quality of graduates and administrative efficiency (Kumari & Afroz, 2023). It largely depends on human capital skills, experience, commitment and engagement (Okusanya et al. 2023). Many university staff seek better opportunities within and outside the country because of unfair retention practices (Adebola & Olanrewaju 2024). South Western States, have a huge concentration of private universities in Nigeria and they have staff retention challenges (Adebola & Olanrewaju, 2024). When key employees leave, universities lose not only people, but also irreplaceable tacit knowledge (Kumari & Afroz, 2023). This gap underpins the need to ascertain how employee retention impacts organisational productivity. Consequently, this study situates employee retention as a strategic tool for improving organisational productivity among the selected private universities.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Statement of the Problem

Employee retention is a persistent challenge in universities. It causes competition for skilled and qualified staff (Adewale & Ojo, 2023). High staff turnover disrupts academic continuity, increases recruitment and training costs, negatively impacts institutional reputation and productivity (Chukwuma & Akintola, 2024). Many private universities in the South western states continue to face this retention challenge (Balogun & Adekunle 2023). Existing studies including Otoo & Mishra (2023), Lee & wong (2024), Obeng & Ugwu (2023), etc. have examined employee retention and organisational productivity independently (Sadiq & Musa, 2022). The extent to which retention strategies impact on organisational productivity among private universities in the South Western States of Nigeria was not fully explored, hence this research.

Objective of the Study

The main objective was to examine the nexus between employee retention and organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria. Specific objectives were to:

i. examine the impact of compensation practices on organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria
ii. assess the influence of career development opportunities on organisational productivity in the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria
iii. investigate the effect of work environment on organisational productivity in the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

iv. examine the impact of leadership support on organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

v. investigate the effect of job security on organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

vi. examine the impact of fair promotion opportunities on organisational productivity in the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

2.0 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Employee Retention

Employee retention is an organisational effort to sustain a stable workforce by reducing turnover and increasing the tenure of employees through targeted human resource practices (Adewale & Ojo, 2023; Balogun & Adekunle, 2023). It is critical in educational institutions like universities because staff turnover disrupts teaching continuity, reduces research productivity and increases recruitment costs (Chukwuma & Akintola, 2024). Several studies have linked effective retention strategies to higher organisational performance in tertiary institutions (Adewale & Ojo, 2023; Balogun & Adekunle, 2023). The retention of talented employees enhances organisational advantage which is pivotal to organisational productivity and sustainability (Kyndt et al. 2009). Chen et al. (2023) proved that effective leadership mentoring and career pathing framework greatly enhance the intention to stay.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Career Development

Career development constitutes creating a structured framework for employees to acquire new skills, advance professionally, and pursue long-term career goals (Ogundipe & Bello, 2023; Sadiq & Musa, 2022; Nwankwo & Eze, 2022). It enhances employee competence, motivation and aiding organisational commitment, (Ogundipe & Bello, 2023). Studies show that career development opportunities impacts both retention and productivity positively in higher education (Sadiq & Musa, 2022). Modern researchers view career development as the equipping of employees with the required competencies for long-term organisational productivity (Harsch & Festing, 2021).

Leadership Support

Leadership support is the guidance, encouragement, and institutional backing that managers provide to employees. It creates trust, organisational commitment, and employee engagement (Ibrahim & Yusuf, 2024). Research indicates that supportive supervisors enhance employee morale and reduce turnover (Balogun & Adekunle, 2023). In Olatunji and Hassan (2023), leadership mentoring improves employee morale, enhances performance, and promote retention intention. According to Okorie and Ojo (2023), organisations that practice leadership support, report better retention rates.

Compensation Practices

Compensation is the monetary and non-monetary benefits offered to employees, including salaries, bonuses, allowances, and recognition that reward performance and service longevity (Ajibade et al. 2025). Studies show that equitable and performance-based compensation enhance employee satisfaction, commitment and productivity (Ogundipe & Bello, 2023). According to Elrayah, (2023), modern compensation reflects a total reward

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

system that harmonises base pay, variable pay, skills-based premiums, and non-monetary aspects including recognition and career development (Sigelman et al. 2024).

The ‘skills-based pay’, connects pay increases to employee demonstrable competencies and certified skills (TestGorilla, 2023; Sigelman et al., 2024).

Work Environment

Work environment is the physical, social and psychological conditions in which employees perform their duties (Sadiq & Musa, 2022). Supportive and resource-adequate work environments enhance motivation, reduces stress, and improves job satisfaction (Ibrahim & Yusuf, 2024). Positive work environments, characterised by teamwork, respect, access to tools, etc. report higher retention and productivity in higher institutions Ogundipe & Bello, 2023. Conversely, negative work environment reduces productivity (Balogun & Adekunle), 2023.

Job Security

Job security is an employee’s perceptions of stability, continuity, and predictability in his employment relationship. It predicts how comfortable and secured employees feel in their roles. When employees experience anxiety, it reduces productivity (Mwangi & Muturi 2023). Studies in higher education institutions showed that job security enhances psychological wellbeing of staff and impacts institutional outcomes (Park & Jung, 2024).

Fair Promotion Practice

An equitable and transparent promotion framework impacts employee behavior, retention levels and productivity. The perception of fairness in promotional decisions shapes employees’ level of commitment, motivation, and intention to remain (Aryee et al. 2022,

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Chinomona & Sandada, 2023. In private universities, promotion often determine career progression, access to research funding, leadership opportunities and enhanced compensation (Mensah & Boakye, 2023; Okeke & Eze, 2022). Li and Zhou (2024) proved that procedural justice in promotion decisions increases employees' trust and enhances higher motivation, (Rahimi & Karkar, 2022). These findings align with organisational justice, which suggests that unfair HR practices reduce cooperation, innovation, and productivity (Al-Sheikh & Hamdan, 2023).

Theoretical Review

This study reviewed Human Capital Theory, Social Exchange Theory, Resource-Based View Theory and Organisational Commitment Theory.

Human Capital Theory

Human Capital Theory (HCT) by Gary S. Becker (1960), highlighted that investments in people (education, training, health) should be viewed as investments in physical capital, that employees' skills, knowledge and experience are assets to the organisation and can be developed and leveraged on to achieve competitive advantage.

When employees benefit from structured upskilling and transparent career pathways, it reflects employer commitment and reciprocal loyalty (Xuecheng et al. 2022).

Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory (SET), by Peter Blau (1964), elucidates on social behavior as a mutual exchange between two or more parties, where one party provides benefits (material or social), and the other feels is a responsibility to reciprocate. In Ahmad et al. (2023);

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Xuecheng et al. (2022), they outlined multiple exchange pathways: (a) material exchanges, which borders on pay, benefits, training, (b) relational exchanges which has to do with supportive supervision, mentorship), and (c) symbolic exchanges with focus on recognition, meaningful work.

Resource-Based View (RBV) Theory

The Resource-Based View theory, (RBV), was first put forward by Penrose (2009), proposing a model on the effective management of firms' resources, diversification strategy, and was popularised by Barney (1991) in his well circulated paper, "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage".

The theory emphasised that for resources to be seen as having a potential and stable competitive advantage, they should be valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and not substitutable (generally known as *VRIS* criteria).

The theory argues that sustained competitive advantage proceeds from valuable resources that are rare, exceptional and non-substitutable, especially firm-related skills, tacit knowledge and leadership pipelines which report successes when developed and protected by the firm (Barney, 2021).

Organisational Commitment Theory

The theory was by Howard S. Becker (1960) through his "Side-Bet Theory", but was later expanded by Mowday et al. (1979). He defined commitment as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization and the psychological attachment and sense of loyalty that employees develop toward their employers.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Among the four theories reviewed, Social Exchange theory was considered significant for this study because employee retention and organisational productivity fundamentally rely on principle of reciprocity between the organisation and its employees.

Empirical Review

This section reviewed some of the works done by researchers in the past and recent times.

Compensation practices and Organisational Productivity

Ahmed et al. examined the impact of retention on organisational productivity. The study revealed that employees stay longer in organisations where the ratio of compensation equals employee input.

Ibrahim and Daniel (2023) also revealed that perceived inequality in salaries increased turnover intention.

Zhang and Chen (2023) in their study proved that reward satisfaction enhances performance.

Osei and Ackah (2022) revealed that recognition practices and work-life balance significantly impacted retention levels even in moderate salary environments.

Career Development Opportunities and Organisational Productivity

Rana and Sharma (2022) while examining the impact of career development showed that employees who perceive stagnation in their careers are three times more likely to resign from their jobs.

Obeng and Ugwu (2023) reported that academic autonomy and organisational career growth frameworks influenced retention among faculty members in African universities.

Work Environment and Organisational Productivity

Brown and Taylor (2023) showed that working environment influences employee attitudes and organisational productivity.

Nguyen and Tran (2024) supported the findings of Brown and Taylor (2023) that supportive work environments reduce stress and enhance productivity.

Adebayo and Olalekan (2022) proved that poor infrastructure and excessive workload significantly increased turnover intention.

Leadership Support and Organisational Productivity

Rahman et al. (2023) showed that transformational leadership positively influenced employee loyalty across educational institutions.

Adeyemi and Adeniji (2022) proved that mentees with senior academic mentors reported stronger job commitment and research engagement.

Bashir and Gani (2022) proved that supervisor support improves employee engagement.

Otoo and Mishra (2023), proved that employees' support facilitates organisational productivity.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Job Security and Organisational Productivity

Mwangi and Muturi (2023) found that job insecurity increased turnover intention among university staff in East Africa, accounting for nearly 35% of variance in turnover intention.

Adebola and Chukwuma (2023) showed that employment stability positively impacted research productivity and administrative performance in Nigerian universities.

Khalid and Nawaz (2022) proved that job security improves psychological attachment and organisational identification behaviour.

Adebola and Chukwuma (2023) showed that job security greatly impacted organisational productivity in Nigerian Universities.

Fair Promotion Opportunities and Organisational Productivity.

Mensah and Boakye (2023) found that procedural justice significantly predicted employee's retentionability and productivity in tertiary institutions.

Okeke and Eze (2022) proved that perceived promotion injustice increased withdrawal behaviours and reduced commitment by employees.

Li and Zhou (2024) proved that fairness in promotion decisions enhances trust in leadership, and improves productivity.

Al-Sheikh and Hamdan (2023) confirmed that transparent appraisal practices positively impacted job satisfaction and productivity.

Gaps in Empirical Review

Having reviewed several studies, quite a number of gaps such as; geography or area of the study, organisations used, the variables tested were identified.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Despite the numerous studies in this field, including Otoo & Mishra (2023), Lee & wong (2024), Obeng & Ugwu (2023), Adeyemi & Adeniji (2022) etc. there was a dearth of studies that covered multiple variables (Compensation Practices, Career development opportunities, Work environment, Leadership Support, Job security, Fair Promotion Opportunities) and their interactions with organisational productivity.

This present study while complementing previous research, assessed the variables so as to get a glimpse of each variable's impact on organisational productivity among the selected universities highlighting generalisable insights into the relative importance of each variable to organizational productivity in private universities in south western states of Nigeria. It is therefore important that employee retention was examined to bring to light such interplay in the educational sector hence filling these gaps.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

Research Design:

A descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study.

Nature and Sources of Data:

The study made use of primary data which was collected through the use of structured questionnaire.

Methods of Data Analyses:

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and descriptive statistics were adopted, while Inferential statistics, including; Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was used to test relationships between variables.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the effect of retention variables while the hypotheses were tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

Sample Size

The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane’s (1967) formula using a population size of 2385 as expressed below.

N = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}

Where:

N = sample size

N = population size

E = margin of error (commonly 0.05 for 95% confidence level)

BABCOCK UNIVERSITY

$$n = \frac{150}{1+1050(0.05)^2} = \frac{150}{1+2.625} = \frac{150}{3.625} = 289.66$$

Sample ¿290

BOWEL UNIVERSITY

$$n = \frac{650}{1+650(0.05)^2} = \frac{650}{1+1.625} = \frac{659}{2,625} = 247.62$$

Sample ¿248

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

$$REDEEME\,R'S\;\;UNIVERSITY$$

$$n=\frac{685}{1+685(0.05)^2}=\frac{685}{1+1.7125}=\frac{659}{2.7125}=252.57$$

$Sample\;¿253$

Total number of sample size = 791

Therefore, the study sample size was 791 respondents proportionately distributed among the employees of the three selected universities.

4.0 DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES

Data Presentation

Table 4.1: SAMPLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION TABLE

Sn	University	Institution Location	Sample size
1.	Babcock University	Ilishan Remo, Ogun State	290
2.	Bowen University	Iwo, Oyo State	248
3.	Redeemer's University	Ede, Osun State	253
		Total	791

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.1 showed sample size derivatives for each of the three selected universities.

Table 4.2: Gender Distribution

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Male	400	58%
Female	280	41.2%
Total	680	100%

Source: Researcher (2026)

Table 4.2, represented respondents gender distribution

Table 4.3: Age Range Distribution

Age range	Frequency	Percentage (%)
18-25 years	120	17.6%
26-35 years	250	36.8%
36-45 years	180	26.5%
46 and above	130	19.1%
Total	680	100%

Source: Researcher (2026)

Table 4.3 showed Age distribution of respondents indicating a workforce dominated by young adults.

Table 4.4: Marital Status Distribution

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Single	320	47.1%

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Married	330	48.5%
Divorced	30	4.4%
Total	680	100%

Source: Researcher (2026)

Table 4.4 revealed marital status distribution of respondents

Table 4.5: Educational Qualifications Distribution

Education	Frequency	Percentage (%)
PhD	20	2.9%
MSc/MBA	180	26.5%
HND/BSc	300	44.1%
OND/NCE	180	26.5%
Total	680	100%

Source: Researcher (2026)

Table 4.5, revealed the educational qualification distribution of respondents

Table 4.6: Work Experience of Respondents in Years

No of Years	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 5 years	140	20.6%
5-10 years	230	33.8%

11-15 years	180	26.5%
Above 15 years	130	19.1%
Total	680	100%

Source: Researcher (2026)

Table 4.6 showed work experience in years of respondents

Table 4.7. Descriptive for Compensation Practices and Organisational Productivity

SN	COMPENSATION PRACTICES	n	Mean	SD
1	Our organisation offers competitive base salaries compared to industry standards.	680	4.1	0.85
2	Employees benefit from comprehensive health insurance.	680	3.9	0.92
3	Every employee benefit from transparent retirement plans.	680	3.7	0.95
4	Our organisation provides opportunities for employee development.	680	4.0	0.88
5	Our organisation provides opportunities for employee training.	680	4.2	0.83

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

6	The compensation package is transparent because employees understand how it is determined.	680	3.8	0.90
7	Employees are recognised and rewarded for their contributions.	680	3.9	0.87
8	Our organisation pays employees as at when due without excuse.	680	4.3	0.80
9	Overall, I am satisfied with the compensation practices in our organisation.	680	4.0	0.86
	Grand Total / Average	**680**	**4.0**	**0.87**

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.7 showed respondents' perceptions on compensation practices.

Table 4.8. Descriptive for Career Development Opportunities and Organisational Productivity

SN	Career Development Opportunities	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	My university provides adequate training programs to improve my job performance.	680	4.20	0.70
2	I have access to professional development opportunities relevant to my role.	680	4.10	0.75
3	Career advancement opportunities in this institution motivate me to perform better.	680	3.90	0.80
4	The university supports employees in acquiring new skills.	680	4.00	0.72

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

5	There is a clear career growth path for employees in this institution.	680	3.80	0.85
6	The university supports employees in accessing new knowledge.	680	3.90	0.78
7	I am encouraged to pursue further career related education.	680	4.00	0.74
8	Career development initiatives positively influence my efficiency at work.	680	4.10	0.71
9	The institution invests in employee development regularly.	680	4.00	0.73
10	I feel more committed to my job due to the available growth opportunities.	680	4.00	0.70
	Grand Total/Average		4.00	0.75

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.8 showed the participants' responses to career development

SN	Work Environment	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	My workplace provides a comfortable working environment.	680	4.1	0.82
2	The physical facilities (offices, classrooms, equipment) support effective performance.	680	4.0	0.85
3	The university promotes a culture of teamwork.	680	3.9	0.88

4	I have access to the tools needed to perform my duties efficiently.	680	4.0	0.83
5	The work environment motivates me to give my best.	680	4.2	0.79
6	There is a conducive work environment which enhances my overall productivity.	680	4.1	0.81
7	The institution maintains a healthy work-life balance for staff.	680	3.8	0.87
8	There is a positive relationship among staff members.	680	4.0	0.84
9	Our organisation offers flexible work hours arrangements.	680	3.9	0.90
10	The university promotes a culture of collaboration.	680	4.1	0.82
	Grand Total/Average		**4.01**	**0.84**

Table 4.8 showed the participants' responses to career development

Table 4.9. Descriptive for Work Environment and Organisational Productivity

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.9 depicted the respondents' perceptions of their work environment.

Table 4.10. Descriptive for Leadership Support and Organisational Productivity

Sn	LEADERSHIP SUPPORT	N	Mean	SD
1	My supervisors provide adequate	680	3.8	0.9

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

	guidance in carrying out my duties.			
2	Leadership in this university is supportive.	680	4.0	0.8
3	The leadership in this university is approachable.	680	3.9	0.9
4	I receive constructive feedback from my superiors regularly.	680	3.6	1.0
5	Supervisors provide the necessary support to overcome work challenges.	680	3.7	0.9
6	Management involves employees in decision-making processes when necessary.	680	3.5	1.1
7	Leadership support enhances my productivity at work.	680	4.2	0.7
8	The leadership in this institution encourage innovation.	680	3.4	1.0
9	I feel valued by the leadership of the university.	680	3.9	0.8
	Grand Total/Average		**3.78**	**0.90**

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.10 revealed the respondents' perception on the leadership support they receive in their organisation.

Table 4.11. Descriptive for Job Security and Organisational Productivity

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Sn	Job Security	n	Mean	SD
1	I feel secure in my current job position.	680	3.9	0.9
2	The university provides stable employment for its staff.	680	3.8	0.8
3	Fear of job loss does not affect my performance negatively.	680	3.6	1.0
4	Job security motivates me to perform better in my duties.	680	4.1	0.7
5	I am confident about my long-term employment in this university.	680	3.7	0.9
6	Job security in this institution reduces stress and increases productivity.	680	3.8	0.8
7	I feel protected from unfair dismissal.	680	3.5	1.1
8	Job security positively influences my commitment to the organisation.	680	4.0	0.8
	Grand Total/Average		**3.8**	**0.88**

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.11 highlighted respondents' opinions on their jobs' security

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Table 4.12 Descriptive for Fair promotion opportunities and Organisational Productivity

Sn	FAIR PROMOTION OPPORTUNITIES	n	Mean	SD
1	Promotion processes in this university are fair	680	3.6	1.0
2	Promotions are based on merit	680	3.7	0.9
3	Promotion processes in this university are transparent	680	3.5	1.0
4	I believe I have equal opportunities for promotion as other staff	680	3.4	1.1
5	The criteria for promotion are clearly communicated	680	3.6	0.9
6	Promotions are carried out without bias	680	3.3	1.0
7	Fair promotion practices motivate me to work harder	680	4.0	0.8
8	Promotions are carried out without favoritism	680	3.4	1.0
9	The promotion system in this university enhances employee commitment	680	3.8	0.9
10	Promotion opportunities encourage higher productivity among staff	680	4.1	0.7
	Grand Total/Average		**3.70**	**0.93**

Source: Field Survey (2026)

Table 4.12 revealed respondents' lean slightly toward agreement about the impact of fairness, transparency, and bias on promotion processes.

Global Research Journal of Humanities and Public Administration

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

4.1 Test of Hypotheses

Test of Hypothesis One

Restatement of hypothesis in null and alternate form thus:

H_{0_1}: Compensation practices have no significant influence on organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Decision Rule: Accept the null hypothesis if the sign of the coefficient is negative and probability value > 0.05. Otherwise, reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative accordingly.

Table 4.13 **Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.761[a]	.579	.579	.890

a. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation practices

Table 4.14 **ANOVA[a]**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	739.845	1	739.845	933.990	.000[b]
	Residual	537.067	678	.792		
	Total	1276.912	679			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation practices

Table 4.15 **Coefficients[a]**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.570	.080		19.645	.000
	Compensation practices	.010	.000	.761	30.561	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026); SPSS Outputs

Table 4.13, 4.14 and 4.15, showed the results of research hypothesis I. The model summary has an R (correlation) value of .761. R-square value of .579, F (1) = 933.990; p = .000. The unstandardised coefficients (β = 1.570; t = 19.645; P -value = .0000) using a 5% level of significance. Null hypothesis should be rejected. We accept the alternative hypothesis, that the overall regression model is significant and different from zero.

Test of Hypothesis Two

H_{0_2}: Career development opportunities have no significant effect on organisational productivity in the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Table 4.16 **Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.892[a]	.796	.796	.655

a. Predictors: (Constant), Carrier development

Table 4.17 ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1136.625	1	1136.625	2648.014	.000[b]
	Residual	291.022	678	.429		
	Total	1427.647	679			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Career development

Table 4.18 Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.414	.066		6.260	.000
	Carrier development	.019	.000	.892	51.459	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

Source: Researcher’s Computation (2026); SPSS Outputs

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

In Table 4.16, 4.17 and 4.18, model summary showed that R (correlation) has a value of .892 with an R-square value of .796. The ANOVA reported that F (1) = 2648.014 with a corresponding p-value of .000. The unstandardised coefficients (β = .414; t = 6.260; P -value = .0000) with a t-value of 6.260 and P -value of .0000, using a 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis II should be rejected. We accept the alternative hypothesis, that the overall regression model is significant and different from zero.

Test of Hypothesis Three

H_{0_3}: Work environment has no significant effect on organisational productivity in the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Table 4.19 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.716[a]	.513	.512	.918

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment

Table 4.20 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	601.158	1	601.158	713.015	.000[b]
	Residual	571.636	678	.843		
	Total	1172.794	679			

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Environment

Table 4.21 **Coefficients[a]**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.390	.090		15.436	.000
	Work Environment	.012	.000	.716	26.702	.000

a. Dependent Variable: organisational productivity

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026); SPSS Outputs

As indicated in Table 4.19, 4.20 and 4.21, the model summary revealed R has a value of .716, with an R-square value of .513. The ANOVA depicted that F (1) = 713.015 with a corresponding p-value of .000. The unstandardised coefficients (β = 1.390; t = 15.436; P -value = .0000) with a corresponding t-value of 15.436 and P -value of .0000 using a 5%

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

level of significance. The null hypothesis III should be rejected. We accept the alternative hypothesis, that the overall regression model is significant and different from zero.

Test of Hypothesis Four

H_{0_4}: Leadership support has no significant effect on organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Table 4.22 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.930[a]	.865	.865	.452

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership supports

Table 4.23 ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	891.304	1	891.304	4361.655	.000[b]
	Residual	138.549	678	.204		
	Total	1029.853	679			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership supports

Table 4.24 Coefficients[a]

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.158	.047		24.847	.000
	Leadership supports	.012	.000	.930	66.043	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational productivity

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026); SPSS Outputs

Table 4.22, 4.23 and 4.24 showed the model summary of R has a value of .930, and an R-square value of .865. ANOVA reported value of F (1) = 4361.655 with a corresponding p-value of .000. The unstandardised coefficients (β = 1.158; t = 24.847; P -value = .0000) with a corresponding t-value of 24.847 and P -value of .0000 using a 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis IV should be rejected. We accept the alternative hypothesis, that the overall regression model is significant and different from zero.

Test of Hypothesis Five

H_{0_5}: Job security has no significant effect on organisational productivity among the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Table 4.25 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.946[a]	.896	.895	.405

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job security

Table 4.26 **ANOVA[a]**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	953.985	1	953.985	5810.834	.000[b]
	Residual	111.310	678	.164		
	Total	1065.294	679			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Job security

Table 4.27 **Coefficients[a]**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.239	.038		32.923	.000

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Job security	.014	.000	.946	76.229	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational productivity

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026); SPSS Outputs)

Table 4.25, 4.26 and 4.27 showed a model summary of R value of .946, with a corresponding R-square value of .896. ANOVA showed a value of F (1) = 5810.834 with a corresponding p-value of .000. The unstandardised coefficients (β = 1.239; t = 32.923; P -value = .0000) with a corresponding t-value of 32.923 and P -value of .0000 using a 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis V should be rejected. We accept the alternative hypothesis, that the overall regression model is significant and different from zero.

Test of Hypothesis Six

H_{0_6}: Fair promotion opportunities have no significant effect on organisational productivity in the selected private universities in South Western States of Nigeria.

Table 4.28 **Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.934[a]	.872	.872	.447

a. Predictors: (Constant), Fair promotion

Table 4.29 **ANOVA[a]**

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	926.381	1	926.381	4628.048	.000[b]
	Residual	135.713	678	.200		
	Total	1062.094	679			

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Fair promotion

Table 4.30 **Coefficients[a]**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.682	.037		44.920	.000
	Fair promotion	.011	.000	.934	68.030	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Productivity

Source: Researcher's Computation (2026); SPSS Outputs

Table 4.28, 4.29 and 4.30 presented a model summary of R with a value of .934, a corresponding R-square value of .872. ANOVA value of F (1) = 926.381 with a corresponding p-value of .000. The unstandardised coefficients (β = 1.682; t = 44.920; P -value = .0000) with a corresponding t-value of 44.920 and P -value of .0000 using a 5%

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

level of significance. The null hypothesis VI should be rejected. We accept the alternative hypothesis, that the overall regression model is significant and different from zero.

4.2 Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis One: Compensation practices have a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities. The findings align with the studies by Ahmed et al. (2024) and Zhang and Chen (2023).

Hypothesis Two: Findings showed that career development opportunities have a significant impact on organisational productivity. The findings supported the studies by Lee and Wong (2024) and Ugwu (2023).

Hypothesis Three: It revealed that work environment has a significant impact on organisational productivity, upholding the previous findings by Brown and Taylor (2023) and Nguyen and Tran (2024).

Hypothesis Four: It established that leadership support has a significant impact on organisational productivity, supporting the findings by Bashir and Gani (2022).

Hypothesis Five: It showed that job security has a significant impact on organisational productivity. The finding was in tandem with the studies by Adebola and Chukwuma (2023).

Hypothesis Six: It revealed that fair promotion has a significant impact on organisational productivity. It aligned with the studies by Mensah and Boakye (2023).

5.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Compensation practices have a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities, H_{0_1}: (β_1= 1.570, t = 19.645, P = 0.000).

Career development opportunities have a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities, H_{0_2}: (β_1= .414, t = 6.260, P = 0.000).

Work environment has a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities, H_{0_3}: (β_1= 1.390, t = 15.436, P = 0.000).

Leadership support has a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities, H_{0_4}: (β_1= 1.158, t = 24.847, P = 0.000).

Job security has a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities, H_{0_5}: (β_1= 1.239; t = 32.923, P = 0.000).

Fair promotion has a significant impact on organisational productivity among the selected private universities, H_{06}: (β_1= 1.682, t = 44.920, P = 0.000).

Conclusion

In light of the findings, the study concluded that employee retention practice has a positive and significant impact on organisational productivity in the selected private universities.

Recommendations

Premise on the findings drawn from the analysis alongside the conclusions, the study therefore outlined some recommendations:

i. The management of the selected private universities should further improve on their employee retention practices to enhance their productivity.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

ii. The management of the selected private universities should create enabling work environment, sustain same to enhance employee intention to stay.

iii. Private universities stakeholders should develop a framework that ensures equality in compensation structure among themselves.

Contribution to Knowledge

This study made a significant contribution to knowledge by providing a framework for harmonising employee retention and organisational productivity in selected private universities in south western states, Nigeria. Due to the limited studies on employee retention and organisational productivity in private universities, this study contributed to the body of knowledge by examining the relationship between employee retention and organisational productivity in the selected private universities using multiple variables and facilitating the addition of human resource management literature to its body of literature.

REFERENCES

Adebola, S. A., & Olanrewaju, A. T. (2024). Employee turnover and workforce sustainability in Nigerian private universities. Journal of Higher Education Management, 12(1), 45–60.

Adebola, T., & Chukwuma, P. (2023). Job security and organisational performance in Nigerian universities. African Journal of Management Research, 18(1), 77–93.

Adewale, T. O., & Ojo, A. A. (2023). Employee retention strategies and organisational performance in private universities. Journal of Human Resource Management, 11(2), 54–67.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Adeyemi, T., & Adeniji, A. (2022). Leadership mentoring and academic staff retention. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 11(3), 88–102.

Ahmed, S., Khan, M., & Ali, R. (2024). Compensation strategies and employee retention in service organisations. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 35(1), 34–50.

Ahmed, S., & Yang, J. (2023). Career development practices and leadership preparedness in manufacturing organizations. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness, 10(3), 214–230.

Ajibade, M. A., Akindele, K. I., & Ogbogu, F. O. (2025). Managing employee engagement, retention and productivity in a volatile environment: A study of public universities in South West Nigeria. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science.

Akinwale, O. E., & George, O. J. (2022). Human resource practices and employee retention in knowledge-based organisations. African Journal of Management Research, 14(2), 87–101.

Al-Sheikh, A. H., & Hamdan, A. R. (2023). Procedural justice and employee trust: Impact on turnover and commitment. Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 24(2), 67–85.

Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F. O., & Seidu, E. Y. M. (2022). Organisational justice and productivity: A multi-level analysis of promotion fairness and performance outcomes. Journal of Business Ethics, 175(3), 501–517.

Balogun, A. M., & Adekunle, S. O. (2023). Human resource practices and staff turnover in private universities in South-West Nigeria. African Journal of Human Resource Management, 15(1), 58–72.

Bashir, S., & Gani, A. (2022). Leadership support and employee engagement. Management Research Review, 45(6), 765–780.

Brown, J., & Taylor, K. (2023). Workplace climate and faculty performance. Educational Management Journal, 19(3), 102–118.

Chen, X., Mamun, A. A., Hoque, M. E., Wan Hussain, W. M. H., & Yang, Q. (2023). Work design, employee well-being, and retention intention: A case study of China's young workforce. Heliyon, 9(5), e15742.

Chinomona, R., & Sandada, M. (2023). Human resource practices and employee retention in service organisations. African Journal of Economic and Management Studies, 14(1), 34–51.

Chukwuma, I. M., & Akintola, A. S. (2024). Staff turnover, knowledge loss and institutional productivity in Nigerian universities. International Journal of Education and Development, 8(1), 103–118.

Elrayah, M. (2023). Sustainable total reward strategies for talented employees: Evidence from the educational sector. Sustainability, 15(2), 1605.

Harsch, K., & Festing, M. (2021). Dynamic talent management in dynamic environments: Achieving organizational agility through talent flows. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 32(11), 2459–2483. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1579246

Ibrahim, H. Y., & Yusuf, M. O. (2024). Human capital management and organisational productivity in higher education institutions. International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, 16(2), 91–105.

Ibrahim, H., & Daniel, A. (2023). Compensation equity and employee retention in private universities. Journal of Business and Education Research, 15(2), 89–105.

Khalid, U., & Nawaz, M. (2022). Job security and organisational citizenship behaviour. Management and Labour Studies, 47(4), 350–366.

Kyndt, E., Dochy, F., Michielsen, M., & Moeyaert, B. (2009) Employee retention: Organisational and personal perspectives. Vocations and Learning, 2(3), 195–215. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-009-9024-7.

Kumari, P., & Afroz, N. (2023). Talent retention and organisational productivity in higher education institutions. International Journal of Educational Management, 37(4), 812 –828.

Lee, H., & Wong, M. (2024). Professional development and employee engagement. Asia-Pacific HR Journal, 22(1), 15–32.

Li, X., & Zhou, Y. (2024). Fair promotion systems and organisational commitment. Management Decision Review, 40(2), 95–110.

Mensah, J., & Boakye, E. (2023). Promotion fairness and employee performance. African Journal of Business Management, 17(4), 210–226.

Mwangi, D., & Muturi, W. (2023). Job insecurity and turnover intentions in higher education. Journal of Management Sciences, 10(2), 90–105.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Nguyen, P., & Tran, L. (2024). Work environment and employee productivity. International Journal of Productivity Studies, 8(2), 145–162.

Nwankwo, O. E., & Eze, P. N. (2022). Work environment and employee commitment in Nigerian tertiary institutions. African Journal of Management Science, 9(3), 22–39.

Obeng, K., & Ugwu, C. (2023). Academic autonomy and staff retention. African Higher Education Review, 12(1), 67–83.

Ogundipe, O., & Bello, L. (2023). Retention factors and job performance among academic staff in private universities. Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning, 16(4), 77–94.

Okeke, C., & Eze, N. (2022). Promotion justice and employee retention. Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences, 23(1), 50–67.

Okusanya, A. O., Obisanya, A. A., Adenuga, A. J., & Aderemi, A. P. (2023). Harnessing knowledge accessibility for enhanced employee productivity in Ogun State universities: A human capital perspective. The Vocational and Applied Science Journals.

Osei, K., & Ackah, D. (2022). Work-life balance and employee retention. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 12(3), 101–118.

Otoo, F., & Mishra, M. (2023). Employee engagement as mediator of retention. Journal of Service Management Research, 18(4), 150–166.

Park, H., & Jung, Y. (2024). Perceived organisational support and turnover. Journal of Workplace Behavioural Studies, 15(1), 1–19.

Vol. 2, No. 1: 2026 ISSN: 2811-2000 (Paper), 2811-2001 (Online)

Rahimi, M., & Karkar, A. (2022). The impact of organisational justice on faculty motivation. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50(1), 34–52.

Rahman, M., Islam, R., & Rahman, K. (2023). Transformational leadership and employee loyalty. Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 44(2), 210–225.

Sadiq, R. A., & Musa, A. I. (2022). Workforce stability and employee performance in service-oriented organisations. Journal of Contemporary Management Research, 9(4), 120–134.

Sigelman, M., Fuller, J., & Martin, A. (2024). Skills-based hiring: The long road from pronouncements to practice. Harvard Business School Working Paper. https://www.hbs.edu/

Xuecheng, W., Qaisar, I., & Saina, B. (2022). Factors affecting employee's retention: Integration of situational leadership with social exchange theory. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, Article 872105. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.872105.

Zhang, T., & Chen, Y. (2023). Reward satisfaction and performance outcomes. Journal of Applied Management Research, 21(2), 75–92.