Workplace Conditions, Job Satisfaction/Performance and the well-being of Academic Staff at Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU), Ogun State, Nigeria

Aramide Arinola Kuforiji
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources Management,
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria

Peter Oluwadare Kalejaiye
School of Leadership, College of Business and Economic Development, The University of Southern Mississippi, Gulf Port, MS, USA.

Segilola Yewande Oladejo
Department of Sociology

Adeola Elizebeth Adetayo
Department of Business Administration,

Adebiyi Julius Abosede
Department of Business Administration,

Joseph Olutoyin Jiboku
Department of Employment Relations and Human Resources Management,
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria

https://doi.org/10.61090/aksujacog.2024.063

Abstract
In the quickly changing academic landscape of today, there is no denying that higher educational institutions play a crucial role in shaping the brains of future leaders. At Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU), in Ogun State, Nigeria, the study looks into how academic staff members' job happiness and performance are affected by their working environment. The physical, social, and psychological surroundings of the workplace include workload, institutional support, and resource availability. Employee performance is closely correlated with job happiness, which is greatly influenced by these factors. 669 academic staff members participated in the study, which used a quantitative cross-sectional design to collect primary data using questionnaires. Key findings showed that staff performance and manager support are strongly positively correlated. Performance improves when managerial support increases based on the regression coefficient of 0.133. While the coefficient of determination (R2 = 0.461) indicated that management support accounted for 46.1% of the variation in performance, with other factors accounting for the remaining portion, the correlation coefficient (R = 0.679) indicated a high link between support and performance. Although academic employees are naturally driven, the study found that improved management support—such as providing resources and attending to staff concerns—significantly enhanced performance. The study highlighted how important supportive management is to fostering a successful academic environment.

Keywords: Workplace Conditions, job satisfaction, job performance, academic staff Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU).

Introduction

It is indisputable that higher education institutions play a crucial role in developing the minds of future leaders in the quickly changing academic landscape of today. However, the working environment has a big impact on academic staff members' performance and general well-being in addition to their job satisfaction (Ortan et al., 2021). Since human capital is the primary driver of academic institutions (Goldin, 2024; Asongu & Tchamyou, 2020; Chankseliani et al., 2021), the working environment that academic employees experience has a significant impact on their degree of job satisfaction, productivity, and work-life balance. This study aims to evaluate the working environment of Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU), located in Ogun State, Nigeria, and how it affects academic staff members' job satisfaction and performance.

Workers' physical, social, and psychological surroundings while performing their jobs are called workplace conditions (Zhenjing et al., 2022; Akinwale & George, 2020). It includes things like workload, interpersonal interactions, institutional support, organisational policies, and resource availability. Job satisfaction, which is the degree of enjoyment employees have from their employment, is directly impacted by these circumstances. Since a motivated and contented staff is more likely to be engaged and effective in their roles, job happiness and performance are strongly related. Furthermore, unfavourable working conditions can have a negative impact on workers' health, resulting in issues with their physical, mental and emotional well-being (Judge et al., 2020; Kitsios & Kamariotou, 2021; Yanchovska, 2021).

Academic institutions in Nigeria suffer from several difficulties, from excessive teaching loads and inconsistent wage payments to insufficient finance and subpar facilities. Academic staff unhappiness is frequently caused by these problems, and it can show itself in high turnover rates, low productivity, and absenteeism. One of Ogun State's largest universities, Olabisi Onabanjo University, is not exempted from these difficulties. Developing methods to improve the work environment and academic staff well-being requires an understanding of the particular workplace variables that affect job satisfaction and performance at OOU.

Concerns regarding the worsening working conditions in Nigerian colleges have been voiced throughout time, and OOU is no exception. Like many others in the nation, OOU's academic staff face a wide range of obstacles that limit their capacity to function at their best. Inadequate office space, limited access to resources for teaching and research, a lack of funds for professional development, and an imbalance between teaching and administrative duties are some of these issues. Furthermore, the Nigerian academic system is still beset by problems with insufficient compensation, delayed promotions, and inconsistent salary payments. In addition to impeding job satisfaction, these conditions have an adverse effect on academic staff members' physical and emotional well-being, which in turn affects their performance and the standard of education that students get.

The relationship between job happiness and working conditions in academic institutions has been the subject of numerous research. Nevertheless, despite OOU's significance in the Nigerian educational system, there is a paucity of research that focuses exclusively on it. By offering a thorough evaluation of OOU's existing working circumstances and their effects on academic staff members' job happiness, productivity, and general well-being, this study seeks to close this gap.

The main objective of this study is to assess the workplace conditions at Olabisi Onabanjo University and examine their impact on job satisfaction and the performance of academic staff. The significance of this study lies in its potential to provide valuable insights into the workplace conditions at Olabisi Onabanjo University and their impact on the academic workforce. The findings of this study will be useful for university administrators, policymakers, and stakeholders in the education sector as they seek to create an environment that fosters job satisfaction, enhances performance, and promotes the well-being of academic staff. By addressing the challenges faced by academic staff, the university can improve staff retention, reduce burnout, and enhance the overall quality of education provided to students.

Moreover, this study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on workplace conditions in Nigerian universities, providing a foundation for future research in this area. It will also serve as a reference for other universities facing similar challenges, offering practical recommendations for improving workplace conditions in academic institutions across Nigeria and beyond.

It is impossible to overestimate the influence of academic faculty on the direction of society. Their performance, well-being, and job satisfaction all depend on the workplace conditions in which they work. The purpose of this study is to present a thorough evaluation of Olabisi Onabanjo University's working circumstances and their effects on the faculty. This study will provide important insights into how workplace conditions might be enhanced to produce a more encouraging and effective academic atmosphere by identifying the major elements influencing job satisfaction and performance.

Materials and Method

A quantitative research methodology was adopted for this investigation. To evaluate the ideas, opinions, and sentiments of various groups of people with candid feedback, the descriptive cross-sectional research design which is a one-time observation of independent and dependent variables was used. This study takes into account the total population of 669 Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye Ogun State, academic staff members throughout all departments, units, and faculties, which was obtained from the University's Establishment Department.

To obtain first-hand information from the intended respondents, primary data were used. Primary data sources are trustworthy, dependable, and risk-reduction, which allows for creative results (Saunders et al., 2012). The data-gathering method that was employed was the questionnaire. After completing the required training, research assistants were hired to administer the study instrument to the appropriate respondents. With the use of Krejcie & Morgan's (1970) sample size determination table, four hundred and thirteen questionnaires issued to the 669 population for over two weeks, were returned.

Results

Table 1

Descriptive analysis on Perceived Management Support Characteristics among Academic staff of OOU

Variables	SA	A	U	D	SD
	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
Colleagues Support					
My colleagues are supportive when I have stress problem	182 (27.2)	299 (44.7)	60 (8.5)	125 (18.7	3 (0.4
When I have stress issue, my coworkers make accommodations for me (e.g vacation	246 (36.8)	301 (45.0)	20 (3.0)	98 (14.6)	4 (0.6)
My colleagues understand when I talk about personal issues	172 (25.7)	291 (43.5)	58 (8.7)	129 (19.3)	19 (2.8)
My coworkers sincerely care about the effects that job pressures have on my personal life	134 (20,0)	323 (48.3)	30 (4.5)	96 (14.3)	86 (12.9)
My colleagues are friendly towards me	82 (12.3)	350 (52.3)	14 (2.1)	144 (21.5)	79 (11.8)

I can count on my colleagues when I encounter difficulties in my work.	99 (14.1)	301 (42.9)	39 (5.8)	185 (27.7)	45 (6.7)
Head of Department (HOD) support					
My HOD is supportive when I have personal problems	40 (6.0)	254 (38.0)	74 (11.1)	210 (31.4)	91 (13.6)
When I have a life issue, like a vacation, my HOD makes accommodations for me.	66 (9.4)	283 (42.3)	47 (7.0)	223 (33.3)	50 (7.1)
My HOD understands when I talk about personal issues	59 (8.8)	272 (40.7)	26 (3.9)	191 (28.6)	121 (18.1)
My HOD really cares about the effects that work demands have on my personal life	100 (15.0)	350 (52.6)	31 (4.7)	102 (15.3)	83 (12.5)
My HOD is friendly towards me	56 (8.4)	118 (17.6)	441 (65.9)	36 (5.4)	18 (2.7)
I can count on my supervisor when I experience challenges in my work.	182 (25.9)	299 (42.6)	60 (9.0)	125 (18.7)	3 (0.4)
Employee Development Plans					
This organisation has provided me with training opportunities enabling me to extend my range of skills and abilities	246 (36.8)	301 (45.0)	20 (3.0)	98 (14.6)	4 (0.6)
I get the opportunity to discuss my training and development requirements with my employer	172 (25.7)	291 (43.5)	58 (8.7)	129 (19.3)	19 (2.8)
My work pays for any work-related training and/or development I want to undertake	134 (20.0)	323 (48.3)	30 (4.5)	96 (14.3)	86 (12.9)
This organisation is committed to the training and development of its employees	82 (11.7)	350 (52.3)	14 (2.1)	144 (21.5)	79 (11.8)
My organisation offers mentoring (development process under mentor/counsellor)	99 (14.5)	301 (45.0)	39 (5.8)	185 (27.7)	45 (6.7)

Flexible Working Hours					
Flexible working is available	40 (6.0)	254 (38.0)	74 (10.5)	210 (31.4)	91 (13.6)
Flexible arrival and departure times depend on personal agreements with my HOD	66 (9.9)	283 (42.3)	47 (7.0)	223 (33.3)	50 (7.5)
I choose flexible working schedule (arrival and departure)	59 (8.8)	272 (40.7)	26 (3.7)	191 (27.2)	121 (18.1)
I do part-time work (working for fewer hours than full-time	100 (15.0)	350 (52.6)	31 (4.7)	102 (15.3)	83 (12.5)
I use compressed work week (working approx. 40 hours in fewer than 5 hours	56 (8.4)	118 (17.6)	36 (5.4)	441 (65.9)	18 (2.7)
I take leave for a family celebration	182 (27.2)	299 (44.7	60 (9.0)	125 (18.7)	3 (0.4)
Job sharing is allowed	246 (36.8)	301 (45.0)	20 (3.0)	98 (14.6)	4 (0.6)
I take paid maternity/paternity leave	172 (25.7)	291 (43.5)	58 (8.7)	129 (19.3)	19 (2.8)
I take Child/Elder care	134 (20.0)	323 (48.3)	30 (4.3)	96 (14.3)	86 (12.9)
I take educational leave	82 (11.7)	350 (52.3)	14 (2.1)	144 (21.5)	79 (11.8)
I take leave for Doctor’s appointment	99 (14.8)	301 (45.0)	39 (5.8)	185 (27.7)	45 (6.7)
I take excuse to pick up my child from day care school	40 (6.0)	254 (38.0)	74 (11.1)	210 (31.4)	91 (13.0)
Flexible work options: Place					
I use telecommuting (having the flexibility to work from home using a computer	56 (8.4)	118 (17.6)	36 (5.4)	441 (65.9)	18 (2.7)
I use Video conferencing (to attend meetings)	40 (6.0)	254 (38.0)	74 (11.1)	210 (31.4)	91 (13.0)

Perceived Management Support Characteristics among Academic Staff at Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU)

Table 1 provides a descriptive analysis of the perceived management support characteristics of academic staff at Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU). It covers various domains of perceived support, including colleagues' support, head of department's (HOD) support, employee development plans, flexible working hours, and flexible work options. The responses are categorized into five levels: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD), with corresponding frequencies and percentages.

Colleagues' Support: When stress issues develop, the majority of respondents (44.7%) agree that their coworkers are supportive, and another 27.2% strongly agree. A sizable portion of respondents (45.0%)

concur, with 36.8% strongly agreeing, that coworkers help them deal with stress. Of those surveyed, 25.7% strongly agree and 43.5% think that coworkers understand their problems. Although only 20% strongly agree, 48.3% of respondents say that their coworkers are concerned about how work responsibilities impact their stress. Although just 12.3% strongly agree, more than half (52.3%) feel that their coworkers are friendly. With 42.9% agreeing and 14.1% strongly agreeing that they can rely on coworkers when they face difficulties at work, the level of agreement is moderate.

HOD's Support: While 38.0% of respondents agree, just 6.0% strongly agree that their HOD is supportive when they are under stress. A sizable portion (31.4%) disagrees, indicating differing opinions about HOD's support. Just 9.4% strongly agree that their HOD helps them deal with stress, despite 42.3% agreeing. Thirty-three per cent of those surveyed disagree. Similar ratings are given to HODs' comprehension of personal problems: 40.7% agree, while 28.6% disagree. 15% of respondents highly agree, and nearly half (52.6%) think that their HOD is concerned about how job obligations affect their personal lives. The majority of respondents (64.9%) were unsure, with only 8.4% strongly agreeing that their HOD is friendly. This could suggest that HODs have varying or ambiguous opinions about friendliness.

The perception of being able to count on HOD's support is moderately positive, with 42.6% agreeing and 25.9% strongly agreeing.

Employee Development Plans: With 36.8% strongly agreeing, a sizable majority of respondents (45.0%) believe that they are given training chances. Just 3.0% of respondents are unsure. 25.7% strongly agree, and 43.5% agree that they have the chance to talk to their employer about training and development. 20% strongly agree and 48.3% agree that the company funds work-related training. Although just 11.7% strongly agree, more than half (52.3%) think that the company is dedicated to staff training and development. While 27.7% disagree, 45.0% of respondents agree that the organization offers mentoring.

Flexible Working Hours: While 38.0% of respondents believe that flexible working arrangements are accessible, just 6.0% strongly agree. A sizable percentage (31.4%) disagrees, indicating that formal flexibility is not widely available. There is informal flexibility, according to 42.3% of respondents, yet a sizable portion (33.3%) disagrees. While 40.7% agree, just 8.8% strongly believe that they have a choice in their work schedule. A sizable portion (27.2%) is in disagreement. Of those surveyed, 15.0% strongly agree and 52.6% agree that part-time work is an option. Just 8.4% of respondents strongly believe that a reduced workweek is available, while the majority (65.9%) are still unsure.

Flexible Work Options: While most people (65.9%) are still unsure, only 8.4% firmly believe that working from home is an option. In a similar vein, 38.0% of respondents concur that video conferencing can be used for meetings, while 31.4% disagree, indicating varying experiences with this option.

In general, OOU academic staff members report modest support from their peers, with more favourable ratings in areas like friendliness and assistance through personal difficulties. However, opinions about HOD assistance differ significantly, particularly when it comes to comprehending personal challenges and accommodating daily problems. Although opinions on flexible working arrangements are varied and many respondents are still unsure about some aspects of flexibility, especially telecommuting and compressed workweeks, employee development opportunities are moderately well-regarded.

Table 2
Descriptive Analysis of Job Performance, Energy and Job Satisfaction characteristics among OOU Academic Staff

Variables	SA f(%)	A f(%)	U f(%)	D f(%)	SD f(%)
Productivity					
I am happy with the quality of my work	59 (8.4)	272 (40.7)	26 (3.9)	191 (28.6)	121 (18.1)
I work effectively	103 (15.4)	350 (52.3)	31(4.6)	102 (15.2)	83 (12.4)
I am a highly productive employee	441 (62.8)	118 (16.8)	56 (8.0)	36 (5.4)	18 (2.6)
Energy					
I feel enthusiastic about my job	66 (9.9)	283 (40.3)	47 (6.7)	223 (31.8)	50 (7.1)
At work, I feel bursting with energy	56 (8.8)	272 (38.7)	26 (3.9)	191 (27.2)	121 (18.1)
I really have faith in my job	103 (15.4)	350 (52.3)	31 (4.4)	102 (15.2)	83 (12.4)
I go out of my way to ensure that the work is complete	40 (6.0)	254 (38.0)	74 (10.5)	210 (31.4)	91 (13.6)
I have appropriate resources to accomplish task/work	66 (9.9)	283 (42.3)	47 (7.0)	223 (33.3)	50 (7.5)
I fell I am meeting work expectations	59 (8.8)	272 (40.7)	26 (3.7)	191 (27.2)	121 (18.1)
Job satisfaction					
I like my job	246 (36.8)	301 (45.0)	20 (3.0)	98 (14.6)	4 (0.6)
I am satisfied with my job	172 (25.7)	291 (43.5)	58 (8.7)	129 (19.3)	19 (2.8)
I like working here	130 (20.0)	323 (48.3)	30 (4.5)	96 (14.3)	86 (12.9)
I would recommend academic job to friends looking for a job	82 (11.7)	350 (52.3)	14 (2.1)	144 (21.5)	79 (11.8)
I feel personal satisfaction when I do my job well	99 (14.5)	301 (45.0)	39 (5.8)	185 (27.7)	45 (6.7)
I am proud to tell people that I am part of the academic staff at the university	173 (25.7)	291 (43.5)	58 (8.7)	129 (19.3)	19 (2.8)
This is the best administration for me to work under	40 (6.0)	254 (38.0)	74 (11.1)	210 (31.4)	91 (13.6)

Descriptive Analysis on Academic Staff Job Performance, Energy and Job satisfaction in Table 2:

Job Performance: Nearly half of the academic staff are happy with their job output, as seen by the 40.7% who agree and 8.4% who strongly agree. Nonetheless, a sizable percentage (46.7%) disagree or are unsure about their job output, suggesting some hesitancy in this regard. Over half of the employees

(52.3%) think that they do the job well, and 15.4% strongly agree. About 27.6% of respondents (disagree or strongly disagree) question their efficacy, indicating that a sizable portion believe they are not giving their best effort.

The vast majority of respondents (62.8%) strongly agree and 16.8% agree that they are very productive, indicating that they have a high level of confidence in their ability to produce. Just 8% of respondents are still unsure, with the remaining 8% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. This suggests that academic staff members generally view production as a strength.

Energy: While 50.2% of the respondents (SA and A combined) express enthusiasm for their job, 38.9% disagree or strongly disagree, indicating a substantial proportion of the academic staff lack enthusiasm. This points to possible burnout or dissatisfaction. Similarly, 47.5% agreed or strongly agreed, but 45.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This suggests a split in the workforce, where almost half the staff feel energized while the other half may be experiencing fatigue or low energy levels. Most staff (52.3% agree, 15.4% strongly agree) have faith in their job, but 27.6% (disagree or strongly disagree) appear less concerned, which may signal job insecurity or disengagement. 38.0% agree, and only 6.0% strongly agree that they have the resources needed to complete their work, suggesting that a moderate number of staff are willing to go above and beyond to ensure work completion. However, 45% either disagree or strongly disagree, indicating a possible lack of motivation or resources to fully engage in their tasks. 52.2% agree or strongly agree that they have the resources needed to complete their work.

However, 40.8% disagree or strongly disagree, showing that many staff members feel under-resourced, which may hinder their productivity and job performance. 49.5% of the staff feel they meet expectations, but 45.3% disagree or strongly disagree. This suggests a significant portion of the workforce may feel they are falling short of expectations, possibly due to workload or resource limitations.

Job Satisfaction: The majority of staff (45% agree, 36.8% strongly agree) express job satisfaction, indicating that most academic staff find fulfilment in their work. Only a small percentage (15.2%) express dissatisfaction, suggesting overall positive job sentiment among the majority: 43.5% agree and 25.7% strongly agree, indicating that nearly 70% of the academic staff are satisfied with their jobs. However, 22.1% express dissatisfaction, showing there is still room for improvement in job satisfaction across the board. 48.3% agree and 20.0% strongly agree, indicating that a majority of academic staff enjoy working at OOU. Still, 27.2% either disagree or strongly disagree, suggesting that a notable minority may be discontent with their work environment.

52.3% agree and 11.7% strongly agree that they would recommend their job to others, signalling that the majority view academia positively. However, 33.3% (disagree or strongly disagree) may hesitate to recommend the job, which could reflect concerns about job satisfaction or career prospects in academia. 45% of respondents agree and 14.5% strongly agree that they would recommend their job to others, indicating that the majority find personal satisfaction in their work. However, 34.4% express dissatisfaction, which could relate to workload pressure, non-recognition, or other job-related issues.

Job satisfaction is generally positive, with a majority liking their job and feeling proud of their affiliation with the university. However, dissatisfaction with the administration and concerns about job resources and expectations may be contributing to lower energy and enthusiasm levels for some staff. These findings suggest that improving resource allocation, workload management, and leadership communication could further enhance job satisfaction, productivity, and energy among academic staff.

Table 3
Effect of Management Support on Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff of OOU

Model One $y_1 = a_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \mu$	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**F**	**Sig.**
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
(Constant)	1.065	0.298	.808	3.569	.000
Management Support	0.536	.004		35.321	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
b. R= .808 R^2= .653 P<0.05

Effect of Management Support on Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff of Olabisi Onabanjo University.

Table 3 is based on a linear regression analysis examining the effect of management support on job satisfaction among academic staff of Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU). The regression model can be expressed as:
y1=a0+β1x1+μy_1 = a_0 + \beta_1x_1 + \muy1=a0+β1x1+μ
Where:
y1y_1y1 = Job Satisfaction (dependent variable)
x1x_1x1 = Management Support (independent variable)
a0a_0a0 = constant or intercept
β1\beta_1β1 = regression coefficient (slope)
μ\muμ = error term.

The constant of 1.065 means that when management support is zero, the baseline level of job satisfaction among academic staff is predicted to be 1.065. This is the intercept of the regression line and represents the starting point of job satisfaction without management support. The unstandardized coefficient (B = 0.536) shows the strength of the relationship between management support and job satisfaction. For every unit increase in management support, job satisfaction is expected to increase by 0.536 units, holding other factors constant. This positive coefficient indicates a direct, positive relationship between management support and job satisfaction. That is, higher levels of management support tend to increase job satisfaction.

The R^2 value of 0.653 means that 65.3% of the variation in Job Satisfaction is explained by Management Support. This is a relatively high value, suggesting that management support is a strong predictor of job satisfaction among academic staff. The remaining 34.7% of the variation in job satisfaction could be attributed to other factors not included in this model. The F-statistic of 35.321 with a p-value of 0.000 indicates that the overall model is statistically significant. This means that the regression model, including Management Support, significantly explains variations in Job Satisfaction. A p-value of less than 0.05 confirms that the relationship between Management Support and Job Satisfaction is not due to random chance and is statistically significant.

The R-value of 0.808 suggests a strong positive correlation between Management Support and Job Satisfaction. This indicates a strong association between the two variables. The results of this analysis show that Management Support has a significant and positive effect on Job Satisfaction among academic staff at OOU. The model explains a large portion (65.3%) of the variance in job satisfaction, and the strong positive relationship suggests that improvements in management support could lead to higher job satisfaction levels among academic staff. The statistical significance of the model reinforces the reliability of these findings

.

Table 4
Effect of Management Support on Performance among Academic Staff of OOU

Model $y_1 = a_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \mu$	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	F	Sig.
(Constant)	5.509	0.432		12.762	.000
Management Support	0.133	.006	0.679		.000

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Staff Performance
b. R= .679 R^2= .461 P<0.05

Effect of Management Support on Performance among Academic Staff of Olabisi Onabanjo University

The analysis in Table 4 focuses on the relationship between management support and academic staff performance at Olabisi Onabanjo University, using multiple statistical measures to explain the impact. The key findings show a positive and significant effect, supported by various statistical values:

Regression Coefficient (β = 0.133): The regression coefficient indicates the magnitude of change in staff performance for each unit increase in management support. With a positive β value, the result implies that higher levels of management support lead to improved staff performance. The β coefficient shows that for every one-unit increase in management support, staff performance increases by 0.133 units. This suggests that staff performance is responsive to management support interventions.

F-statistic ($F = 12.76, p < 0.05$): The F-statistic tests the overall significance of the regression model. The high F-value of 12.76, along with the p-value less than 0.05, indicates that the model is statistically significant. This means that management support is a significant predictor of academic staff performance, and the likelihood that this result is due to chance is very low. Therefore, management support plays a critical role in shaping staff performance outcomes.

Correlation Coefficient (R = 0.679): The correlation coefficient, R, reflects the strength of the relationship between management support and staff performance. An R-value of 0.679 indicates a strong and positive relationship. This suggests that management support is closely related to performance outcomes—when support increases, performance is likely to increase as well.

Coefficient of Determination ($R^2 = 0.461$): The R^2 value shows how much of the variation in staff performance can be explained by management support. With $R^2 = 0.461$, approximately 46.1% of the changes in staff performance are attributable to management support. This highlights that while management support is a major contributor to performance, other factors (accounting for the remaining 53.9%) are also influencing staff performance

The results show that management support is an essential determinant of staff performance at Olabisi Onabanjo University, contributing to nearly half of the performance variations. However, the unexplained portion suggests room for exploring other factors, such as faculty motivation, workload, and access to professional development opportunities. The positive constant value also implies that while staff are inherently driven to perform, strategic management interventions can further boost their productivity and effectiveness. The F-statistic demonstrates the overall significance of the regression model, with an F-value of 12.76 and a p-value less than 0.05. These results confirm that management support is a statistically significant predictor of staff performance (Field, 2018). In other words, the observed relationship is not due to random chance but rather reflects a meaningful impact of management support on academic outcomes.

Discussion

The regression analysis examined the effect of workplace conditions concerning management support on job performance, job satisfaction and general well-being of academic staff at Olabisi Onabonjo University (OOU) in Ogun State. The findings suggest that management support is critical in influencing job satisfaction, as indicated by various statistical parameters.

The unstandardised coefficient (B = 0.536) is crucial as it quantifies the relationship between management support and job satisfaction. A positive coefficient indicates that with every unit increase in management support, job satisfaction is expected to increase by 0.536 units while holding other factors constant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019; Field, 2018). This suggests a direct and positive correlation between management support and job satisfaction, meaning higher management support leads to increased job satisfaction among academic staff.

The model's R^2 value of 0.653 indicates that 65.3% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by management support (Cohen et al., 2013). This is a relatively high explanatory power, underscoring the significance of management support as a predictor of job satisfaction. However, the remaining 34.7% of the variation in job satisfaction could be attributed to other factors not included in the model. The p-value of 0.00 confirms that the relationship between management support and job satisfaction is not due to random chance, reinforcing the reliability of the results (Pallant, 2020).

Regression analysis, F-statistics, and correlation measurements were used to evaluate the relationship between academic staff performance and managerial assistance at Olabisi Onabanjo University (OOU). The findings show that manager assistance significantly affects employee performance. This result is consistent with Armstrong & Taylor's (2020) previous research that highlights the value of supportive management in raising employee performance. As a result, management actions including resource provision, staff grievance resolution and feedback are essential for increasing academic output. Strong management systems are essential to employee effectiveness, especially in educational contexts, according to Bingham & Pitts (2021).

According to studies by Duyan & Yıldız (2018), academic staff members frequently react favourably to settings where management is involved and encouraging, which in turn increases their output. According to the R2 value of 0.461, 46.1% of the variation in staff performance can be attributed to management support. This illustrates how different factors affect performance outcomes even when managerial assistance is a crucial component. The remaining 53.9% of performance variation may be explained by elements including institutional policies, professional development, and individual motivation (Duyan & Yıldız, 2018). Consequently, even while management support is important, it is not enough to completely account for the variation in academic achievement.

The study emphasizes how important management support is in determining the effectiveness of OOU's academic staff. Although managerial support accounts for around 46.1% of the performance variability, other factors, such as institutional and individual characteristics, also play a role. This study therefore recommends that OOU management should look into workload optimisation and professional development to consistently improve employee performance. The large association values and positive regression coefficient show that, even if academic staff members are intrinsically motivated, strategic management support would greatly increase employee output. This is consistent with Kuforiji & Tobi's (2022) assertion that supportive management practices, such as reducing anxiety-inducing factors like high workload and lack of growth opportunities, can lead to improved employee output.

Conclusion

The study highlights how crucial workplace conditions are to job satisfaction/performance of academia, in relation to managerial support. According to the findings, there is a significant positive correlation between employee performance and managerial support, with management support accounting for 46.1% of the variation in performance outcomes. This highlights how important it is to create a friendly environment where academic staff members may get the support, guidance, and feedback they require to be successful in their roles. It has been shown that managerial practices such as listening to staff

members, allowing for flexibility in work schedules, providing educational help, and providing adequate institutional support raise job satisfaction and, thus, improve performance.

Although a key component of employee productivity is management assistance, the study also points out that other elements including institutional regulations, professional development opportunities, and individual motivation have a high impact on performance. These additional factors suggest that a holistic approach is necessary to support the best academic outcomes, as they account for 53.9% of the performance variance.

By suggesting the creation of an atmosphere that promotes academic achievement and staff well-being through management support, which induces work satisfaction and performance, this study offers valuable information to university administrators who wish to increase faculty members' effectiveness at work.

References

Akinwale, O. E., & George, O. J. (2020). Work environment and job satisfaction among nurses in government tertiary hospitals in Nigeria. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 14(1), 71-92. https://www.emerald.com.

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.

Asongu, A. S & Tchamyou, V. S, (2020). Human capital, knowledge creation, knowledge diffusion, institutions and economic incentives: South Korea versus Africa, *Contemporary Social Science, Taylor & Francis Journals*, 15(1), 26-47, https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3702046.

Bingham, L. B., & Pitts, D. (2021). *Public management and performance: Research directions*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23276665.2023.2176333.

Chankseliani, M., Qoraboyev, I., & Gimranova, D. (2021). Higher education contributing to local, national, and global development: new empirical and conceptual insights. *Higher Education*, 81(1), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00565-8.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2013). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioural sciences* (3rd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. www.psypress.com/9780805822236.

Duyan, M., & Yıldız, S. M. (2018). The effect of leader-member exchange on job performance of academic staff: Empirical evidence from higher education institutions. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(2), 1129-1136. https://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/5162.

Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3504991.

Goldin, C. (2024). Human capital. In Handbook of cliometrics (pp. 353-383). Cham: Springer International Publishing. DOI: 10.47577/business.v8i.11520.

Judge, T. A., Zhang, S. C., & Glerum, D. R. (2020). Job satisfaction. Essentials of job attitudes and other workplace psychological constructs. *Journal of Society for Human resources management* 207-241. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346547946_Job_Satisfaction.

Kitsios, F., & Kamariotou, M. (2021). Job satisfaction behind motivation: An empirical study in public health workers. *Heliyon*, 7(4) 71-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06857

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001316447003000308

Kuforiji, A. A., & Tobi, A. A. (2022). Influence of Employee's Anxiety on Human Factor Dimensions and Successful Change Implementation: Evidence from Nigeria. *Kelaniya Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(1). https://kjhrm.sljol.info/articles/10.4038/kjhrm.v17i1.91.

Ortan, F., Simut, C., & Simut, R. (2021). Self-efficacy, job satisfaction and teacher well-being in the K-12 educational system. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(23), 12763. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph182312763

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students* (6th edit.) Harlow, England: Pearson Education

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.

Yanchovska, I. (2021). The relationship between job satisfaction and individual performance of IT employees. *Proceedings International Conference on Innovations in Science and Education pp* 142 – 148 (Economics and Business) https://doi.org/10.12955/peb.v2.267.

Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K.Y., Nassani, A.A. and Haffar, M., 2022. Impact of employees' workplace environment on employees' performance: a multi-mediation model. Frontiers in public health, 10, p.890400. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9136218/.