INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
Banjoko, Simbo Adenuga

DETERMINANTS OF EMPLOYMENT SECTOR CHOICE OF NIGERIAN STUDENTS

The Ohio State University

University Microfilms International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PH.D. 1982
PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark √.

1. Glossy photographs or pages ______
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print ______
3. Photographs with dark background ______
4. Illustrations are poor copy ______
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy ______
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page ______
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ______
8. Print exceeds margin requirements ______
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine ______
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print ______
11. Page(s) ________ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) ________ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered ________. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages ______
15. Other ____________________________________________________________
DETERMINANTS OF EMPLOYMENT SECTOR CHOICE
OF NIGERIAN STUDENTS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Simbo Adenuga Banjoko, B.Sc., M.B.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
1982

Reading Committee:
Professor Robert C. Miljus
Professor Anthony Campagna
Professor Steve Hills

Approved By

Robert C. Miljus
Adviser
Department of Business Administration
Dedicated to the memory of my mother who sacrificed so much for my education, but died too early to reap the fruits of her labor.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

In bringing this dissertation to its final form, I am greatly indebted to many people. My academic advisor, Professor Robert C. Miljus has been extremely helpful in providing the necessary counsel and in guiding and monitoring every phase of my academic program. I sincerely enjoyed studying under his supervision.

I am also grateful to Professor Anthony Campagna for all the encouragement he gave me. On many occasions when my spirit seemed low, a word or two with him would reactivate my spirit. He showed an incredible concern for my academic and personal problems.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Steve Hills who made a very strong impact on my methodology chapter. He extensively broadened my knowledge of research methodology. I would also like to thank Professor Jim Ginter for his constructive comments and suggestions on my Chapter IV.

My love and appreciation go to my wife, Bisi, for the lonely moments she endured and for her deep understanding of the demands of a graduate program. Both my sister, Mrs. Adebusola Odebunmi and my daughters, Tolulase and Oluwatosin suffered a long period of separation. I sincerely thank them for their patience and continued prayer. I apologize to my little son, Olubode, for the numerous occasions I had to lock him out of my reading room in order to get this dissertation completed in good time.

iii
Above all, I thank my Lord and Creator for His mercy. Without His grace, I could not have been able to see the four walls of a university.
VITA

July 24, 1944 ........................................ Born - Ijebu-Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria

1972 ......................................................... B.Sc. (Hons.), Business Administration University of Lagos, Nigeria

1973-1974 .......................................... Graduate Assistant, Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Nigeria

1974-1975 ........................................... M.B.A., School of Business Administration, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

1976-1978 ........................................... Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos, Nigeria

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Manpower and Industrial Relations. Professors Robert C. Miljus and Anthony F. Campagna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT................................................................. iii
VITA........................................................................................ iv
LIST OF TABLES................................................................. viii
LIST OF FIGURES.................................................................... ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION.............................................................................. 1

Purpose of the Study................................................................. 5
Statement of the Problem......................................................... 6
Justification for the Study......................................................... 9
Overview of the Study............................................................. 11

II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE............................ 12

Holland's Theory of Vocational Choice................................. 12
Super's Self-Concept Theory................................................... 15
Ginzberg, Ginzburg, Axelrad and Herman's
Theory of Occupational Choice............................................. 17
Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Organization
Choice..................................................................................... 18
Behling, Labovitz and Garner Organizational
Choice Theories................................................................. 19
Sector Choice Conceptual Model............................................ 21
Summary of Review of Literature......................................... 43

III. METHODOLOGY................................................................. 45

Specificification of Research Variables................................. 45
Operational Definitions of Key Research
Variables................................................................................ 46
Research Instrument................................................................ 51
Measurement.......................................................................... 52
Procedure................................................................................. 55

vi
Techniques of Statistical Analysis................................. 56  
Research Models ................................................................. 57  
Statement of Hypothesis.......................................................... 57  

IV. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA.............. 59

Description of Study Population............................................ 59  
Sample Selection................................................................. 60  
Subject's Descriptive Data..................................................... 61  
Research Findings................................................................. 67  
Hypothesis Testing................................................................. 83  

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.................. 88

Interpretation of Major Research Findings............................ 90  
Conclusions............................................................................ 92  
Recommendations..................................................................... 97  
Future Research....................................................................... 98  

APPENDIXES

A. Data Collection Instrument.............................................. 101  
B. Sample Letters to Government Departments....................... 112  
C. Salary Grade Levels in Public Sector................................. 117  
D. Inter-Industry Comparison of Changes in Wage Rates and Regular Allowances......................................................... 118  
E. Comparative Analysis of Fringe Benefits in the Civil Service and the Private Sector................................................... 127  
F. Respondents' Classification Results.................................... 130  

BIBLIOGRAPHY............................................................................. 132  

vii
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage Distribution of Respondents in Each Field of Study</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age/Sex Percentage Distribution</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parents' (or Fathers') Occupational Distribution</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parents' (or Fathers') Place of Work</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Distribution of Fathers' Years of Formal Education</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students' Distribution by Type of Sponsorship</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Statistically Significant Discriminant Variables (First Model)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Statistically Significant Discriminant Variables (Second Model)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respondents' Occupational Value Ranking</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Overall Test of Equality of Group Means</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rotated Correlations Between Canonical Discriminant Functions and Discriminating Variables</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Percentage Distribution of the Relative Attractiveness of Selected Predictor Variables in Public and Private Sector Jobs</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Impacts of Federal Government Exmployment Quota Policy on Respondents' Sector Choice</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>O'Neil et al. modified model of occupational choice.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Occupational and Employment Sector Choice Model</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective transition from school to the world of work, especially to a job environment which is congruent with the individual's value-orientations and expectations, is a major concern of many students. Because of the inseparable nature of work satisfaction from total life satisfaction, the choice of a work career where one can participate in a role that best suits the individual becomes a critical life decision. Apart from the fact that work represents an important avenue for economic gratification, it has wider implications for diverse aspects of one's life. From the viewpoint of an individual, power and status in society and the esteem in which one is held are the products of where he works, what type of work he does and how well he performs. To many people a well paid job could help satisfy individual aspirations for power and status.

Opinions vary among individuals as to their perceptions of pay or other financial benefits as the most significant factor in any job consideration. However, there is little doubt that pay represents one

---

of the most objective and quantifiable measures for ranking job attractiveness. In view of Rosenberg's contention that

the enjoyment of material goods and services, and
the opportunity to follow a characteristic style
of life hinges largely on the remuneration one
receives from work,

it is expected that for most individuals, occupational or job choice
could hardly be made without due consideration for the anticipated
flow of remunerations from that occupation or job.

While good pay may help in maintaining an expected standard of
living, it does not necessarily ensure job satisfaction by itself.
In fact, many theories of job satisfaction classify pay as a
dissatisfier. Thus, in trying to choose an occupation or a job in
which an individual can optimize his job satisfaction, increasing
attention is being focussed on nonmonetary factors.

---

2 M. Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free

3 See for example: F. Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman, The
E. E. Lawler, Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychologica-

4 Studies that have emphasized the influence of nonmonetary factors
include: William F. Glueck, "Decision Making: Organization
Choice," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 27, 1974, p. 77-93; W. L.
Slocum, Sociological Aspects of Occupational Choice," The
American Journal of Economic and Sociology, January 1959,
p. 139-153; John P. Wanous, "Organizational Entry: Newcomers
84, No. 4, 1977, p. 601-618.
Rosenburg, for example, has also emphasized the influence of other non-monetary factors in any occupation or job choice decision. He believed that "many people derive enormous satisfaction from a job environment that permits the exercise of their initiative and draws out their highest potentialities."\(^5\) Bowman and Norman claimed that the environments of private and public sector jobs differ with respect to the opportunities and challenges they offer to their employees or prospective job seekers.\(^6\)

Consistent with Soelberg's conclusion on college students' job choice process, it is generally believed that students' choice of job in either the private and public sector would reflect their assessment of opportunities and challenges in each of these sectors.\(^7\) Unfortunately, the assessment may often be based on incomplete information or the effectiveness of window dressing efforts that can be mounted by both private and public employers. For example, Behling et al.'s Contact Theory of Organizational Choice explains how individual's decision to work for a particular organization may be made on the impression created by the recruiter on the first day of contact.\(^8\) Rarely do job seekers have complete information on which to base their choice.

---


Not much empirical study of a comparative analysis of the problems and prospects of public and private sector employment has been reported in the literature. However, if much reliance is to be placed on Miller's conclusion that public employment is "undemanding, bureaucratic and requiring only minimally competent people," many highly talented people could be scared away from public service. This trend could result in serious implications for the quality and efficiency of public service particularly in Nigeria.

Conversely, Hinchliffe observed that even though the private sector offers the attraction of better remuneration and opportunities for challenging jobs compared to public sector, relationships in private organizations may be very impersonal. He expressed the fear that an individual who is lured by an attractive salary might end up becoming an anonymous cog in a huge corporate machine. This observation could significantly affect an individual decision to work in the private sector.

It is within this contrasting framework that most graduating students must commit themselves to working for either the "bureaucratic" public employer or the "impersonal" private employer.

---


Purpose of the Study

In view of the paucity of research studies on how and on what basis students discriminate between public and private sector jobs, the purpose of this study is to identify and examine the relevant factors that influence individual's choice of job in either of the two sectors. Toward this end, this study makes two basic and fundamental assumptions:

1) That job remuneration for comparable skills are held constant across all sectors. In view of the economist model which assumes that a rational jobseeker would maximize his net gain by choosing the higher paid job, this control variable is necessary in order to avoid a skewed outcome.

2) That availability of jobs in both sectors is also held constant. By controlling for the availability of jobs in both sectors, it is possible to remove the effect of a student having to take a job where he finds one rather than where he would choose to work.

Having held these two control variables constant, attempts were made to examine the impact of other variables such as previous work experience, family (or father's) influence, perceived job security, perceived opportunity for creativity and for exercise of one's initiative, and the effect of employer's image or status on students' choice of public or private sector jobs. The effects of certain government policies; e.g., the Nigerian Federal Government
policy designed to "reflect the federal character" in appointments and promotions and the controversial issue of car loan, will also be examined.

Statement of the Problem

Nigeria is presently in the process of massive industrialization. The country's orientation towards a mixed economy requires a balanced development of both her private and public sectors. Yet, the post-independent Nigeria has been grappling with the problem of recruiting and retaining the required number of highly skilled manpower necessary for the implementation of her massive development programs.

Mounting concern over the falling quality of public service in both the federal and state level in Nigeria has been noticeable during the past two decades following the attainment of national independence. The poor performance of the post office, public transport, telephone, electricity, water and other public utilities are believed to be due to the inability of the various state and federal governments to attract and retain qualified personnel. Even though no research effort has been directed to this issue, the problem is not unrelated to the nature and policies of public employment. Unfortunately government's response has always been in the form of raising

---


salaries and setting up wages review boards with the hope that workers would not only be motivated with higher pay but highly skilled manpower could be attracted as well into the public service. The outcomes of such actions have not been impressive in terms of the problems they were intended to solve primarily because the policy-makers lack a proper understanding of the dynamics of individual's job choice process. A solid understanding of the psychological process of individual job choice as it reflects personality and value orientations could have enabled public policy-makers to be more efficient in attracting, motivating and retaining adequate and highly skilled manpower.

While the employment opportunities in the private sector (particularly in private companies) may appear more attractive in many respects, it is believed that relationships in these organizations may be very impersonal. Also, there may be many people who would prefer the "luxury" of the public service to the "nerve-racking" and "profit-driven" atmosphere of the private sector.

It is important to highlight the various influences that shape students' value-orientations and expectations which affect their

---

13 Since the attainment of independence in October 1960, the numerous salaries and wages review boards set up by the Federal Government include:
- Morgan Salaries & Wages Review Commission (1964)
- Udoji Salaries & Wages Review Commission (1975)
attitudes and choice of employment sector. In this regard, efforts will be directed to finding answers to the following specific research questions:

1) On what basis or criteria do students evaluate the attractiveness of jobs in either the public or private sector?

2) Is opportunity to make a good deal of money the most important consideration for choosing a particular occupation, job, or for deciding to work in a particular sector?

3) Are non-monetary considerations more significant than pay in individual's occupational or job choice? If so, which non-monetary factors are more important?

4) With regard to pay and other important non-monetary factors, is the public service less competitive vis-à-vis the private sector?

It is expected that the answers to the above questions would not only enhance our current knowledge of occupational, job or employment sector choice but also could have significant policy implications for both the public and private sector employers.
Justification for the Study

Substantial research efforts have examined the determinants of occupational choice-making with comparatively little or no attention on the determinants of individual's choice in regard to working in either the public or the private sector. Apart from pay consideration, there is no clear insight as to why a person would choose to work in one sector of the economy rather than the other. As Vroom put it,

little is known about the factors which affect peoples' decisions to work for the government, private industry, educational institutions, or social agencies, let alone company X rather than company Y.

Vroom maintained that the absence of a large body of sound empirical study on individual job choice process has restricted much understanding in this area.

Lawler et al. also noted this apparent vacuum in the literature by contending that the research on the psychological dynamics of the

---


job choice decision is almost entirely missing and that very little is known about how individuals go about deciding which jobs to apply for and which jobs to take.  

In view of this apparent vacuum in the literature, an investigation into the factors influencing individual's job or organizational choice will be a fruitful direction for research. Apart from its expected contribution to the literature, the outcome of this study could be of tremendous interest to both public and private employers. Just as occupational choice is made on the basis of some values, interests and capabilities, the choice as to which sector one finds more appealing is also presumably made on the basis of certain values. An examination of those values and the extent to which they influence behavior and choice of sector might be helpful to both public and private employers in terms of its policy implications. For example, the research findings could demonstrate the need for public service reforms or the need for the establishment of career planning, counseling and job placement programs for Nigerian undergraduate students.

---

Overview of the Study

Chapter II deals with the review of the pertinent literature and the discussion of the theoretical framework of this study.

In Chapter III, the methodological approaches are presented. The research variables are operationally defined and the relevant statistical techniques used in the study are specified.

Chapter IV presents the data analysis, the research findings and the discussions of the findings.

Chapter V covers the summary of the study and its findings. Relevant conclusions as deduced from the research findings are presented. Recommendations for policy implications as well as for future research are suggested.
Chapter II
REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

The choice of employment sector can be considered as a logical extension of an individual's occupational choice. Occupational choice-making process has been the focus of numerous studies in the recent past. Underlying these empirical studies are some theories which permit greater insights into the determinants of occupational choice and which are also useful in explaining individual's behavior with respect to the choice of employment sectors.

Holland's Theory of Vocational Choice

Holland's theory of vocational choice provides a framework for understanding how an individual matches his personality with the available job environment. The theory rests on the assumption that vocational interest is "one aspect of what is commonly called 'personality' and that by describing an individual's vocational

---

interests the individual's personality is also described.\(^2\) Holland classifies individuals into six personality types: social, artistic, realistic, intellectual, conventional and enterprising. He argues that individuals having each of these personality types would seek job environments that are congruent with their personalities. He contends that

\[\text{people search for environments that will let them exercise their skills and abilities, express their attitudes and values, and take on agreeable problems and roles}.\]\(^3\)

The implication of Holland's theory is that job success and satisfaction rest on the extent to which one can find a job environment that is congruent with one's personality orientations. Thus, an individual with a social or people-oriented personality is most likely to discriminate between public and private sector jobs on the basis of which one provides him with avenues for satisfying his social values.

An artistic individual, according to Holland, is one who is usually very expressive, original and introspective. Students possessing this personality type would choose to work in either public or private sector depending on where they perceive greater opportunities for exercising their creativity and initiative. If the private sector


is perceived as providing a better avenue for creativity as shown by Shuster,\(^4\) it is most likely that many Nigerian students with artistic personalities would find the private sector more attractive.

The above theoretical framework of Holland is helpful in understanding an individual's job decision-making process as it relates to his personality trait. French substantiated Holland's theory by contending that "a lack of fit between individual's personality and the environment could result in job dissatisfaction, psychological strain and stress when people found themselves in environments with incompatible position demands."\(^5\)

Despite the demonstrated validity of Holland's theory as shown by Horton and Walsh\(^6\) and Ward and Walsh,\(^7\) the fact that there are small differences between Holland's personality types tends to weaken his theory. Besides, an individual could, according to Holland's classification, possess two personality types. In admitting this inherent limitation of his theory, Holland warns that

---


the reader is reminded that many of these attributes... differ only slightly from type to type.®

In a situation where an individual has, for example, artistic and enterprising personalities, Holland's theory fails to indicate which personality type will have more influence on his choice of sector or organization. Besides these limitations, the validity of generalizing Holland's findings to other populations particularly in developing countries remains to be proven.

Super's Self-Concept Theory

The impact of an individual's perception of oneself on the type of occupational or job environment in which one would choose to work has been demonstrated by Super's self-concept theory. According to Super, self-concept is

the individual's picture of himself ..., the perceived self is generally a picture of the self in some role, some situations, in a position performing some set of functions or in some web of relationship. 9

According to Starishersky and Maltin, 10 self-concept theory as used by counseling psychologists is designed to predict how people would

---


10 Ibid., p. 33.
reflect their inner-self in their occupational choices. In this regard, Super's self-concept theory could provide a valuable insight into how Nigerian students see themselves in relation to which employment environment they perceive as congruent with their individual self-concepts.

In implementing his self-concept, a student whose picture of himself is that of an independent, self-reliant and enterprising fellow would be more inclined to engage in self-owned business or private practice. Another student whose image of himself is that of an administrator with orientation and interests in public service would most likely find the public sector more satisfying. In each of these situations, the self-concept theory provides a useful framework for understanding how an individual's picture of himself, what and where he wants to be could influence his choice of job in either public or private sector. The implementation of individual self-concept is significant in view of Super's conclusion that

work satisfactions and life satisfactions
depend upon the extent to which the individual
finds adequate outlets for his abilities,
interests, personality traits, and values;
they depend upon his establishment in a type of
work, a work situation, and a way of life in
which he can play the kind of role which his
growth and exploratory experiences have led him
to consider congenial and appropriate.\textsuperscript{11}

Tom has investigated the relationship of self-concept theory to student's organizational choice. He concluded that there is a significant relationship between student's self-image and organizational attractiveness since preference for an organization varies directly with "the degree of acceptance of the organizational image as self-descriptive." This implies that most people prefer those organizations with images similar to their own.

The major problem with the self-concept theory is how an individual's self-concept can be reliably measured in view of its elusive nature.

Ginzberg, Ginzburg, Axelrad and Herman's Theory

Ginzberg et al. had earlier theorized that the process of occupational decision making involves a compromise between an individual's needs and the realities which impinge upon him. In a reformulation of their theory, they maintained that occupational choice is "a lifelong process of decision-making in which the individual attempts to find the optimal fit between his career preparations, goals and the realities of the world of work." By


emphasizing the need to strike a balance between many factors in any job or occupational choice consideration, Ginzberg theory tends to destroy the adventitious or 'accident' theory, which claims that occupational choice is made purely on the basis of chance.

Since decision-making involves a consideration of many alternatives, it is conceivable in the light of Ginzberg's theory that student's choice of public or private sector job would be based on an optimal consideration of relevant factors. Unfortunately, Ginzberg's theory fails to specify how the process of achieving the "optimal fit" is arrived at.

Vroom's Expectancy Theory of Organizational Choice

Vroom's expectancy theory of organizational choice provides another significant insight into how students choose which organization to work for in either the public or private sector. Vroom's expectancy theory suggests that people base their organizational choice on 'expected value' calculations of all the probable prospects that may result from their membership in a particular organization. In a study of 49 graduate students of industrial management at Carnegie-Mellon University, Vroom found that 76% of the students based their choice of organizations on an instrumentality-goal index.\(^{15}\) This index which forms the basis of an index of organizational

attractiveness is a function of the sum of the multiplicative combination of the valences (V) of decision outcomes and the prospect of expectancy (E) that a particular decision will lead to the occurrence of that outcome. Thus:

\[ \text{Index of Organizational Attractiveness} = f(EVE) \]

Preferences for organizations are according to each organization score on the index of attractiveness.

In support of the expectancy theory approach, Lawler et al. found that 80% of individual decision to work for an organization in either the public or private sector was based on the index of attractiveness obtained. In view of its established usefulness, the expectancy theory approach can be a significant guide to understanding how Nigerian students' ranking of the expected outcomes of working in the private or public sector could affect their ultimate choice.

**Behling, Labovitz and Gainer Organizational Choice Theories**

Three related theories of organizational choice process have been developed by Behling, Labovitz and Gainer. The theories are classified as objective factor theory, subjective factor theory and critical contact theory. Although they incorporate most of the important elements of the occupational theories discussed so far, they relate

---

more specifically to organizational or job choice than occupational choice.

**Objective Factor Theory:** This theory views the organizational or job choice of most individuals "basically as a process of objective comparison of measurable job factors such as remuneration, opportunity for advancement or the nature of work performed."17 Each of these job factors is weighted in terms of its relative importance to the individual and the outcome is used in constructing an index of desirability.

**Subjective Factor Theory:** Rather than basing job choice decision on the evaluation of objective and measurable factors, this theory views job choice as being made purely on a highly personal and emotional basis. For example, an individual choice of job may reflect his desire to identify or relate with the subjective image of a particular organization or sector.

**Critical Contact Theory:** This theory asserts that many students usually are unable to make meaningful differentiation among many employers and their competing offers. Consequently, they tend to base their decision on external variables like the appearance and behavior of the recruiter or the physical facilities of the organization.

These theories provide a comprehensive theoretical base which could be useful in understanding how Nigerian students will discriminate between public and private sector jobs.

---

The various influences on an individual's choice of employment sector can be conceptualized as comprising of individual, familial, organizational, social and economic factors. In addition to these factors, as noted in the preceding theories, individual's choice of job in either private or public sector involves an assessment of the relative opportunities offered by each sector: pay and other benefits, security of job and income, creative job environment, and the perceived chances for rapid advancement.

In an attempt to provide a broader framework for understanding the various factors that influence an individual's career choice, O'Neil et al. have developed a model that incorporates variables that are considered to be statistically significant in a career decision-making process. Figure 1 shows the modified version of their model. The career decision making process is depicted in the model as a product of six major factors: familial, situational, individual, societal, socio-economic and psycho-social emotional factors.

Figure 1. Factors influencing career decision making process.

Familial Factors: Since the choice of a career involves the commitment of substantial effort, money and a reasonable period of one's lifetime to a particular endeavor, parental guidance is always very crucial in ensuring appropriate career choice. As a result, parents have been recognized as influential agents in the process of an individual's career choice.19

Situational Factors: Career choice can be made purely on the basis of chance events or some situational constraints (e.g., available resource for pursuing a particular career). The "chance" or "accident" theory of occupational choice has been primarily associated with Miller and Form.20 Critics have categorically rejected the "accident" theory of occupational choice as "over-simplified and naive."21

Individual Factors: An individual's choice of a particular occupation or career is expected to be a reflection of his abilities, interests, attitudes, achievement needs and his self expectancies. Unless individual's potentials and interests towards a particular career are sufficiently adequate, and attitudes towards it and its expected

rewards are reasonably positive, the chances of a successful career can be severely impaired. As a result, individual factors are very significant in a career decision making process.

**Societal Factors:** Environmental influences like peer group, mentor, or mass media also provide significant inputs into the individual's career choice process.

**Socioeconomic Factors:** An individual's choice of a particular occupation could be significantly influenced by an anticipated social class. For example, many people who chose medical, legal or academic careers might have been influenced by a desire to become members of the elite or highly regarded social class. Also, an individual's assessment of the relative balance or imbalance between the supply and demands of jobs relevant to a particular career may be an important factor for choosing that career. In Nigeria, for example, the surplus supply of legal practitioners relative to demands is believed to be turning many interested people away from choosing a legal career.

Another major economic influence on the choice of a particular occupation or career is the expected stream of earnings and benefits from that occupation. An individual's choice of an occupation could be based on the discounted value of the flow of earnings from that occupation. With many individuals, this economic calculus could be so important as to overshadow other influences shown in the model.
Psycho-Social Emotional Factors: Psycho-social emotional factors reflect the specific problem areas that may restrain an individual from entering a particular occupation. As shown in Figure 1, these factors include the individual's fear of failure or success, lack of confidence that could be attributed to deficiencies in abilities and interests in a particular career. While the influence of these factors may not be apparent as socio-economic, societal or familial factors, they do reflect the inherent concerns of many individuals where faced with their career or occupational choice making process.

In spite of the usefulness of O'Neil et al.'s model in synthesizing the various determinants of career choice, it is nevertheless inadequate in providing the required conceptual framework for understanding how such factors, or any other factors, could influence the process of sector choice. Consistent with Wanous' view of organizational choice as a further extension of occupational choice, this relationship in addition to the various factors that may determine individual's choice of employment sector are conceptualized into a model as shown in Figure 2. The determinants of occupational choice as depicted in the model are similar to some of the factors described under O'Neil et al.'s model. In this sense, Figure 2 can be regarded as an expansion of O'Neil et al.'s career choice model.

22 John P. Wanous, Organizational Entry, p. 601.
Figure 2. Occupational and employment sector choice decision model.
The determinants of sector choice can be broadly categorized as consisting of economic and non-economic forces. The economic forces include expected pay and other benefits (e.g., relative pensions schemes, vacation and sick benefits, bonus, and rate of salary increases); general economic situation; market forces affecting demand and supply for a particular skill in each sector; relative elasticity of product market for each employer under consideration; prospects for stability of employment and security of earnings; likely economic prosperity in the private or public sector; and history of labor relations in the particular companies or institutions (Federal, State and local government) being considered for employment.

The non-economic forces comprise the influences of an individual's family background and socio-economic status; field of study; source of educational financial support; contractual obligation to serve sponsors; previous working experience; perceived advancement opportunities, perceived opportunities for creative use of one's skill and aptitudes and employer's image.

Economic Influences

The essence of work lies in its ability to satisfy the personal and material needs of the individual. Mills, for example, observed that the chief meaning of work for most people "lies in income, status and power."\(^{23}\) Similarly, in commenting on the economic orientation of many

people in their job or career search, Gurko reported that
careers and indeed life experiences are
selected not necessarily on the basis of
their personal satisfaction or social
usefulness, but strictly in cash-register
terms.\(^2^4\)

According to Rosenberg,\(^2^5\) the satisfaction of a host of subsidiary wants
is dependent on the extrinsic reward of work. As a result, the choice
of career or job can hardly be made without due reference to the
expected stream of pay and benefits.

The impact of economic considerations on most important life's
decisions has been well demonstrated by classical economic theory
Economic theorists believe that as an economic man, an individual
decides on a course of action that best maximizes his total net
benefits. In choosing between a public or private sector job, it is
expected that individuals would employ this economic decision model
in their decision making process. In this regard, it is believed
that, when choosing between two job offers in the public and private
sectors, individuals would rationalize their choice on the basis of
the discounted value of the likely future earnings or expected pay
and other benefits from each of the job offers by choosing the more
attractive offer.

\(^{2^4}\) Leo Gurko, Heroes, Highbrows and the Popular Mind (New York:

\(^{2^5}\) Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Glencoe: Illinois, The
The impact of expected pay and other monetary benefits on individual's choice of job in either the private or public sector becomes much more significant when viewed against the background of most of the respondents of this study. In Nigeria as well as in most developing countries, most people are still primarily preoccupied with physiological and security needs within the context of Maslow's needs hierarchy. Since money has the greatest potential for satisfying these basic needs, it is likely that pay consideration would have a major impact on an individual sector choice.

Another economic factor that is considered likely to affect sector choice is the perceived stability of employment and security of income in each sector. This factor is shaped by a whole series of economic situations; market forces affecting demand and supply, and the elasticity of product or service market offered by each sector. In making a choice between a private and public sector job, the prospects and opportunities in each sector would have to be evaluated against the background of these economic forces.

Non-Economic Influences

Besides the likely significant impact of pay and other economic considerations, an individual's choice of sector is expected to be significantly influenced by many non-economic factors. The family, for example, has a social influence that may reinforce an individual towards a particular occupational niche or a particular employment
sector. An individual's major field of study may constrain his choice of employment sector. The various forms of students' sponsorship and the contractual obligation to serve such sponsors may restrict available avenues for most people. Previous working experience in one sector may influence current sector choice.

Sex may be a critical factor in choosing between public or private sector job. Private sector jobs, particularly in some private companies require not only long hours of work but also the need to be away from families for days or weeks on out-of-station assignments. It is likely that women with many family commitments would find such a situation very uncomfortable.

Age may influence individual's sector choice. Older people may tend to place higher premium on job security than younger people. Hence, the concern for job security may influence many people towards choosing the sector that has a better chance of guaranteeing job security.

Organizational factors like employer's status or image or the history of collective bargaining activities in a particular organization may lure or scare potential employees away from that organization. In addition, the extent to which the organizational environment (public or private) is conducive to the satisfaction of individual's value and personal orientations may be a critical factor in an individual's decision to accept a job in the public or private sector.
Most of the non-economic factors described here have been examined in many empirical studies of occupational choice and the conclusions tend to support their significant influence on individual's career or job choice as demonstrated in the succeeding sections.

Parent's (or Family) Background and Socio-Economic Status

The preponderance of research studies in the area of vocational psychology and counseling over the past few decades in the Western world have led strong support to the tremendous impact of parent's or family's background and socio-economic status on career choice of many people. Most of these studies emphasize the role of the family as an influential agency in the career choice making process of their children.

Using occupation as an index of socio-economic status, one of the early studies to investigate the relationship between parent's (or father's) occupation and children's occupational choice was conducted

---

by Form and Miller. From a study of 276 work histories of workers in Ohio, the researchers concluded that there is a strong relationship between father's occupation and the chosen occupation of the children.

Jenson and Kirchner used data obtained from census records to test the hypothesized relationship between father's occupation and children's chosen occupation. The authors concluded that "sons do in general follow their father's occupations."  

As early as 1957, Roe developed a theory of vocational choice which maintained a significant relationship between family's atmosphere, parental attitudes and children's orientation toward vocational choice. Roe theorized that if the family's atmosphere is indicative of love and cordiality, the children are likely to develop a major orientation towards others and would choose occupations which involve contact with people. On the other hand, where the parent-child relationship is that of rejection and neglect, the children are more likely to prefer a work environment that does not involve contact with others.

---

Kinnare and Pable\textsuperscript{25} investigated the effect of different family atmosphere on the occupational choice of most children. Their classification of the different family atmospheres include materialistic atmosphere, family cohesiveness, cultural stimulation and adolescent independence. They concluded that:

1. A materialistic atmosphere leads to an emphasis upon making money, accumulating goods and concern for economic security. Consequently, children reared under this atmosphere would most likely seek a job environment that tends to enhance their economic and material gratification. Job remuneration and other monetary benefits are likely to be the most significant factors in their job or sector choice.

2. Family cohesiveness would lead the children to value work for the type of condition it affords and the relationship it provides with people.

3. Children raised under a situation of cultural stimulation in which the family provides all the atmosphere for artistic, literary, and scientific exposures are likely to value scientific and creative

\begin{footnote}
\end{footnote}
work experience. For this group of children, opportunities for a creative job environment will be a significant factor in their decision to work for the government, a private company or to set up a business of their own.

4. Children who enjoy independence at home are mostly likely to seek jobs that afford some independence. As a result, jobs which have little latitude for autonomy or where established procedures and rules are to be rigidly followed (as in public service) would have less appeal to this group of people.

The above conclusions are supported by Paine, Deutsch and Smith who reported a significant correlation between college students' family background patterns which they defined in terms of family income, emphasis on discipline and values placed on material possessions, responsibility and prestige.

Oliver's study reinforced the predicted relationship between children's career orientations and parents' (or fathers') identification by demonstrating that parents' influence and interactions do affect children's career choice.

---

26 Paine et al., Family Background and Work Values, p. 321.

Despite the interesting conclusions of most of the above studies, their validity tends to be restricted to a particular cultural setting. Osipow, for example, contends that the process of career choice is so deeply imbedded in cultural and economic factors that it is unreasonable to try to develop a theory of career development without including those variables.  

Since cultural impacts on career choice varies from one country to another, generalization of the above conclusions to other cultural regions may be severely restricted.

Evidences from recent studies of occupational choice in developing countries indicate that family's background or socio-economic status may have lesser influence on children's career choice than in the United States and other European countries. In his study of ecological influences on vocational aspirations of Nigerian students, Osuji concluded that "family's socio-economic status may not be a useful factor in predicting the vocational behavior of Nigerian students." The research findings of Olayinka and Hinchliffe indicate that environmental, demographic and socio-economic determinants of vocational choice in developing countries may act in

---


29 Osuji, Patterns of Occupational Choice, p. 222.


31 Hinchliffe, Manpower Planning, p. 167.
ways different from those in highly industrialized western societies.

**Academic Field of Study**

Since organizational or sector choice is viewed as an extension of occupational choice, it is likely that a relationship may exist between student's academic fields of study and their choice of employment in private or public sector. However, the relationship is far from being direct as many intervening variables like government loan or scholarships, company's sponsorship and family loan can influence an individual's decision to work for the government, a private company, or a family's business.

In a study of students' attitudes towards public employment, Gibson and James found a significant difference in attitudes of students in different fields of study towards public employment. The authors concluded that respondents majoring in education, a career supported largely by state and local government with growing assistance from the federal level, had, as expected, the most favourable attitude towards public service of all groups surveyed.

The researchers also discovered that respondents majoring in business administration generally displayed unfavorable attitudes towards public employment. The authors observed similar attitudes among students majoring in the physical and natural sciences.

---


Delbecq and Vigen \(^{34}\) had investigated the differences in the mean prestige and preference ratings of occupations among students in different colleges or faculties. Their conclusion which is consistent with Gibson and James findings shows that students differ across academic fields of study in their preferences for jobs in public and private sectors.

In a more recent study designed to test Gibson and James conclusions, Bowman and Norman found that students majoring in education do not necessarily find public employment to be attractive.\(^{35}\) In a question designed to assess the appeal of public and private employment by college major, the authors showed that 48.2\% of the education students found public employment attractive, 40.2\% found it unattractive, and 11.5\% had no opinion. Whereas, 75.3\% of the same group of students found private employment attractive; 8.2\% did not, while 16.5\% expressed no opinion.

According to the authors' analysis, public service is more attractive to social science and humanities students than those majoring in education. As expected, business administration and related majors found private employment very appealing. This later

---


finding is consistent with the conclusions of most of the earlier studies.

Previous Working Experience

If past experiences are helpful in providing guidance for future course of action, it is likely that there could be a significant relationship between students' previous working experiences and their choice of public or private sector job. In a review of the determinants of students' attitude towards taking a career in business or public service, Steven and Stephen disclosed that

student interpersonal relationship
during their pre-college working days
or their summer or parttime job
experiences tend to affect their choice of future employment.36

Katz provided further evidence of the impact of future work experience on students' job decision making. In a study involving 323 Stanford University students, Katz observed that 22% of the students reported that "their work experience has instigated or heightened their desire to do the kind of work they experienced. About 41% claimed that their work experience had a negative influence upon them."37


This conclusion implies that if previous working experience with a particular employer, private or public, is satisfying, and barring other influences, the chances are higher that one would choose to work in such a job environment again. However, if an individual past working experience in a particular sector or organization is unimpressive, such a person would be under much pressure to look for a job in another sector that offers the possibility of a more satisfactory work experience.

Job Security

Concern for employment security in a world of general economic instability has been cited by Hinchliffe as a factor that might significantly influence a student's choice of work in either public or private sector. In a society where people cherish self-dependency, concern for job security could be translated into working for themselves (as most lawyers, physicians and businessmen do) or working in a relatively secure atmosphere of a family business.

In deciding to work for the government or a private company, available evidence indicates that the public service offers more job security. In a study designed to assess people's perception of the image of federal service, Kilpatrick, Cummings and Jennings discovered that the public service is rated much higher in terms of job security.

38 Hinchliffe, Manpower Planning, p. 168.
In a question relating to what certain groups of public service employees consider their most significant occupational value that is being maximized in their jobs, about 70% of general employees, 61% of executives, 52% of natural scientists and 60% of engineers mentioned job security. The authors concluded that

the ratings of federal employment on security are not only very high in absolute terms, but also significantly higher than the ratings given to large business on security. 39

Perceived Opportunity for Creativity and Avenues for Using One's Initiatives and Skills

Increasing evidence has surfaced to support the current thinking that most college students are now more concerned with intrinsic rather than extrinsic aspects of work. As Andrisani and Miljus indicate, individuals differ in their preferences for intrinsic versus extrinsic aspects of work. 40 It is believed that an individual's preference for certain intrinsic aspects of work and the extent to which he perceives a job as having those values may be a critical


factor in his decision to accept such a job irrespective of whether it is a public sector or private sector job.

The most widely cited aspect of the intrinsic nature of work is the opportunity for creativity and avenues for exercising one's aptitudes and skills. Stessin pointed out that the new college man is less interested in money than in "meaningful and challenging work." Norton-Taylor summed it up by saying that "in all my interviews with students, the theme 'I am concerned with doing something significant' ran through every discussion." In an occupational value ranking involving 19,693 graduating seniors, the College Placement Council observed that "opportunities to be original and creative ranked highest." Rosenberg also observed that his respondents ranked opportunity for creativity and challenging work as their highest occupational value.

In a study designed to assess the occupational preferences of African students in the United States, Adwere-Boamah found that 83.6%

44 Rosenberg, Occupational Values, p. 12.
of his respondents indicated that "an opportunity to be creative and for using their special abilities would be the most significant requirement they would look for in a job when they return home." Interestingly, only 4.4% of his total sample considered "a great deal of money" as a very important condition for considering a job as an ideal one.

In view of the substantial research evidence emphasizing the importance of opportunities for creativity and the use of one's aptitude as a critical job requirement, it is expected that this factor would be a significant discriminant variable for Nigerian students' choice of public or private sector jobs. If the conclusions of Kilpatrick et al. that "the government is seen as lagging behind the business world in providing outlets for the more dynamic motivations a potential employee may have" were to be applicable in Nigeria, many students are more likely to work for private companies or go into self-owned or family business.

Perceived Employer's Image and Job Status

Both the personality - environment matching theory of Holland and the self-concept theory of Super provide a significant theoretical

45 Adwere-Boamah, Occupational Preferences, p. 22.
46 Kilpatrick et al., Federal Image, p. 159.
47 Holland, Vocational Choice, p. 30.
48 Super, Career Development, p. 18.
base for understanding the influence of perceived employer's status and image on students' organizational and sector choice making process. Students are more likely to work for organizations or employers whose image and status are congruent with their personalities, value orientations or their self-image. 49

According to Miller, 50 the public sector has the reputation of being bureaucratic and for placing much emphasis on conformity with old established rules and procedures instead of permitting creativity in searching for new and better ways of solving national problems.

The considerable impact of an employer's reputation on students' choice is demonstrated by Neilson's study of students' attitudes toward business careers. The author found out that "about 40% of B.S. and 49% of M.B.A. students mentioned reputation as a reason for selecting a company for interview."

Summary of Review of Literature

Existing theories of occupational and job choice as developed by Holland, Super, Ginzberg et al., Vroom and Behling et al. have been helpful in understanding various factors that might influence not only

---

49 Wanous, Organizational Entry, p. 602.
50 Miller, Manpower in Public Sector, p. 50.
52 West Africa Magazine, August 6, 1979, p. 1399.
individual choice of occupation but also the choice of working either for the government, a private company, or going into self-owned business. Research evidence shows that in deciding where to work, most individuals try to match their personalities with the job environment, seek to implement their self-concepts, and attempt to achieve an optimal consideration of all relevant factors. In addition, individuals evaluate each job opportunity on the basis of an index of attractiveness.

It is believed that the decision of most Nigerian students to work in either public or private sector could be influenced, among other things, by their academic fields of study, parental's influence, previous working experience, perceived opportunity for challenging work, and the employer's image.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Having presented the conceptual framework of this study in Chapter II, this chapter deals with the research methodology. Discussions are centered on: (a) the specification and operational definition of the research variables; (b) the description of the research instrument and the procedure used; (c) the research techniques and (d) the statement of hypotheses.

Specification of the Research Variables

Since the objective of this study is to identify and examine factors that influence an individual's employment sector choice, the pertinent research variables are specified below.

Independent Variables: These include the following:

Family's background and socio-economic status  =  X_1
Student's major field of study  =  X_2
Previous working experience  =  X_3
Perceived job security in each sector  =  X_4
Perceived opportunity for creative use of one's skill and aptitude  =  X_5
Employer's image and job status  =  X_6
Sex = \(X_7\)
Age = \(X_8\)
Student's source of sponsorship = \(X_9\)
Student's contractual obligation to serve sponsors = \(X_{10}\)
Perceived advancement opportunities in each sector = \(X_{11}\)
Federal government employment quota policy = \(X_{12}\)
Relative expected pay and other benefits in each sector = \(X_{13}\)
Probability of employment in each sector = \(X_{14}\)

Dependent Variable: The dependent variable (Y) is the choice of employment in either public or private sector. The dependent variable would be examined under two situations: (a) when pay and availability of job in each sector are held constant; (b) when both pay and availability of job are not held constant. Hence the two forms of the dependent variable (Y) are as follows:

Choice of employment sector with pay and job availability held constant = \(Y_1\)
Choice of employment sector when pay and availability are not held constant = \(Y_2\)

**Operational Definition of Key Research Variables**

(a) Independent Variables: The following definitions of the predictor variables represent the framework within which the various variables are examined in this study.
Family's Background and Socio-Economic Status: The variable is defined and examined in terms of the father's socio-economic status. The approach is necessary in view of the fact that most ethnic groups in Nigeria are patriarchal. Most mothers are engaged primarily in household work and only in few cases do they head the family. Occupation and education will be used as indexes of father's socio-economic status in this study.

Students' Major Field of Study: This variable is defined as the specific academic pursuit of the respondents. It indicates, for example, whether the respondent is studying engineering, law, medicine, or education.

Previous Working Experience: This variable is operationally defined as the number of weeks, months, or years that a respondent has worked in either public or private sector prior to his or her gaining admission into the university.

Perceived Job Security in Each Sector: Job security in each sector is defined as the degree of stability of employment and security of income in each sector. This variable reflects individual's perception of the extent to which both employment and hence income are stable in each sector.

Perceived Opportunity for Creative Use of One's Skill and Aptitude: This variable is defined as the extent to which an individual perceives the expected job environment as conducive to the full and effective utilization of his skills and abilities during the course of his duties.
Employers Image and Job Status: Employers image is used in this study to reflect the relative position of each public or private employer on a continuum of favorable or unfavorable. An employer's favorable image might, for example, be attributed to his policy of equal employment opportunities for all, irrespective of tribe or ethnic origin; his support for the welfare of workers and other philanthropic activities. For the purpose of this study, the specification of an employer's image as favorable or unfavorable would be the product of the overall assessment of the employer's related policies.

Students' Source of Sponsorship: Students' source of sponsorship is defined as the institution or body responsible for financing the respondents' education. For the purpose of this study, the sources of sponsorship include government, private companies, personal or family.

Students' Contractual Obligation to Serve Their Sponsors: This variable is defined as the respondent's legal commitment to work for the institution, body or company that provides for their educational support upon their graduation from school.

Perceived Advancement Opportunities in Each Sector: This variable is defined in this study to reflect the perceived rate of promotion from one job level to the other in each sector.
Federal Government Employment Quota Policy: This variable is defined in terms of the Nigerian Federal Government policy of ethnic balancing in employment and promotions. This policy allows candidates whose tribes are currently under-represented in the federal civil service to be given first consideration in appointment and promotions over other better qualified candidates whose tribes happen to have been well represented or over-represented.

Relative Expected Pay and Other Benefits in Each Sector: This variable is defined to include expected salaries, bonuses, pensions, vacation and sick benefits in each sector.

Probability of Employment in Each Sector: This is defined in numerical terms as the likelihood that each respondent attaches to his finding a job in each sector. For example, a business student might claim an 80% probability that he would find a job with a private company, while an education student might claim only a 10% probability of his finding a job with a private company.

(b) Dependent Variable

Public Sector: Public sector employment is hereby defined as embracing employment in the service of:

- Federal Government
- Various State Governments
- Various Local Governments
Private sector employment is defined to include employment in the following:

- Private Company
- Self-owned Business
- Private Practice
- Family Business or Farm

In this study, private sector employment would be examined under two categories: (a) employment in private companies and in (b) privately-owned businesses (which comprise self-owned businesses, private practice, and family business or farm).

Empirical conclusions as reviewed in Chapter 2 have demonstrated the significant influences of some of the predictor variables included in this study on individual's job choice decisions. In view of the closely-knit family system in Nigeria, one could argue that family's influences on individual sector choice would be predominant. However, the relatively low education and rural life of most parents may seriously limit their influence on their children's choice of employment sector. As for the influence of the respondents' major fields of study, it is expected that people who are in public service related fields like nursing, medicine, or education would most likely work in the public sector. Likewise, the influence of the source of students' sponsorship would be such as to constrain students' choice towards the sector of their sponsors.
With respect to the series of organizational factors included in the model it is expected that most respondents would likely find most private employers' image more favorable than the public employers. In addition, opportunities for creative job environment are expected to be perceived as more available in the private sector than the public sector. The author expects a very weak relationship between previous working experience and employment sector since most Nigerian university students lack pre-college working experience. The need to satisfy the basic human needs and to maintain a reasonable standard of living could enhance the influence of expected pay and other benefits in individual's sector choice.

In view of the decreasing oil prices in the world market and its effect on Nigeria's revenue earnings, in addition to the country's sickening economy of the past few months, which has impaired economic activities in both public and private sectors, it is expected that considerable concern for where one could easily find a job and the stability of income and employment would be significant factors in individual's sector choice.

Research Instrument

Since this is an attitudinal study, a survey questionnaire was considered more appropriate and hence used to obtain the necessary data (See Appendix A.). Apart from focusing on the relevant research

variables, questions on personal data as well as on current policy issues in Nigeria (e.g., the issue of employment quota based on existing level of ethnic representation in the federal public service) were also included. Some of the items in the research instrument were based on the occupational value scales developed by Rosenberg\textsuperscript{2} and Kilpatrick et al.\textsuperscript{3}

**Measurement:** Most of the research variables are nominal or discrete in nature and were measured on nominal and dichotomous scales accordingly.

Family's Background and Socio-Economic Status ($X_1$): Occupation and education were used as indexes of fathers' socio-economic status. Occupation is a nominal variable and hence it was measured by asking respondents to check the appropriate occupations of their fathers from a list of occupations provided in the questionnaire. Since education is a continuous variable, respondents were requested to indicate their fathers' years of formal education from the eight categories of formal education provided in the questionnaire.


Students Major Field of Study ($X_2$): This is a nominal variable. Seven major fields of study were provided from which students checked their appropriate major fields of study.

Previous Working Experience ($X_3$): This variable was measured by asking respondents to indicate the length of period they have worked in federal, state and local government as well as in each of the areas comprising private sector as defined earlier.

Perceived Job Security in Each Sector ($X_4$): Since this is an attitudinal variable designed to assess which of the private or public sector is perceived as being more secure to work with, respondents were asked to rank each sector on a scale of 1 to 2 on the basis of job security (where 1 means better job security than 2).

Perceived Opportunity for Creative Use of One's Skill and Aptitude ($X_5$): This variable was measured in the same manner as variable $X_4$ above. Respondents were asked to indicate where they believe they could have better chances for creative use of their skills.

Employers Image and Status ($X_6$): The measurement of this variable followed the procedure used for variables $X_4$ and $X_5$ as explained above.

Sex ($X_7$): This is a nominal variable (male/female).

Age ($X_8$): This variable was measured on a continuous scale ranging from 26 to 48 years.
Students' Source of Sponsorship ($X_9$): This is a nominal variable which was measured by asking respondents to check their appropriate sources of support from a list of possible sources of sponsorship.

Students' Contractual Obligation to Serve Their Sponsors ($X_{10}$): Respondents responded to a question asking if they are legally committed to work for their sponsors upon their graduation from the University by checking 'yes' or 'no'.

Relative Advancement Opportunities in Each Sector ($X_{11}$): This variable was measured in the same manner as variable ($X_5$) on a comparative basis.

Federal Government Employment Quota Policy ($X_{12}$): The purpose of including this variable is to assess its likely impact on each respondent's attitude towards working in the public sector. This impact was assessed by asking if the policy, as it is presently being practiced, would positively, negatively or would not affect their attitude towards working for the government.

Relative Expected Pay ($X_{13}$): This is measured by the expected salary that each respondent would likely receive if he were to work in either sector. The public sector has a fixed salary of N4104.00 per annum (see Appendix C), for each new graduate that enters the public service irrespective of his field of study or previous experience. The mean salary in the private sector is N5744.00 per annum.
Probability of Employment in Each Sector ($X_{14}$): This variable was measured by asking respondents to indicate the probability of their being employed in a particular sector by checking the appropriate probability level on a continuum of 0-100% probability.

The questionnaire was pretested on a randomly selected group of 19 final year Nigerian students. Their response necessitated some minor modifications in the original questionnaire, particularly with respect to question 9.

In addition to the use of a questionnaire, interviews were held with officials of three government departments and agencies: (1) The Ministry of Labor, Employment and Productivity, (2) The Ministry of Establishment, and the (3) Public Service Commission. Interviews were also held with officials of the Nigerian Employers' Consultative Association which is the sole representative body of all private employers.

Procedure

The research instrument was personally administered by the author to the selected students during their class periods. The process was facilitated by the help and cooperation of the lecturers and professors who graciously gave up the last fifteen minutes of their class periods to be used in filling out the questionnaires. The author first explained the objective of the study and the instructors followed up by urging the students to cooperate fully.
By personally administering the questionnaires, the problem of low response which often plagues the use of a questionnaire as a data gathering technique was overcome. Also it was possible to clarify any question raised by the respondents. In view of the academically-tensed atmosphere prevailing at this time (final examinations were two weeks away), it could have been difficult to obtain a good response rate had any other procedure been used.

Techniques of Statistical Analysis

In view of the discrete nature of the dependent variable and some of the independent variables involved in this study, the use of discriminant analysis technique is considered most appropriate. Discriminant analysis is a statistical technique that is extremely useful for handling a dichotomous dependent variable, the kind of which is typified by a choice of public or private sector job. Since one of the basic objectives of this study is to be able to assess the relative importance of each variable, the use of the discriminant analysis technique would be more appropriate than the standard regression model. In the standard multiple regression model, it is not possible to interpret or determine if one beta weight is more important or significant than the other.

The use of the multiple discriminant technique is therefore relevant in two respects:

1) It enables us to formulate a linear function of the predictor variables that would help in ascertaining how well each of the variables help in discriminating between
the choice of public or private sector jobs.

2) Given the partial F-values for each predictor variable, it enables us to assess the relative importance of the variables with regards to the criterion variable.

Research Models

The research models are as follows:

1. With pay and other benefits as well as availability of jobs in each sector held constant:

   \[ Y_1 = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8, X_9, X_{10}, X_{11}, X_{12}) \]

   where \( X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{12} \) are as defined in the preceding section.

2. With pay and other benefits as well as availability of jobs in each sector not held constant:

   \[ Y_2 = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8, X_9, X_{10}, X_{11}, X_{12}, X_{13}, X_{14}) \]

   where \( X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{14} \) are as defined previously.

Statement of Hypothesis

Hypotheses to be tested in this study are stated as follows:

1. Monetary considerations have greater weight in individual's sector choice than non-monetary considerations.

2. In choosing between public and private sector jobs, individual tends to emphasize job security more than opportunities for
creative use of his skills, abilities and aptitudes.

3. The federal government policy of ethnic balancing through employment quota into the federal civil service has no adverse effect on individual's intention to work in the federal civil service.
Chapter IV
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

This chapter consists of two sections. The first deals with the description and analysis of the survey data. In this section, the study population and the sample selection process are described. In addition, responses on some of the predictor variables are presented to highlight important respondents' characteristics as they might affect the criterion variable. The second section focuses on the relevant research and statistical models, the discussion of research findings, and the testing of pertinent hypotheses.

The field work for this study was carried out by the author in Lagos, Nigeria between May 12, 1981 and June 23, 1981. The administration of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) took place at the University of Lagos campuses at Akoka and Idi-Araba.

Study Population
Since the objective of this study is to examine factors that influence Nigerian students' choice of public or private sector jobs, the study population comprises final year students in all of the Nigerian institutions of higher learning. However, since some of the colleges, e.g., the Administrative Staff Colleges were set up primarily to provide a steady stream of manpower to the public sector, they are
excluded from consideration in this study. Their exclusion is necessary to avoid any contamination in the criterion variable. The various colleges of technology are also excluded on the ground that they operate not as degree-granting institutions in Nigeria. They are placed on a lower level compared with the other universities. The population of this study is therefore made up of final year students in all the 13 Nigerian universities.

Sample Selection

Most of the Nigerian universities are homogeneous both in terms of their administrative structure and their academic orientation (i.e. entry requirements, course structures and graduation requirements). However, the ethnic distribution of students vary from one school to the other with the result that a larger proportion of students of a particular university comes from the state in which the university is situated. To have a fair representation of students from various ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, the choice of University of Lagos, which is situated in the federal capital, appears appropriate. Besides its course offering, academic units are very similar to what is found in other 12 universities thereby enhancing its representativeness.

Subjects

From a comprehensive list of all final year students, a systematic random sample of 550 students was selected. The author systematically sampled subjects occupying the 1st, 5th, 10th ... and nth position in each faculty list.
This process resulted in the selection of 550 final year students representing all colleges and faculties (Business, Education, Engineering, Law, Medicine, Science and Social Science) in the University of Lagos. The sample comprised 440 men and 110 women. Their mean age was 26 years with a standard deviation of 6.5.

Out of the 550 questionnaires administered, 529 were filled out and returned representing a return rate of 96.2%. Out of those returned, 21 questionnaires were either not properly completed or had missing data on the criterion variable. They were subsequently discarded thus leaving a usable and satisfactory response rate of 92.4% (N = 508). Data were coded, punched and processed using data analysis programs as available in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.¹

**Respondents' Characteristics Data**

**Academic Field of Study**

Table 1 shows the percent distribution of the total sample according to students' academic fields of study. Students of Business Administration accounted for 31.0% of the total respondents. This group of students includes those majoring in Business, Accounting, Finance,

**TABLE 1**

Percentage Distribution of Respondents in Each Field of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Student Representation in the Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insurance and Actuarial Science. These majors rank among the largest groups in the University and reflect a direct response to the increasing demands for administrative and executive manpower by both the public service as well as private companies. As evident later in this chapter, special government subsidies for business programs in addition to students' financial support from private and public employers could have significant implications for students' ultimate choice of employment sector.
Social Science students accounted for 17.8% of the respondents and comprise sociology, political science, philosophy and economic majors. Education students accounted for 11.7%; Engineering and Medicine each accounted for 10.8%, and Law and Science students accounted for 9.9% and 7.8% respectively.

Sex and Age Distribution

Out of a sample of 508, male respondents accounted for 80.1% while the female respondents amounted to 19.9%. The age distribution of respondents varies from 19 years to 48 years of age. As shown in Table 2, of those whose ages are 30 or below, 78.2% are male while 91.9% are female. Similarly, 19.3% of those who are between 31 to 40 years old are male while only 7.9% of them are female. Only 2.5% of male and 1.0% of female respondents are within the range of 41 to 50 years of age.

In spite of the disproportionate sex distribution, it is not expected that there would be any significant sex differences in expected sector choice. However, in view of Kilpatrick et al. findings that preference for public service jobs inversely varies with students' age, it would be interesting to discover how significant an individual's age could be in his expected sector choice.

---

TABLE 2

Age/Sex Percentage Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=405</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 30</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents' (or Fathers') Socioeconomic Data

Occupation: Table 3 summarizes the occupational distribution of the respondents' parents (or fathers).

TABLE 3

Parents' (or Fathers') Occupational Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Lecturer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/Dentist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer/Judge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Executive</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trader</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Others</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that the majority of the respondents' parents are either farmers (41.7%), public servants (23.2%), or traders (14.3%). If the parents' occupations are to be of any influence in sector choice, one would expect most of the students to return to the farm, become traders or enter the public service. It is hard to imagine such possibilities and the likelihood that parents' occupation would exert any positive impact on students' career decision appears less likely.

**Place of Work:** Table 4 indicates that most parents (or fathers) are in self-employed businesses and a large proportion of them are either farmers or traders as illustrated in Table 3.

**TABLE 4**

Parents (or Fathers) Place of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Work</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Service</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Companies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Owned/Family Business or Farm/ Private Practice</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education: In Table 5, the total years of formal schooling of respondents' father are summarized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6 years</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 13 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years and above</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 1 in 5 of the respondents reported their fathers had no formal education, while about 42.5% reported that their fathers had no more than 13 years of school. The percentage of students whose fathers had at least a college degree is 13.2%. Since most fathers are not highly educated, it is unlikely that they would be able to exert much influence on their children's career choice.

Students' Sponsorship

Scholarships, loans and various other forms of sponsorship have been some of the means with which private and public employers have tried to attract qualified manpower. In view of the fact that an acceptance of sponsorship may be contingent upon a contractual
commitment to serve the sponsor for a specified number of years, students' choice of employment after their graduation may be constrained. Table 6 summarizes the percentage distribution of students by the various forms of scholarship they enjoy. Over half of the respondents (54.1%) neither enjoyed government financial assistance nor private company sponsorship. Most students financed their education through personal or family sources thereby having their choice of employment less constrained, as one would have expected if they have depended heavily on government's support.

### Table 6

**Students' Distribution by Type of Sponsorship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of Sponsorship</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal government scholarships</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government scholarships</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bursary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government scholarship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/family sources</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company scholarships</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Findings**

The analysis began with a 3-group classification of the criterion variable \( Y = 0, 1, 2 \) where group

0 = public sector (federal, state and local

1 = private companies

2 = self-owned, private practice and family businesses.

According to the discriminant analysis procedure, this classification requires that the analysis have \( (g - 1) \) or two discriminant functions.
First Discriminant Model

Two separate analysis were performed on the survey data. For the first model ($Y_1$), relative pay and availability of employment opportunities in each sector were held constant by asking each respondent to assume for a moment that (a) the probability of finding his or her type of expected job is about the same in either the public or private sector and (b) the remuneration in both sectors is more or less the same. With these two variables under control, the model is expected to indicate which other variables are critical to individual's choice of job in each sector. In the second model ($Y_2$) all the independent variables were examined. Through a stepwise procedure each of the independent variables was selected for inclusion in the discriminant model on the basis of its discriminatory power. In the first analysis, a total of twelve variables were included. After 7 steps of iteration, the 7 predictor variables that have statistically significant discriminatory power in their order of importance are shown in Table 7.

Having controlled for the relative pay and employment opportunities in each sector, the table shows that the most significant variable in individual's choice of public or private sector job is $X_4$ (stability of employment and security of income). The next important variable is $X_6$ (perceived status or image of job in each sector). Variable $X_5$ (perceived opportunities for creative use of one's skills, ability and aptitude) is the third most important variable. Fourth in importance is $X_{10}$ (students' legal commitment to serve their sponsors) while variable $X_{11}$ (relative advancement opportunities), $X_{12}$ (federal
TABLE 7
Statistically Significant Discriminant Variables
(First Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Partial F-Valuea</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₄</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₆</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₅</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₀</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₁</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁₂</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x₂</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Each F-value for the predictor variables is statistically significant at \( \alpha = 0.05 \) level.

b Wilks Lambda is a measure of the discriminatory power of each of the variables included in the model.

government employment quota policy), and \( X₂ \) (student's major field of studies) are the other important considerations. The first discriminant model therefore shows that when relative pay and employment opportunities in each sector are held constant, individual's expected sector choice can be expressed as a function of seven mostly non-economic variables as shown in Table 7. Hence we have the predicted relationship for \( Y₁ \) as

\[
Y₁ = f(X₂, X₄, X₅, X₆, X₁₀, X₁₁, X₁₂).
\]
Second Discriminant Model

For the second model, the question was reworded to remove the constrain on pay and employment availability as being the same in both sectors. A re-estimation of the model, using the new definition for the dependent variable shows no major difference. The fact that the public sector has a fixed salary entry level for all Nigerian graduates irrespective of their fields of study as compared to the non-uniformed salary structure in the private sector makes it relatively difficult to examine precisely the influence of pay in sector choice. However, from a ranking of occupational values as shown later on in Table 9, it can be inferred that pay is not an important consideration in individual's sector choice.

Based on the second analysis, Table 8 shows the statistically significant discriminant variables in their order of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Partial F-Value</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>0.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11}$</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{14}$</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{12}$</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8
Statistically Significant Discriminant Variables (Second Model)
where \( X_5 \) = Perceived opportunity for creative use of one's skill and aptitude

\( X_{10} \) = Student's contractual obligation to serve their sponsors

\( X_6 \) = Job status

\( X_2 \) = Students' major fields of study

\( X_{11} \) = Perceived advancement opportunities in each sector

\( X_{14} \) = Probability of employment availability in each sector

\( X_4 \) = Perceived job security in each sector

\( X_{12} \) = Federal government employment quota policy

In terms of the relative importance of the predictor variables, the table shows that the most significant variable influencing individual's employment sector choice is \( X_5 \) (perceived opportunities for creative use of one's skills, abilities and aptitude). Variable \( X_{10} \) (student's legal obligation to serve their sponsors) is the second important variable, while the next significant variable is \( X_6 \) (the perceived image or status of jobs in each sector). Other significant variables include \( X_2 \) (students' fields of study), \( X_{11} \) (perceived advancement opportunities in each sector), \( X_{14} \) (relative employment availability), \( X_4 \) (relative job security in each sector) and \( X_{12} \) (federal government employment quota policy). In terms of the above variables, the second model \( (Y_2) \) can be expressed as

\[ Y_2 = f(X_2, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_{10}, X_{11}, X_{12}, X_{14}). \]
### TABLE 9
Respondents' Occupational Value Ranking Relative to Choice of Employment Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Values</th>
<th>Most Important (1)</th>
<th>Very Important (2)</th>
<th>Important (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Opportunities for creative use of one's ability and special aptitude</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chance to earn a good deal of money</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.1(^a)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Opportunities for creative work</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social status and prestige</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to work with people with other things</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stability of job and secure future</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Freedom from supervision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chance to exercise leadership</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chance for adventure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Opportunities to be helpful to others</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>503</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Contrary to expectation, pay consideration was cited by only 6.1% of the respondents as the most important factor.

\(^b\) Each percent total could not add up to 100% due to missing data.
In spite of the removal of the control that was earlier placed on variables $X_{13}$ (relative pay) and $X_{14}$ (relative availability of job in each sector) in the second analysis, the effect of pay was still very insignificant in the second analysis. However, the impact of job availability in each sector was significant even though it ranks sixth in importance. This result is contrary to the author's expectation that expected pay, if not controlled, would significantly influence individual's expected sector choice and thus draw many people towards a particular sector. Since the impact of expected pay in each sector has been shown to be insignificant even when it is uncontrolled, further analysis in this chapter would be based on the second model ($Y_2$).

**Discriminant Function Model**

In Table 10 the standardized coefficients of the 8 predictor variables on function 1 (non-economic influences) and function 2 (economic influences) are shown.
Using the above values of $w_1^*$, the discriminant model with which to predict individual's expected sector choice (with no control variables) can be expressed as

$$Z = 0.313X_{21} + 0.262X_{22} - 0.192X_{41} + 0.377X_{42} - 0.540X_{51}$$
$$+ 0.002X_{52} - 0.401X_{61} - 0.198X_{62} - 0.497X_{101}$$
$$- 0.127X_{102} - 0.252X_{111} - 0.251X_{112} + 0.114X_{121}$$
$$+ 0.152X_{122} - 0.165X_{141} + 0.594X_{142}.$$
For interpretative purposes, the signs of the coefficients are usually ignored as they merely indicate the direction of the major impact of each variable in either sector. As in the multiple linear regression model, the magnitude of the coefficients in the model reflect the relative weight of each variable on individual's sector choice. As pointed out earlier, variable $X_5$ (perceived opportunity for creative use of one's skills, abilities and aptitudes) exerted the greatest influence on individual's sector choice.

Given the above coefficients and individual's scores on variables $X_2$, $X_4$, $X_5$, $X_6$, $X_{10}$, $X_{11}$, $X_{12}$ and $X_{14}$ as shown in Table 10, individual's overall score can be computed and used as a basis for predicting expected sector choice for all respondents. Using individual's total discriminant scores, Table 15 shows the percentage of respondents correctly classified or whose expected sector choice is correctly predicted to be 64.14% which is well above the chance level of 50%.

**Group Differences**

Having identified the significant discriminating variables affecting expected sector choice as shown in Table 8, it is the basic objective of this study to determine the relevant dimensions on which private sector (private companies and privately-owned business) and public sector jobs are statistically different from each other. As a first step towards this goal, it is necessary to determine if the three groups -- public sector, private companies and privately-owned
businesses -- are equal or different on all variables included in the discriminant model.

```
TABLE 11
Overall Test of Equality of Group Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilks Lambda</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent F</td>
<td>14.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
significant at α = 0.05.
```

Given an 'equivalent F' value of 14.413 as shown in Table 11, and a critical F value ($F_{0.95, 9, 430}$) of 1.88, it is observed that the equivalent $F > F_{critical}$. Hence, the hypothesis that the groups are equal on all the variables included in the model is rejected.

The attractiveness of jobs in each sector is expected to differ on two broad dimensions: economic and non-economic considerations. These two dimensions are discussed earlier under this study's conceptual framework in Chapter 2. In Table 12 a rotated structure matrix showing the correlation between the two canonical discriminant functions and the discriminating variables is shown. Analogous to the factor analysis procedure, the rotated matrix shows the respective loadings of each discriminant variables on each of the functions or 'factors'.
### TABLE 12
Rotated Correlations Between Canonical Discriminant Functions and Discriminating Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Function 1 (Non-economic Influences)</th>
<th>Function 2 (Economic Influences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X_5</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{10}</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_6</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_2</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{11}</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{12}</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{14}</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_4</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function 1 reflects the whole series of non-economic influences on individual's expected sector choice while function 2 reflects the economic influences. From Table 12 it is possible to determine the relative significance of each of the non-economic or economic variables as shown by their respective loadings on each of the two functions.

Of all the non-economic variables, X_5 (perceived opportunities for creative use of one's skill and abilities) has the highest loading of 0.618 on Function 1. This result is also consistent with the data in Table 8 which shows variable X_5 as the most important predictor.
variable in choosing between public and private sector jobs. The next important non-economic variable is $X_{10}$ (student's contractual obligation to work for their sponsor) with a loading of 0.455. This variable has a very strong impact on students' expected sector choice in view of the legal consequences should a student decide to do otherwise. The relatively high loading of this variable on Function 1 is indicative of the fact that students' sector choice can be effectively constrained by the type of sponsorship they enjoy which is often contingent on their acceptance to be bonded to the sponsors.

Variable $X_6$ (perceived job status) with a loading of 0.453 is the third important variable with a relatively high loading on function 1. Other important non-economic factors with substantial loadings on function 1 are $X_2$ (student's fields of study), $X_{11}$ (relative advancement opportunities), and $X_{12}$ (employment quota policy of the federal government).

As far as economic influences are concerned, and contrary to the author's expectation, the influence of the relative expected pay and other benefits in each sector has been found to be statistically insignificant. The variable with the highest loading of 0.615 on function 2 is $X_{14}$ (employment availability in each sector). This variable was described in Chapter 2 as indicative of general economic activity and the respective economic performances of each organization in each sector. In a period of depression or low economic activities, individual's choice of sector or job can be severely constrained by limited employment opportunities. Rather than go unemployed, the
need to sustain one's self and his family could force one to sacrifice certain desirable occupational values by taking any available job.

Variable $X_4$ (perceived job security in each sector) reflects another phase of the economic influences on individual's sector choice. It has a loading of 0.476 on function 2. Security of income and stability of employment have been shown to be a product of general economic level and a series of market forces. Ideally, the ability of an employer (public or private) to guarantee stability of employment to all workers depends on the behavior of his product or service market or the general economic condition. However, the extent of susceptibility to the general economic conditions vary among organizations or sectors. A moderate recession could lead to a spate of layoffs in some organizations while in others it would require a worsening economic condition to start off any major layoffs. Consequently, it is the extent of the ability of each employer in both private and public sectors to withstand adverse economic conditions without resorting to a major layoff or retrenchment that is often the concern of most job seekers as far as job security is concerned.

Having highlighted the respective loadings of each of the discriminant variables on the two functions, it becomes necessary to identify the various dimensions on which the broad categories of jobs in public and private sectors differs from each other. In Table 13 the dimensions on which the perceived attractiveness of jobs in the two sectors differ are shown. Also shown in the table is the percentage distribution of the respondents' perceived attractiveness of jobs in each sector with respect to each of the variables or dimensions.
TABLE 13

Percentage Distribution of the Relative Attractiveness of Selected Predictor Variables in Public and Private Sector Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11}$</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{14}$</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the statistically significant variables shown above, the most important dimension on which both the public and private sectors differ in terms of perceived attractiveness is in respect to variable $X_5$ (the perceived opportunity for the creative use of one's ability, skills and aptitude. As many as 80% of the respondents perceived jobs either in private companies or self-owned businesses as more attractive in terms of being able to exercise their initiative, use their skills and capabilities, and accept responsibilities. Only about 20% of the respondents believed similar opportunities are available in the public sector. This finding is consistent with Miller's findings.

---
which categorized public sector jobs as undemanding and less challenging when compared with private sector jobs. The next important dimension on which the two sectors differ is on variable $X_{11}$ (perceived advancement opportunities). On the basis of this variable, private sector jobs are more attractive to 87% of the respondents. However, this result is not surprising in view of the enormous capabilities of private organizations to expand and thus create more avenues for both individual and corporate growth. As a public service-oriented institution, the public sector is limited in its expansion as well as in creating advancement avenues by budgetary constraints.

The next important dimension on which both sectors differ is job security ($X_4$). The public sector is highly rated as more attractive on this variable by 84% of the respondents. This result suggests that the public sector has greater capacity to absorb temporary economic downturn. In most developing countries, the apparent restraint on the part of public employers to laying off workers in period of economic distress is primarily political expedience. As the largest employer of labor, any mass retrenchment of workers could have serious political and economic consequences for the ruling government. Hence, there is always greater pressure on public sector employers to ensure stability of employment and security of income to all workers. In this regard, public sector jobs appear more attractive.

The two sectors also differ with respect to the awards of financial assistance to students and the emphasis placed on contractual obligations required of all sponsored students with respect to their working for their sponsors after their graduation.
This factor (variable $X_{10}$) has been effective in constraining individual's sector choice as many students who were faced with great financial distress, and with no other choice, have been compelled to accept financial assistance with the understanding of working for the sponsors upon the completion of their studies. Table 13 shows that 23% of the respondent believed that any financial assistance from the government or public employers would constrain their choice towards the public sector while 77% believed private sector sponsorship would commit them to working for private sector organizations. In terms of a minimal constraint on one's sector choice, the data show that the public sector appears more attractive than the private sector.

Availability of employment opportunities is another dimension on which the private and public sectors differ significantly. As much as 37.0% of the students believe that jobs relevant to their skills could be more readily found in the public sector than in the private sector. On the other hand, 63.0% of the respondents see more employment avenues in the private sector than in the public sector. Students' perception of employment avenues in either sector is influenced by individual's field of study. For example, most students of education, nursing, and administration are more likely to perceive the public sector as more attractive in terms of job opportunities than students majoring in law, business administration and engineering.

Apart from the effect of students' field of study, general economic conditions could (as discussed earlier) also influence student's perception as to whether they could get a job in either sector. A serious depression could wipe out many private companies and
thus create a bleak atmosphere for those who have looked toward many
private firms for employment opportunities.

Although the data revealed the influence of pay (variable $X_{13}$)
to be insignificant in individual's sector choice, it is nevertheless
an important dimension on which both sectors are expected to differ
substantially. Tables 15 and 16 in Appendix B show the salary structure
of pay in the private sector in Nigeria. Private sector employers
have greater ability to pay. Hence, they have a competitive advantage
over the public sector employers. The public employer works within a
budgetary constraint and there is a limit beyond which the government
can increase salaries and other benefits without increasing taxes and
facing the political and economic impact of such tax increase.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The specific research hypotheses are examined in the succeeding
sections.

**Hypothesis 1:** Monetary considerations have greater weight in
individual's sector choice than non-monetary considerations.

The satisfaction of individual needs and the maintenance of
appropriate standard of living depend on the extrinsic rewards one
receives from work. As a result, it is expected that pay and benefits
would override other considerations in individual's expected sector
choice. In Table 8 the partial F-values of the most significant
factors that influence individual's sector choice in their order of

---

4 M. Rosenberg, *Occupations and Values* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free
importance are shown. Contrary to expectation, pay consideration did not even show up as the least significant factor let alone being the most important consideration. The result of the stepwise discriminant analysis shows that non-monetary considerations have greater influence on sector choice than monetary factors. These non-monetary factors include job security ($X_4$), job status or image ($X_6$), and perceived opportunities for creative use of one's skills, initiative and aptitudes. Hence, the hypothesis that monetary consideration has greater weight than non-monetary factors is rejected (see also Table 9).

**Hypothesis 2**: In choosing between public and private sector jobs, individuals tend to emphasize job security more than opportunities for creative use of their talents.

In Table 8, both job security ($X_4$) and opportunities for creative use of one's skill ($X_5$) are shown to be important factors in a choice of employment sector. Their partial F-values are 9.34 and 7.73 for $X_4$ and $X_5$, respectively. The magnitude of their partial F-values tend to suggest that concern for job security ($X_4$) is more important than consideration for a creative and challenging job ($X_5$). However, the data in Table 6 are a result of a stepwise procedure. The relatively higher partial F-values of variable $X_4$ could have changed assuming that more significant and highly correlated variables have been included. In Table 12, variable $X_5$ has the highest loading of 0.618 of all the variables listed. Besides, in a relative ranking of three most important occupational values (see Table 9), opportunities for creative use of one's skills ($X_5$) is consistently ranked higher.
than job security. About 52% of the respondent emphasized variable $X_5$ as the most important occupational value that would influence their sector choice as compared to about 7% that emphasized job security. As a result, the hypothesis that greater emphasis is placed on job security than opportunities for creative use of one's skills and abilities in sector choice cannot be statistically supported.

Hypothesis 3: The federal government policy of ethnic balancing through employment quota into the federal civil service has no adverse affect on individual's attitudes towards working in the federal civil service.

Table 14 shows a contingency analysis of the respondents' expected sector choice with respect to the employment quota policy of the Federal Government. The respondents were requested to indicate the likely impact of such policy on their willingness or intention to work with the government. When the observed $\chi^2$ value of 24.425 is compared with the critical value of 9.488 (df = 4), the hypothesis that the policy has no adverse effect on the respondents' attitudes towards working in the federal government is rejected.
TABLE 14

Impact of Federal Government Employment Quota Policy on Respondents' Sector Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Private Sector</th>
<th>Self-Owned/Family Business/Private Practice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Effect</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Effect</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Effect At All</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2 = 24.425 \)
\( df = 4; \) critical value; 9.488
\( p < 0.05 \)

Since Nigeria is a multi-ethnic nation, the employment quota policy is designed to assure the minority ethnic groups of an adequate share of the "national cake." A large proportion of appointments in the federal civil service is held by people from the three majority groups, and it is only through a deliberate attempt that the goal of an "egalitarian society" can be achieved.

The result as shown in Table 14 indicates that a substantial proportion of the respondents believe that such a policy could affect their decision to work with the federal civil service. Due to the sensitive nature of matters relating to ethnic origin in the Nigerian
society, it was not possible to determine from this study the ethnic backgrounds of those respondents who have negative perception of the policy. However, since the study's sample was selected using a systematic random approach, it is very unlikely that the majority of those who responded negatively to the policy are mainly those whose ethnic groups stand to lose on the implementation of the quota employment policy.
Chapter V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is concerned with identifying and examining the relevant factors that influence Nigerian students' choice of jobs in either the public or private sector. Perceived differences in attractiveness between the two sectors as determined by economic and non-economic opportunities available in each sector are expected to be the basis for discriminating between public and private sector jobs.

Nigeria is currently going through a massive pace of industrialization. The country's commitment to a mixed economic system requires a balanced development of her public as well as private sectors. An efficient public service depends on government's ability to attract and retain the right quality and quantity of skilled manpower. Similarly, businesses in the private sector require adequately skilled and highly talented manpower to help sustain survival in today's increasingly tense atmosphere of business competition. As a result, an attempt to examine the major influences on individual's choice of employment sector would be of valuable interest to both public and private sector employers.

Public sector jobs are defined as consisting of jobs in the federal, state and local government civil service. Private sector jobs comprise jobs in private companies, self-owned or family businesses and private practice.
Fourteen predictor variables were used in this study. These variables can be broadly categorized as individual (e.g., students' fields of study, age, sex, previous working experience), familial (e.g., parents' background and socio-economic status) and organizational factors (e.g., job status, job security, and relative pay in each sector).

A sample of 550 students representing all academic fields in the University of Lagos, Nigeria provided the required data which was obtained through the questionnaire technique. The research instrument was administered by the author between May-June 1981 to the selected students during their regular lecture periods. As a result, an impressive response rate of 92.4% was obtained.

Due to the dichotomous nature of the criterion variable and the nature of this study's research questions, the use of a discriminant analysis statistical technique was considered more appropriate. In testing some of the research hypotheses, the use of the discriminant analysis was supplemented with frequency tables and contingency analysis.

Two limitations of the study should be pointed out. First this study's sample was drawn mainly from university students. It was not possible to include students from technical schools or from the colleges of education, science and technology in view of their non-uniform structure of administration and student representation. As a result, generalization of the findings of this study should be limited to university students rather than to the entire student body in Nigeria.
Another limitation of this study relates to its methodology. First, the author arrived in Nigeria to administer the questionnaire at a time when most students were gripped with final examination tensions. It is not unlikely that students could have been more relaxed and prepared to cooperate had the survey been conducted much earlier. Second, the controversy over the issue of legal minimum pay that was being debated at the Nigerian National Assembly at that time made many private employers more hesitant and cautious in discussing their pay and other employment-related policy matters with the author.

Major Research Findings

The results of this study's data analysis indicate that non-monetary considerations are the overriding factors in most individual's choice of employment sector. This result is contrary to the author's expectation that pay would be the most important factor in view of the relatively poor socio-economic background of most of the respondents. In terms of Maslow's theory, most of these respondents and their parents are still primarily preoccupied with the first or second hierarchy of needs (physiological and security needs) for which the monetary factor is expected to have its best attraction. However, it turns out that monetary consideration is less important as a determinant of sector choice as far as the subjects included in this study are concerned.

Of all the non-monetary factors considered, the extent of opportunities for creative use of one's skill, abilities, as well as opportunities for exercising authority and accepting responsibilities
is the most significant discriminatory variable in a choice of public or private sector job. A greater proportion of the respondents believe that the civil service is too rigid and allows little or no room for the exercise of initiative and the growth of one's potentials. On the other hand, the private sector, either by way of working in private companies or in self-owned businesses, is perceived as being conducive for the development of one's potentials through the opportunities it provides. Other important non-monetary factors include the degree of stability of employment and security of income and perceived job status in each sector.

Other findings of this study include the following:

1. Except where individual's choice is constrained (e.g., through a legal agreement to serve one's sponsor) the process of choosing between a private and public sector job is characterized by a rational choice process. The process involves an assessment of the relative attractiveness of the job in either sector in light of desirable job or environmental attributes (e.g., challenging work, chances for rapid advancement, the image of the employer and the extent to which individual's personal and job goals can be realized).

2. The family's socio-economic status that is so influential in occupational choice decision is relatively not significant in influencing individual's choice of employment sector. This finding implies that the type of parental guidance that is required for making the right choice of occupation is hardly noticeable in sector choice.
3. Even though job security might be an important factor in choosing between private and public sector jobs it is nevertheless not a major consideration. For example, despite the fact that 425 respondents viewed the public sector as providing better job security, only 173 (i.e., 40.7%) prefer to work in the public sector.

4. Contrary to expectation, there is no systematic evidence of any direct relationship between job or sector choice and previous work experience.

5. There is no sex effect on the respondents' choice of private and public sector jobs.

6. The data indicate that the civil service appears to be less competitive in the manpower market than business or industry.

7. Also, there is strong indication that the Nigerian Federal Government's policy of ethnic balancing through employment quota policy in the federal public service could deter many potential talents from joining the civil service.

Conclusions

Judging from the relatively insignificant effect of pay as shown by the findings of this study, it appears that attractive salary policies in themselves would produce no substantial entry into any sector. Rather, it is emphatically clear from this study that value orientations (i.e., need for security, achievement, creative job opportunities and job status) greatly influence sector choice. The implication of this finding is two-fold. First, there is need to
design or redesign jobs or responsibilities in either sector in a manner that will allow employees or prospective employees to develop their capabilities in ways consistent with the individual's and organization's objectives.

It is apparent that jobseekers are no longer contented with accepting jobs primarily because of the monetary rewards. As demonstrated by Stessin\(^1\) and the results of the College Placement Council's study, people are less interested in money than in "meaningful and challenging work."\(^2\) Increasingly, college graduates are more concerned with jobs and a work environment that would tap their potentials. Adwere-Boamah\(^3\) found that 83.6% of his subjects emphasized that opportunities for creative and challenging work would be the most important consideration they would look for in a job.

Job seekers are becoming reluctant to work in an increasingly bureaucratized occupational structure where high premium is placed on following the "old established order of doing things." Gardner\(^4\) reported that rigid civil service rules and bureaucratic public


administration procedures prevent the efficient use of trained professional in developing countries and also result in a 'brain drain' from these countries. While the possibility of 'brain drain' cannot be ignored, it is most likely that professionals who may become frustrated by the civil service lack of flexibility may readily make their services and skills available to private sector employers. This appears to be the trend in Nigeria at the present time.

The second implication of this finding is that neither public nor private sector employers can afford to ignore the personal and idealistic aspirations of young people, if they want to attract and retain them.

Another important but not surprising finding relates to the insignificant influence of family's background and socio-economic status. Substantial empirical studies conducted in the United States and other European countries have pointed conclusively to its significant impact on individual's occupation or job choice. The difference in the conclusions of previous studies and the current study is not unrelated to cultural differences. Osipow has warned that "the process of career choice is so deeply imbedded in cultural and economic factors that it would be unreasonable to try to develop a theory of career development without including those variables."  

---

Major studies\(^6\) that have examined the impact of family's socio-economic status within the context of the developing countries seem to agree that the impact of parents' (or father's) background and socio-economic status is less influential in determining career choices in many developing countries. The findings seem unusual, however, in view of the relatively close-family system that is characteristic of Nigerian life, and in particular, the unabridged influence of parents over all aspects of their children's life. However, the insignificant family influence on the respondents' occupational or sector choice is understandable if one considers that effective parental's guidance requires solid knowledge of economic and non-economic prospects in each occupation or sector. Since most parents are farmers or traders with relatively little or no education (see Tables 3 and 4 in Chapter IV), they lacked the job experience and the knowledge of the problems and prospects in either sector.

The fact that most of the discriminant variables are more favorably associated with the private rather than the public sector implies that in terms of most desirable job factors, the private organizations seem to have a competitive advantage in their drive to attract skilled manpower. This trend could create a severe imbalance

---

in the supply of manpower to the two sectors. Besides, oversupply of manpower to the private sector could create a superficial under-employment in the economy unless applicants are willing to relocate to the public sector.

Another major finding of this study relates to the Nigerian Federal Government policy of ethnic balancing through an employment quota. This quota policy allows a qualified candidate to be denied an appointment into the federal civil service if he comes from a state or tribe whose employment quota has been filled. As a result, the least qualified candidate whose state or tribe is underrepresented in the federal civil service will get the first consideration over the most qualified candidate who happens to come from a state that is already overrepresented in the federal public service. The finding of this study with respect to this policy has two serious implications. First, it could deter potential talent from joining the civil service and thus drive them to seek employment elsewhere possibly in the private sector. This trend would undoubtedly worsen the manpower requirement situation in the public sector and could create a serious imbalance of supply and demand of manpower in the private sector.

Second, an employment quota in which ethnic origin, instead of merit, is the criterion for employment could encourage mediocrity with grave consequences for the efficiency and quality of decision-making in the public service.
Recommendations

The findings of this study have established some significant relationships between individuals' choice of employment sector and their personal value orientations. In the process, the research findings have opened up many avenues through which both public and private employers could maximize their organizations' attractiveness to prospective applicants.

First, since the public sector's most effective means of attracting more college students into the public service is through the award of scholarships, it is recommended that more generous awards be made on a larger scale to deserving and qualified students. As this study revealed, a substantial majority of the students are on non-governmental scholarships. As a result, there is neither any commitment nor inducement for these students to work for the government. The author strongly believes that more governmental involvement in the educational financing of many students could create more positive students' attitude towards working for the government.

Second, disenchantment with public service jobs have centered on the higher premium placed on following the "old established civil service rules" and the need to show consistency in one's work instead of exercising one's creativity in solving national problems. As Adwere-Boamah suggested, an absence of opportunity for the new professionals and college graduates to bring their intellectual skills and talents to bear upon the problems of their country may frustrate and scare them away from the public service. As a result, the public service needs to

7 Adwere-Boamah, Occupational Preferences, p. 48.
embark on a deliberate attempt to restructure jobs and responsibilities within the public service in ways that would satisfy the aspirations of most people without sacrificing the basic objectives of public service.

Third, consistent with its declared goal of ensuring "a just and egalitarian society" the government should encourage equal employment opportunities based on merit and not on political, tribal or ethnic considerations. Highly talented and motivated people can be attracted into the public service only when they are convinced that they would never suffer discrimination in appointments and promotions because of their political or ethnic backgrounds.

Fourth, closer liaison between the universities and the labor markets needs to be established. This would require that both the public and private employers maintain a steady flow of information as to the prospects and challenges in their respective organizations. This information could be helpful to newly graduating students who are in the process of choosing a job in either of the two sectors.

Fifth, career and job counseling activities and programs that have proven so successful in the United States and other industrialized countries should be established in each Nigerian university. Effective career guidance is necessary to enhance the goodness of fit between an individual's abilities, interests and values and the type of jobs or organizations they would like to be involved with.

**Future Research**

While the present study has identified the various variables that influence the respondents' expected choice of private and public sector
jobs, it is nevertheless desirable to examine the post-choice experiences of the respondents as they settle on their jobs through a longitudinal study. This study would not only permit an assessment of the reality of the respondents' perception of organizational or job characteristics but also the extent of their post-choice dissonance.

Since most developing African countries share similar manpower or employment problems with Nigeria, the results of this study could be of tremendous interest to policymakers, employers and researchers in these countries. As a result, a replication of this study in these countries could provide a test of the generalizability of some of its findings to other developing countries.

Finally, the present study has established significant relationships between sector or organizational choice and certain personal and value orientations of the respondents. However, empirical relationships are usually a first step in building substantive knowledge. The findings of this and other studies on job or organization choice should be integrated with similar studies of occupational values and be developed into a systematic theory which will be useful in guiding future research on the relationships between individual's value orientations and employment sector choice.
APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT
OBJECTIVE: This study examines the occupational choices that students make, the industries in which they plan to work, and the factors which influence their decisions.

INSTRUCTION:

(A) Please read and respond to each question or statement carefully and completely.

(B) Indicate your response by placing a check (✓) where appropriate.

1. Name of the institution: _________________________________________________

2. My major field of study is (e.g., Accounting, Law, History):

3. After graduation my plans are:

   ✓ To enter the National Youth Service
   ✓ To enter graduate studies
   ✓ To enter regular employment
   ✓ Others (Explain) ______________________________________________________

4. My sex is: (i) ___ Male (ii) ___ Female

5. My age is: __________

6. My marital status is:

   ✓ 1. Single
   ✓ 2. Married
   ✓ 3. Divorced
   ✓ 4. Widowed
7. When I was age 14, my father worked in:
   [ ] 1. Federal government service
   [ ] 2. State government service
   [ ] 3. Local government service
   [ ] 4. With a private company or firm
   [ ] 5. Self-owned business or farm
   [ ] 6. Private practice
   [ ] 7. Others (please specify) __________________________________

8. When I was age 14, my father's principal occupation was:
   [ ] 1. Teacher/Lecturer
   [ ] 2. Civil servant
   [ ] 3. Doctor/Dentist
   [ ] 4. Lawyer/Judge
   [ ] 5. Business executive
   [ ] 6. Trader
   [ ] 7. Farmer
   [ ] 8. Others (please specify) __________________________________

9. My father's years of formal education was (circle the number which applies):
   1. No school 0
   2. Primary school 1 2 3 4 5 6
   3. Modern/middle school 7 8 9
   4. Teacher training 10 11 12
   5. Secondary school 10 11 12 13 14 15
   6. Technical school 15 16
   7. University 15 16 17
   8. Graduate school 18 or more
10. My education is being financed by:

- [ ] 1. Federal government scholarship
- [ ] 2. State government scholarship
- [ ] 3. Local government scholarship
- [ ] 4. Personal loans
- [ ] 5. Bursary
- [ ] 6. Private company sponsorship
- [ ] 7. Personal/family source
- [ ] 8. Others (please specify) ______________________________

11. Are you under bond to serve your sponsors?

1. ____ Yes 2. ____ No

12. What occupation or job do you expect to enter soon after you complete your formal education (and National Youth Service)?

(e.g. accounting, agriculture, engineering, teaching, administration, etc.)

13. Why did you elect this occupation (in question 12 above)? Select the three most important reasons from the choices listed below and write in the numbers here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Reason</th>
<th>Second Reason</th>
<th>Third Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides me with an opportunity to use my special abilities or aptitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provides me with a chance to earn a good deal of money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permits me to be creative and original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives me social status and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives me an opportunity to work with people rather than things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enables me to look forward to a stable, secure future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leaves me relatively free of supervision by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. (Continued)

8. Gives me a chance to exercise leadership

9. Provides me with adventure

10. Gives me an opportunity to be helpful to others

11. Others (please specify) __________________________________________

14. What is the probability of your finding this type of job (as mentioned in question 12 above) in the public sector (e.g., Federal, State, or Local government service)?

1. 0-25% meaning not very likely

2. 26-50%

3. 51-75%

4. 76-100% meaning highly likely

15. In addition, what is the probability of your finding this type of job in the private sector (e.g., with a private company, family business, or farmer, or private practice)?

1. 0-25% meaning not very likely

2. 26-50%

3. 51-75%

4. 76-100% meaning highly likely

16. Assume for a moment that (a) the probability of finding your type of expected job is about the same in either the public or private sector and (b) the remuneration in both sectors is more or less the same. In which sector would you prefer to work?

1. Federal government service

2. State government service

3. Local government service

4. A private company

5. Self-owned business
16. (Continued)

6. Private practice
7. Family business or farm
8. No preference

17. Why did you choose this sector (in question 16 above)? Select the three most important reasons from the choices listed below and write in the numbers here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Reason</th>
<th>Second Reason</th>
<th>Third Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides me with an opportunity to use my special ability or aptitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gives me a chance to serve my country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Permits me to be creative and original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gives me social status and prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gives me an opportunity to work with people rather than things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enables me to look forward to a stable, secure future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leaves me relatively free of supervision by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gives me a chance to exercise leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provides me with adventure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gives me an opportunity to be helpful to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Others (please specify) ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Assume that on your graduation from school (and completion of the National Youth Service), there is no job opportunity in the sector your prefer to work. Would you prefer to wait rather than to take an available job in any other sector?

1. Yes, I would wait. How Long? _____ months

2. No. Which sector from the list in question 16 would you prefer? __________________________________
INSTRUCTIONS:

This part of the questionnaire is intended to find out your personal opinions regarding jobs in the government and private sector. Please carefully read each statement below and check (✓) your choice.

19. In Nigeria, one can make the greatest contribution to national growth and social change by working in . . .
   ✓ 1. The government (Federal, State, Local)
   ✓ 2. Private sector (with a firm, family business, self-employment, etc.)

20. Which job do you consider to be of higher status? One in . . .
   ✓ 1. The government
   ✓ 2. Private sector

21. If I had a son just getting out of school, I would want him to work in . . .
   ✓ 1. The government
   ✓ 2. Private sector

22. If I were to choose a job on the basis of security, I would pick a job in . . .
   ✓ 1. The government
   ✓ 2. Private sector

23. If I were to decide on the basis of better opportunities for making use of my skills and abilities, I would prefer a job in . . .
   ✓ 1. The government
   ✓ 2. Private sector

24. If I were to decide on the basis of better opportunities for rapid promotion, I would prefer to work in . . .
   ✓ 1. The government
   ✓ 2. Private sector
25. The fringe benefit package (pension, housing and transportation allowances) are much better in ...

☐ 1. The government
☐ 2. Private sector

26. If I were to decide on the basis of salary, I would choose a job in ...

☐ 1. The government
☐ 2. Private sector

27. If the government were to decide to pay higher salary but no car loan as against a private employer with car loan but lesser salary, which of the two would you work for?

☐ 1. The government
☐ 2. Private sector

28. If you were to find a private employer that operates an early voluntary retirement policy similar to the government which of them would you work for?

☐ 1. The government
☐ 2. Private sector

29. How long have you ever worked in each of the following organisations?

1. Federal government service _______ months
2. State government service _______ months
3. Local government service _______ months
4. With a private company or firm _______ months
5. With family business or farm _______ months
6. Others (please specify) _______ months

7. Have not worked at all ☐ Check, if apply
30. Of all the persons whom you know, which one do you feel has had the MOST SIGNIFICANT influence on you regarding your choice of future job and career?

1. Father
2. Mother
3. Other person. Explain _____________________________________
   (e.g., a school teacher, a clergy person, an uncle, etc.)
4. No one

INSTRUCTION:

If your answer to question 30 above is Father, skip questions 31-33 below and go to question 34.

If "No one", go to question 36.
All others go to question 31.

31. At present, the person (mentioned above) is working in:

1. Federal government service
2. State government service
3. Local government service
4. With a company or firm
5. Self-owned business or farm
6. Private practice
7. Other (please specify) ____________________________

32. He (or she) is a:

1. Teacher/Lecturer
2. Civil Servant
3. Doctor/Dentist
4. Lawyer/Judge
32. (Continued)

☐ 5. Business Executive
☐ 6. Trader
☐ 7. Farmer
☐ 8. Others (please specify) _________________________________

33. His (or her) years of formal education is (Circle the number which applies):

1. No school 0
2. Primary school 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Modern/Middle school 7 8 9
4. Teacher training 10 11 12
5. Secondary school 10 11 12 13 14 15
6. Technical school 15 16
7. University 15 16 17
8. Graduate school 18 or more

34. Considering the person you identified in question 30, what degree of influence did he/she have on your choice of job or occupation?

☐ 1. No influence at all
☐ 2. Some influence
☐ 3. Fairly significant influence
☐ 4. Very significant influence

35. In choosing between a private or public sector job, the person identified in question 30, would encourage you to take a job in:

☐ 1. Federal government service
☐ 2. State government service
☐ 3. Local government service
☐ 4. A private company
35. (Continued)

- 5. Self-owned business
- 6. Private practice
- 7. Family business or farm
- 8. Others (please specify)
- 9. Would not seek to influence me

36. Consider the Federal Government Policy of "reflecting the federal character" in both appointments and promotion in the federal public sector (i.e., withholding further appointments and promotion from people whose ethnic tribes are presently overrepresented and given more opportunities to those whose tribes are underrepresented). What effect would that policy have on your intention to accept a job in the Federal Service?

- 1. Would have negative effect
- 2. Would have positive effect
- 3. No effect at all

37. All in all, given your educational background, experience and other influences, you will probably work for which one of the following after your National Youth Service (or completion of school)?

- 1. Federal government service
- 2. State government service
- 3. Local government service
- 4. A private company
- 5. Self-owned business
- 6. Private practice
- 7. Family business or farm
- 8. Others (please specify)

Thank you and good luck in your exam!
June 4, 1981

The Chairman,
Public Service Commission,
Secretariat,
Ikoyi, Lagos.

The bearer, Mr. S.A. Banjoko is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration of the University of Lagos. He is presently working on his Ph.D. dissertation and would require your assistance in obtaining relevant public service employment data that are relevant to his study.

I would therefore be grateful if you could be helpful to him in all ways possible.

O. Iyanda
Ag. Head
Dept. of Business Admin.
June 4, 1981

The Permanent Secretary,
Federal Ministry of Establishment,
Secretariat,
Lagos.

The bearer, Mr. S.A. Banjoko is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration of the University of Lagos. He is presently working on his Ph.D. dissertation and would require your assistance in obtaining relevant public service employment data that are relevant to his study.

I would therefore be grateful if you could be helpful to him in all ways possible.

O. Iyanda
Ag. Head
Dept. of Business Admin.
OFFICE OF THE HEAD OF THE CIVIL SERVICE OF THE FEDERATION
ESTABLISHMENTS DEPARTMENT

VISITORS FORM

Name of Visitor: Banje Ko S.A.
Address: University of Lagos

Whether by Appointment: Yes/No:
Purpose of Visit: To request for assistance in obtaining certain public service employment information.
Date: 9/6/51 Time:

Signature: DHEGEME

U.S. (Pay Research)
Mr. HDMI

Please help.
$L^2 (R_{12}) + (L^2 (R_{12}))$
$DC (MC) D$

VAC (MC)

Please help.
June 4, 1981

The Permanent Secretary
Federal Ministry of Labour
Broad Street
Lagos

The bearer, Mr. S.A. Banjoko is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration of the University of Lagos. He is presently working on his Ph.D. dissertation and would require your assistance in obtaining relevant public service employment data that are relevant to his study.

I would therefore be grateful if you could be helpful to him in all ways possible.

O. Iyanda
Ag. Head
Dept. of Business Admin.
APPENDIX C

SALARY GRADE LEVELS IN PUBLIC SECTOR
### SALARY GRADE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>1,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>1,856</td>
<td>1,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>2,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>2,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>2,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>2,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>3,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>3,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>3,316</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>3,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>3,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>3,756</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>3,996</td>
<td>4,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D

INTER-INDUSTRY COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN
WAGE RATES AND REGULAR ALLOWANCES
### Appendix VII:

#### Senior Management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Car Basic</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>Annual Bonus</th>
<th>Total Regular</th>
<th>% Increase Regular Allowances</th>
<th>Total Sal./Vages Regular Allowances</th>
<th>% Increase Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>9745 - 16616</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>17685</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>10005 - 18335</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>10005 - 18335</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mining & Petro. Leum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Car Basic</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>Annual Bonus</th>
<th>Total Regular</th>
<th>% Increase Regular Allowances</th>
<th>Total Sal./Vages Regular Allowances</th>
<th>% Increase Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>9745 - 16616</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>17685</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>10005 - 18335</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>10005 - 18335</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commerce:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Car Basic</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>Annual Bonus</th>
<th>Total Regular</th>
<th>% Increase Regular Allowances</th>
<th>Total Sal./Vages Regular Allowances</th>
<th>% Increase Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>9745 - 16616</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>17685</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>10005 - 18335</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>10005 - 18335</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2515</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5116</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19586</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Federal Ministry of Labor, Employment and Productivity, Lagos, Nigeria, 1978
### INTER-INDUSTRY COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN WAGE RATES & REGULAR ALLOWANCES: - 1976 - 78: MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION/INDUSTRY GROUPS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AVERAGE SALARY</th>
<th>HOUSE ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>CAR BASIC/TRANSPORT ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>LEAVE ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>ANNUAL BONUS</th>
<th>TOTAL REGULAR ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>% INCREASE</th>
<th>TOTAL REGULAR ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>% INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE MANAGEMENT:</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>662 - 10135</td>
<td>191 - 1263</td>
<td>203 - 354</td>
<td>2839</td>
<td>10739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. MANUFACTURING</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5956 - 10773</td>
<td>1109 - 1426</td>
<td>267 - 363</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>11553</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>5966 - 10773</td>
<td>1109 - 1426</td>
<td>267 - 363</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>11553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5000 - 10900</td>
<td>720 - 1182</td>
<td>246 - 358</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>10450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MINING &amp; PETROLEUM</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6842 - 12572</td>
<td>1217 - 1135</td>
<td>563 - 445</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>13770</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6847 - 12572</td>
<td>1317 - 1135</td>
<td>563 - 445</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>13770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6177 - 11083</td>
<td>1260 - 1170</td>
<td>36 - 411</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>12007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. COMMERCE</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7158 - 11982</td>
<td>1440 - 1260</td>
<td>549 - 465</td>
<td>3714</td>
<td>15284</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7158 - 11982</td>
<td>1440 - 1260</td>
<td>549 - 465</td>
<td>3714</td>
<td>15284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6000 - 9600</td>
<td>1142 - 912</td>
<td>201 - 525</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>10576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6000 - 9600</td>
<td>1142 - 912</td>
<td>201 - 525</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>10576</td>
<td>10918</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6000 - 9600</td>
<td>1142 - 912</td>
<td>201 - 525</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>10576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.../3
INTER-INDUSTRY COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN WAGE RATES & REGULAR ALLOWANCES - 1976 - 78.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION/INDUSTRY GROUPS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AVERAGE SALARY</th>
<th>HOUSE ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>CAR BASIC/TRANSPORT ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>LEAVE ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>ANNUAL BONUS</th>
<th>TOTAL REGULAR ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>% INCREASE REGULAR ALLOWANCE</th>
<th>TOTAL SAL/WAGS REGULAR ALLOWANCES</th>
<th>% INCREASE ALLOWANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. MANUFACTURING: AVERAGE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3648 - 6735</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>7031</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3850 - 7315</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>7793</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3850 - 7315</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>7793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MEDIAN:</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3500 - 6800</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>7519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3500 - 7000</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>7239</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3500 - 7000</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>7239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MINING &amp; PETRO.: AVERAGE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4364 - 7536</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2481</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9127</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4547 - 7988</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4547 - 7988</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MEDIAN:</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4192 - 6453</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10530</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7594 - 7608</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2929</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7594 - 7608</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2929</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. COMMERCE: AVERAGE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4048 - 5723</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6930</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4048 - 5723</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4048 - 5723</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MEDIAN:</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>4000 - 5350</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6571</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4000 - 5350</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4000 - 5350</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Inter-Industry Comparison of Changes in Wage Rates and Regular Allotments: 1976 - 1978

#### Supervisory Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation/Industry</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary/Wages</th>
<th>House Allowance</th>
<th>Car Basic/Transport</th>
<th>Leave Allow.</th>
<th>Annual Bonus</th>
<th>Total Reg. Increase (Allow)</th>
<th>Mid-Point Salary/Wage &amp; Regular Allowance</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3373 - 4410</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>5960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3772 - 5044</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3772 - 5044</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>5960</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2134 - 4420</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>4748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2427 - 4500</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2427 - 4500</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mining and Petroleum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2587 - 4848</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>5601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2843 - 5296</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>6197</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2843 - 5296</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2097</td>
<td>6197</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2496 - 4220</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>6071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2681 - 4908</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2681 - 4908</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2282</td>
<td>6071</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1756 - 2914</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>3227</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1826 - 2995</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>3244</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1826 - 2995</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>3244</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1510 - 2952</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1660 - 3001</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>3495</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1660 - 3001</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>3495</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1556 - 2523</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1668 - 2754</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>6310</td>
<td>2679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1668 - 2754</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1385 - 2137</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1540 - 2442</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td>-56.9</td>
<td>2413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1540 - 2442</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td>2413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mining and Petroleum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1935 - 3074</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2063 - 3156</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>3851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2063 - 3156</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1922 - 3043</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
<td>3323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1922 - 3157</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1922 - 3157</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td>3496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1401 - 2174</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1464 - 2194</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>2406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1464 - 2194</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td>2406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1409 - 2164</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1409 - 2187</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>2333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1409 - 2187</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td>2333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION/INDUSTRY</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>AVERAGE SALARY/WAGES, MIN MAX</td>
<td>HOUSE ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>VEHICLE/TRANSPORT ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>LEAVE ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>ANNUAL BONUS</td>
<td>TOTAL REGULAR ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>% INCREASE ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>MIDPT SAL./WAGES TRANS. ALL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>912-1588</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>981-1757</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1161-1514</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINING AND PETROLEUM</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1261-2276</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1328-2349</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1282-2310</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>990-1773</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1043-1839</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1043-1839</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1009-1760</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1021-1806</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1021-1806</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION/INDUSTRY</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>AVERAGE SALARY/WAGES</td>
<td>HOUSE ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>VEHICLE/TRANSPORT ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>LEAVE ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>ANNUAL BONUS</td>
<td>TOTAL REGULAR ALLOWANCES</td>
<td>% INCREASE</td>
<td>MIDPT. REGULAR ALLOWANCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING AVERAGE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>990-2873</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1072-3182</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1072-3182</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>986-2405</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1064-2860</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>2361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1064-2860</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>2361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINING &amp; PETROLEUM</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1039-1689</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1005-1632</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1078-1706</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1078-1706</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1017-1701</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1074-1778</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1074-1778</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>973-1708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1027-1710</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1027-1710</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General (Unskilled & Semi-Skilled) Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation/Industry</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Salary/Wages</th>
<th>House Allowance</th>
<th>Vehicle/Transport Allowance</th>
<th>Leave Allowances</th>
<th>Annual Bonus</th>
<th>Total Regular Allowances</th>
<th>% Increase in Allowances</th>
<th>Midept Salary/Wages &amp; Regular Allowances</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>686 - 1143</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>733 - 1286</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>735 - 1298</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>710 - 1190</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>745 - 1252</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>745 - 1252</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; Exploration</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>786 - 1189</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>826 - 1247</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>828 - 1247</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>792 - 1173</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>851 - 1257</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>851 - 1257</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>605 - 1288</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>647 - 1344</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>647 - 1344</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>614 - 1361</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>763 - 1388</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>763 - 1388</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FRINGE BENEFITS IN

THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR
### Comparative Analysis of Fringe Benefits in the Civil Service and the Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fringe Benefit</th>
<th>Civil Service (Current)</th>
<th>Private Sector (Current)</th>
<th>Absolute Differentials</th>
<th>Percentage Differentials</th>
<th>Recommended Percentage</th>
<th>Recommended Rates</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Allowance</td>
<td>₦120</td>
<td>₦720</td>
<td>₦300</td>
<td>₦5000</td>
<td>₦180</td>
<td>₦4200</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Allowance</td>
<td>₦64</td>
<td>₦192</td>
<td>₦5% of basic salary or ₦400 without ceiling</td>
<td>₦336</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>525%</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Allowance</td>
<td>₦120</td>
<td>₦300</td>
<td>₦300</td>
<td>₦1800</td>
<td>₦180</td>
<td>₦1500</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Year Incentive Pay</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>One month</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unremunerated Allowance</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>₦5000</td>
<td>₦5000</td>
<td>₦1000</td>
<td>₦5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Lunch Allowance</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>₦2.00 per day</td>
<td>₦4.00 per day</td>
<td>₦2.00 per day</td>
<td>₦4.00 per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL BENEFIT</th>
<th>CIVIL SERVICE (current)</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR (Current)</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE DIFFERENTIALS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE DIFFERENTIALS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED RATES</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICITY ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>N1200</td>
<td>p.a.</td>
<td>N1680</td>
<td>p.a.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING LOAN SCHEME</td>
<td>7 years sal. max</td>
<td>8 years sal. max</td>
<td>N40,000</td>
<td>at 3% interest</td>
<td>N60,000</td>
<td>N60,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC STAFF</td>
<td>provision of 1 cook, 1 gardener, 1 steward, 1 night guard, 1 day guard for senior mgst. staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME FURNITURE LOAN</td>
<td>N10,000 - N13,000 in NEPA and NPA</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

RESPONDENTS' CLASSIFICATION RESULTS
### Table 15

Respondents' Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of "Grouped" Cases Correctly Classified: 64.14%
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