Organisational Climate and Silo Mentality Behaviour of Pension Fund Administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria

[1]AZUMARA, EMMANUEL CHUKWUEMEKA; [2]PROF. OMOANKHANLEN JOSEPH AKHIGBE
[1]Doctoral Candidate, Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt;
[2]Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt

Abstract: Pension fund managers in Rivers State, Nigeria, were analysed to determine how their internal politics and their tendency towards a "silo mentality" affect their work. Cross-sectional survey methodology was used for the research. The sample size for this study was one hundred seventy-one (171) workers. This study, however, used a systematic sampling method to choose a sample of 169 workers from the larger population. Copies of the questionnaire were given to responders in person to gather the data. Analysis of hypothesis 1-3 was performed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. According to the data, a lack of emotional investment, a pessimistic outlook on the job, and feelings of isolation are all negatively correlated with the organisational climate dimension of an equitable incentive system. It was thus concluded that for organisations to effectively minimize or eliminate the manifestation of silo mentality behaviour, they should create a conducive climate were employees perceive equity in reward and were the workers are given full support in executing their task effectively. The study recommended that the management of the pension find administrators should ensure a cordial and harmonious work environment that encourages collaboration as such will help avoid employee negative behaviour.

Keywords: Organizational Climate, Silo Mentality, Equitable Record System, Lack of Emotional Involvement, negative attitude, isolation

Introduction

The Pension Fund Administrators (PFA) is a servicing firm which require high collaborative effort of individuals in order to achieve stated goals. Ekpulu and Bingilar (2016) maintained that the Pension Reform Act (PRA) of 2004 changed the Nigeria standard pension model from benefit scheme to contribution scheme. Its primary objective is to promote long-term savings among workers for retirement and to provide a separate set of regulations for workers in the public and private sectors. According to Christian and Wobiaraeri (2016), pension fund administrators are private companies authorised to set up retirement savings accounts for workers; they invest and manage the pension funds in fixed-income listed securities and additional instruments as the relevant commission may prescribe from time to time; they maintain accurate records of all transactions involving the pension funds under their management; and they report on

investment strategies on a regular basis. Often times, the effort to cause transformation in the organisation is thwarted when employees fail to work together with a share of mission due to silo mentality (Ribeiro, Giacoman & Trantham, 2016).

However, the presence of silo mentality behaviour in the workplace could affect the synergy among employees and thus weaken the competitive stand of the firm in the industry. Syverson (2011) opined that silo attitude occurs when different departments or groups refuses to share knowledge or information with other employees in the same organization. Silo mentality behaviour courses distraction which can destabilize the operation of the organization. In alignment with the above assertion, Serrat (2010) pointed out that organizations and management teams are said to exhibit silo mentality behaviour when they lack the motivation or desire to communicate with other entities in the same firm, which thus result in duplication of effort inefficiency and inconsistencies. Silo behaviour is used to describe organizational parochialism (a mind-set of excessive narrowness). Silo behaviour can be defined as the behaviour exhibited by employee in the organization whereby they do not share information or knowledge with other employee in the organization.

However, employees are rational, cognitive and reflective being whose silo behaviour can be triggered as a result of the dominant organisational climate. When considering the larger fields of organisational psychology and organisational behaviour, the concept of "organisational climate" stands out as an integrative and holistic factor. The term "organisational climate" refers to the factors that shape the culture of an organisation. According to Armstrong (2013), an organization's climate consists of the elements of its environment that employees are aware of. Thus the perception of the employees could make them exhibit silo behaviour. Fenwick, Seville and Brunsdon (2009), argued that silos are usually used to describe internally focused unit of the organization whereby the external relationships are given little or insufficient attention. They maintained that breakdown in communication, co-ordination and co-operation among employees and other stakeholders, are the main features of silo behaviour. Organizations need to seek for best possible ways to eliminate or solve the problem of silo behaviour among employees in the workplace. Furthermore, Stone (2004), pointed out that silos pave an enabling environment whereby the individual interest of an ambitious manager may take precedence over the organisational well-being. Workers who think in silos are less likely to share their knowledge and work with those in other departments.

It is therefore of paramount importance to eradicate silo mindset which is capable of frustrating the effectiveness of the firm. Fenwick, Seville and Brunsdon (2009), argued that silo mentality is an individual or land group mind-set which could be divisive within and among organisations and which often manifest in communication barriers and triggers disconnected, disjointed and detrimental consequences on the relationship among employees (McManus, Seville, Brunsdon & Vargo, 2007). Watson (2012), viewed employees in firm as elephant and he argued that "No elephant can exist in isolation for a longtime. He further argued that silo behaviour causes a break in the networking among employees. Thus it is necessary to have an organisational climate that could foster collaboration and reduce silo behaviour. The dimensions of organisational climate are norms and standards, welfare concern, interpersonal relations, recognition and encouragement, reward, job security and job autonomy (Balachandran & Thomas, 2007).

Several work has been done in time past in an attempt to address the issue of silo behaviour. Chisita and Abdullahi (2012) examined how organization can get above silo Mentality through collaboration. Alter (2015) examined how silo thinking can be overcome in the information system discipline. Again Fenwick, Seville and Brunsdom (2009) studied how the impact of organisational silos on resilience could be reduced. Others scholars has actually examined the construct of silo behaviour (Shirey 2006; Servat, 2010; New house & Spring, 2010; Margalit, Thompson, Visovsky, Geske, Collier, Birk & Paulman, 2009; Gulati, 2007; Cilliers & Grey Venstein, 2012; Bannister, 2001; Aaker, 2013). Despite various research on silo behaviour, most of the studies was carried out in the advanced countries, again most of the studies was not empirical and did not examine how organisational climate relate with silo behaviour. It is this observed lacuna that has informed this study. This work differs from previous work because it intends to examine how organisational climate relates with silo behaviour of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem
The problem of silo behaviour cannot be over emphasized because of its high negative consequences in the workplace. Silo behaviour creates barriers within the firm and it also truncate opportunities that could be fostered by good communication, coordination and cooperation among employees. It is worth to note that the pension administration firms are firms which are saddled with the responsibilities of retirement plan. Thus, the success of the firm is highly dependent on the ability of the employees to effectively cooperate with the firm. Communication and information sharing are crucial for firms that wishes to remain competitive in the world of business. Silo behaviour impede information sharing and communication and thus creates barriers to opportunities that may have be explored through proper communication channel. Moreso, silo behavior truncate information relating to creativity, innovation and efficiency (FenWick, Seville & Brunsdon, 2009). Organizations are open system which operate maximally when there is a conducive climate. Thus employee who are social being may develop silo mentality when they perceive that the dominant climate in the workplace is not encouraging or does not encourage free sharing of information. Chisita and Abdullahi (2012) painted out that the problem of silo behaviour also manifests in failure to accomplish common goals and tendency of duplication of effort because of lack of coordination.

The problem of Silo mentality behaviour has over the years affected individual and the entire organisation. Silo mentality negatively affect team identity in the organisation and thus impede on the wellbeing of the firm (Cilliers & Greyvenstein, 2012). Again, Silo mentality behaviour result in inconsistency in responding to varieties or changes in demand of the organisation and it also the destabilizes the effective operations of business (Syverson 2011) the problem of Silo mentality also manifest in customer dissatisfaction, inability to meet with customer requirements, and incoherent among employees in the same organisation. (Mohapeloa, 2017). Furthermore, Silo mentality behaviour negatively affect employees' interest in getting a job done and the emotional involvement of employees in the organisation. Silo mentality behaviour also reduces the rate of employee affective and cognitive engagement in their firm. It further restrict or discourages knowledge and information sharing among employee. Silo mentality decreases key performance, negatively affects quantity services to customers, frustrates

employees, inability to meet employee and employer contractual obligations and failure to provide unique customers experience (Mahapeloa, 2017). Again, Silo mentality behaviiour among employees in the workplace, reduces morale, creates dysfunctioning of the organisation and also sends mixed signals externally and internally.

The problem of organisational silo behaviour manifest when the employees withhold information that may be useful to other employees or organization at large which could be cost the firm a great fortune. The cohesiveness of members of the organization is weakened when the workplace is dominated by employees with silo mentality behaviour. Silo behaviour is undesirable by organization because it creates communication barriers among group members. This facilitates the group or members working in isolation which impact negatively on the work process due to lack of integration between functions. This is more serious in service-based firms that compromise on the ability to offer integrated solutions. In every firm where silo behaviour mentality is domicile, various objectives and goals of the firm cannot be achieved optionally because the collective work potentials and brain power of the organization cannot be maximally harnessed.

Despite the various work by various scholars on ways to resolve the problem of silo behaviour, vis-a-vis organizational silo, yet the problem still persist in the workplace. It is on this note that this study seeks to examine the relationship between organisational climate and silo mentality behaviour of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this work is to look at the correlation between organizational climate and silo mentality behaviour of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria. However, the specific objectives are to examine the relationship between;

1. Equitable reward system and lack of emotional involvement of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.
2. Equitable reward system and employee negative attitude of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.
3. Equitable reward system and isolation of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Research Hypotheses

The null hypotheses are proffered for the study;

Ho_1: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and lack of emotional involvement of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Ho_2: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and employee negative attitude of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Ho_3: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and isolation of pension fund administrators in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Literature Review
Person-Environment fit Model

Kurt Lewin conceptualized the interaction between the person and environment (P × E) as the key to understanding people's cognitive, affective and behavioral reactions. Person–environment fit (P–E fit) is the level to which environmental and individual

characteristics match (French, Caplan, & Harrison, 1982; Rounds, Dawis & Lofquist, 1987; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). People seek out and create environments that allow them to behaviourally manifest their traits (e.g., dominant individuals seek leadership positions); the extent people fit their work environments has significant consequences (e.g., performance, satisfaction, stress, turnover, productivity), with better fit related to improved outcomes; and P-E fit is a mutual and continuing process whereby individual shape their environments and environments shape people (Rounds & Tracey, 1990).

Lewinian Field theory

The second assumption of Gestalt psychology, suggested that individual associate the order they created to the environment they are in, which later translates into behaviour. Working on this assumption, Lewin (1951) in his work "Field theory in Social change" conceptualized the relationship between individuals and their social environment. For Kurt Lewin, behaviour is influenced by entirety of an individual's circumstances. In his field theory, a 'field' is defined as 'the totality of coexisting facts which are conceived of as mutually interdependent. Individuals were seen to behave differently according to the way in which tensions between perceptions of the self and of the environment were worked through. The total psychological field, otherwise 'life space', within which individual acted, had to be observed, in a way to understand behaviour. Within this individuals and groups could be seen in topological terms (using map-like representations).

Concept of Organization Climate

Various definitions have been used to elucidate the idea of organizational climate. One of the earlier definitions of organizational climate was from Forehand and Gilmer (1964). They regard organizational climate as a collection of somewhat stable characteristics that illustrates an organization, differentiate it from other organizations, relatively stable over time and influences organizational member's behaviour. One of the most extensively mentioned definitions of organizational climate is that of Litwin and Stringer (1968). They regard organizational climate as a collection of measurable properties of the work settings perceived directly or indirectly by organizational members and assumed to influence their motivation and also behaviour.

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) used a psychological definition of organizational climate which addresses the issue of interpretation. They regard organizational climate as a collection of perceived traits of a specific organization. The traits are found to be generated from the way an organization deals with their members and environment. Lastly, Schneider (1990) defined organizational climate as 'incumbents' perceptions of the events, practices and procedures and the types of behaviours' that are rewarded, supported and expected in a environment. Generally, organizational climate can be defined as employees' personal views of the work setting and these views can lead to emotional reactions and consequently influences employees' behaviour (Poon & Ainuddin, 1990).

Equitable Reward System

Reward system according to Armstrong (2001) consists of a firm integrated process, policies, and practices for rewarding its staffs in line with their skill and competence,

market worth and contribution. The reward system is established within the context of the firm's strategies and policies, reward philosophy and contains arrangements in the form of procedures, processes, structures and practices which will provide and maintain suitable levels and types of pay, benefits and other forms of reward. Obisi (2005) defines reward system is a prize employee receives as an inducement towards their performance. Robert (2005) maintained that reward system is the act of initiating and implementing policies, strategies and systems which help the firm to actualize its objectives by attracting and keeping the people it needs and boosting their motivation and commitment.

Wasiu and Adebajo (2014) in their study outlined features of reward system, thus; Competitiveness, Rewards must satisfy employee needs, Equity and Flexibility. There is an upsurge demand on firms to develop reward plans that can inspire employees to work enthusiastically and faster. These programs usually educate and encourage associates to become more productive, efficient, and valuable individuals in the company in terms of the "bottom-line" (Mujtaba, 2008). As a result of the pressures in relation to incentives and performance or procedures of implementation, in some cases, unethical behaviours are encouraging by these program. Firm therefore is required to have a suitable pay system that motivate and reward employees, in order to attract and retain qualified and committed individuals and to make them remain focused on producing quality products in an efficient manner and to always do the right thing. At the meantime, managers and entrepreneurs should be moving toward greater alignment between performance management and company strategies, values, and quality measures (Mujtaba & Shuaib, 2010).

Concept of Silo Mentality Behaviour
The idea of silo mentality behaviour has become more necessary in this era because of its influence on the total wellbeing and success of the organization. Silos in organization do not merely refer to conscious structures, nevertheless is also refer to an unconscious condition of mentality and mind that focuses on a life of its own. Silos leads in the splitting of firms' artefacts and interactions, and influence negatively on relationship building between individuals and among teams (Cilliers & Greyvenstein, 2012). The concept of organisational silos is often used in practice but has not been thoroughly researched. Neebe (1987) first propounded silos as a metaphor within organisational behaviour, with special reference to grain silos as an illustration of how various parts of a firm function in a way disconnected from others. The broad organisational psychology writings refer to the concept based on the traditional opinion and mechanical way in which firms are structured (Weisbord & Janoff, 2005; Diamond & Allcorn, 2009). This indicates a hierarchical firms structure in which positions run downward – vertically, starting with those with greatest organisational authority and control to individuals with least power.

Scholars like Greenberg and Baron (2003) used silo metaphor to mean organisation fragmentation and dysfunction. It denotes an emotional state of disconnection – the left hand not aware of whatever the other is doing, isolation, powerlessness, stuckness, lack of respect, trust, collegiality and collaboration.

Lack of Emotional Involvement
Emotion are intricate feeling accompanied by physiological arousal and overt behaviours". According to Wirth (2006), involvement is a motivational metal notion that

encompasses a wide range of responses to or interactions with a mediated stimulus. It's thought of as a mental condition or process with distinct mental, emotional, and behavioural sub-elements.

Several scholars have suggested that being emotionally invested in a task and experiencing strong emotions are both indicators of or correlates with being motivated. To put it another way, a person who is emotionally invested is "captured" by the mediated environment. Therefore, the emotional aspects of the mediated environment become more prominent and meaningful to the person experiencing them. In addition, the person has an urge to behave in line with the emotions (Brehm, 1999) or is driven to do so (Lerner & Keltner, 2000). Different feelings elicit distinctive patterns of behaviour (Lerner & Keltner, 2000). All of these methods are based on the same basic premise, which is both simple and compelling: when people are emotionally invested in something, they are more likely to put their attention and focus on that thing (Lerner & Keltner, 2000).

Since organisations are co-constituted and influenced by emotional qualities, emotions play a significant role in our individual and social lives in the workplace. As places where a wide variety of sentiments and passions can be expressed, organisations are a form of emotional arena (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995) that vibrates with the powerful processes of experienced emotions. Emotions in the workplace are not only a factor in the social life of an organisation; rather, they are an integral part of it, both helping to shape and being shaped by the established norms and values of that organisation (van Maanen & Kunda, 1989).

Employee negative Attitude
One's attitude is their mental or psychological state of preparedness towards all events and objects to which they are associated. This condition is organised via experience. Positivity and negativity are the two poles from which attitudes are derived. They reflect how a person really feels about something (Robbins, 2003). A positive affirmation may cause desired or even positive outcomes for the person, thing, or event in question, while a negative assertion may cause undesirable or even negative outcomes.

An attitude can be thought of as a positive or negative emotional state or a psychologically prepared response to people, circumstances, and objects that is acquired and arranged via experience. The ramifications of this attitude characterization for managers are not without weight. First and foremost, one's attitude is something that one picks up through their own experiences. Second, an employee's attitudes characterise their inclinations towards particular areas of the world. Finally, an individual's attitude reveals the motivations behind their affiliation with and interactions with coworkers. As a fourth point, one's attitudes are well-structured and embedded deep within one's character. Some attitudes are more stable and long-lasting than others, although everyone's point of view can shift with time (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974).

Isolation
Isolation, as defined by Merriam-Webster, is the state of being alone. According to WordNet.com, social isolation is "a state of separation between persons or groups and a feeling of being disliked or alone." According to Etymology.com, the term "isolation" comes from the Latin insulatus, which means "made into an island." Isolation, in the context of science, means to set apart from other people or things. Isolation from

important others, organisations, activities, and social settings can have negative effects on an individual's ability to interact with others (Biordi & Nicholson, 1995; Sells, 2008).

In most cases, people experience social isolation when they are physically prevented from interacting with others. Isolation is not subjective, but rather the objective state of having few social ties, being uninvolved in existing social networks, communicating less, and having close relationships with people severed over a lengthy period of time. Isolation, then, is not so much a feeling as it is a situation. When an employee is isolated, he or she is deprived of typical sensory and social input and may also be forced to endure restrictions on his or her freedom of movement. However, the relative importance of each characteristic varies from one person to the next or from one social group to another, making it impossible to specify which characteristics must be present for a person to be characterised as solitary.

Methodology

A cross-sectional survey, a form of quasi-experimental research, was used for this investigation. Justifying the use of a cross-sectional survey is the fact that it provides a snapshot in time and may be used to either confirm or refute hypotheses. The target population is 21 pension fund administrators in Rivers state according to the national pension commission (Pencom). However, the accessible population of this study was the 169 employees of 15 pension fund administrators in Port Harcourt. In determining the sample size, the researcher make use of the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table. From the table, the sample size for a population of 169 is 118. Questionnaire was distributed to only 118 employees in the firms under study. Therefore, the sample size for this study is 118 employees. Using SPSS version 21, we performed a statistical analysis of the hypothesis using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation to learn more about the connections between the variables.

Result and Discussions

We sent out 118 copies of the questionnaire and received back 98 (or 83%), with 4 of those copies being null, thus we used 94 (or 80%) of those that were returned. Six demographic factors, including gender, married status, educational attainment, and age range, were analysed.

Table 1: Gender Distribution

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	69	73.4	73.4	73.4
	Female	25	26.6	26.6	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2023

Respondents' sex identities are broken down in Table 1. There were more men than women among the responses. Seventy-three percent (69 responses) of the sample were

males, whereas just twenty-six percent were females. This suggests that men make up the bulk of the workforce.

Table 2: Marital Status Distribution

Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	80	85.1	85.1	85.1
	Single	8	8.5	8.5	93.6
	Divorced	1	1.1	1.1	94.7
	Separated	3	3.2	3.2	97.9
	Widow/Widower	2	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2023

Table 2 displays the breakdown of respondents based on their marital status. One person is divorced, two are widowed, three are separated, and the remaining respondents are all single.

Table 3: Educational Qualification Distribution

Highest Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MBA/MA/M.Sc/ M.Ed	3	3.2	3.2	3.2
	BA/B.Sc/B.Ed/ HND	70	74.5	74.5	77.7
	OND/NCE	21	22.3	22.3	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2023

The respondents' educational backgrounds are listed in Table 3. According to the graph, the most common level of education held by respondents is a bachelor's (37.5%), followed by an associate's (22.3%) and a master's (3.2%).

Table 4: Age Distribution

Age Bracket

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30-39 years	25	26.6	26.6	26.6
	40-49 years	62	66.0	66.0	92.6
	50 years old and above	7	7.4	7.4	100.0
	Total	94	100.0	100.0	

Source: Research Data, 2023

The respondents' ages are displayed in Table 4. The results suggest that the largest demographic group is made up of people aged 40–49 (66.0%), followed by those aged 30-39 (26.6%), and finally those aged 50+ (7.4%).

Hypotheses Testing
Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and lack of emotional involvement.

Table 5: Equitable reward system and lack of emotional involvement

		EQUITABLE REWARD SYSTEM	LACK OF EMOTION INVOLVEMENT
EQUITABLE REWARD SYSTEM	Pearson Correlation	1	**-.130**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		**.002**
	N	94	94
LACK OF EMOTION INVOLVEMENT	Pearson Correlation	**-.130**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**.002**	
	N	94	94

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Table 5 reveals that there is a statistically significant correlation between a fair incentive system and dispassion in the workplace (p 0.05, 0.002 0.05, rho = -0.130). This suggests that a fair system of rewards is closely linked to dispassionate performance. The association is negative, however, meaning that a more equal compensation system will lead to greater employee emotional investment in the company, but the opposite will be true if the reward system is not fair. By rejecting the null hypothesis, we are reiterating the significance of the link between fair rewards and dispassion.

Table 6: Equitable reward system and Employee Negative Attitude
Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and employee negative attitude

		EQUITABLE REWARD SYSTEM	EMPLOYEE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE
EQUITABLE REWARD SYSTEM	Pearson Correlation	1	**-.065**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		**.032**
	N	94	94
EMPLOYEE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE	Pearson Correlation	**-.065**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**.032**	
	N	94	94

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Table 6's study demonstrates a negative correlation between an equitable incentive system and employee unfavourable attitude at the p 0.05 (0.032 0.05) level. That's why it's so important to have a fair compensation system in place: it reduces employee negativity. Nonetheless, the correlation is negative, suggesting that positive sentiments towards the company and its management are more likely among employees when the reward system is fair and less so when it is not. The significant link between an equitable reward system and worker dissatisfaction is restated, and the null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

Table 7: Equitable reward system and Isolation
Ho$_3$: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and isolation.

		EQUITABLE REWARD SYSTEM	ISOLATION
EQUITABLE REWARD SYSTEM	Pearson Correlation	1	**-.105**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		**.015**
	N	94	94
ISOLATION	Pearson Correlation	**-.105**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	**.015**	
	N	94	94

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Table 7's statistical analysis reveals a negative correlation (rho = -0.105, p 0.05) between social isolation and an equitable reward system. This implies that a lack of a fair incentive system is significantly correlated with being on your own. However, the link is inverse, so that if the compensation system is equitable, the workers will be less isolated and vice versa if it is not. The considerable link between an equitable incentive system and social isolation is reaffirmed, and the null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

Discussions
Ho$_1$: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and lack of emotional involvement.
According to the results of testing Null Hypothesis 1, there is a statistically significant inverse association between an equal reward system and apathy. Given that the p-value is only .002 and the r-value is just -.130, it follows that a sufficient and fair compensation system in the organisation increases emotional involvement. Simply put, this means that a fair incentive structure is inversely related to a person's level of emotional investment in their work. Furthermore, the correction of determination (r^2) is 0.0169. The implication of the coefficient of determination shows that 1.7% total variation in lack of emotional involvement is accounted for by the equitable reward system in the organization. This align with the opinion of Jilani and Juma (2015) which maintained that reward system has high motivational influence on employees. Munap, Badrillah and Rahman (2013) believed opined that salary served as the most essential factor that enhances employee satisfaction while incentives was the least important factor. Bureaucratic system in the implementation of rewards is preferred to team and inclusive approach which is more equitable have unfaviourable and negative effect on the involvement of employees (Jilani & Juma, 2015).

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and employee negative attitude.

An equitable reward system was found to have a statistically significant inverse association with unfavourable sentiments among workers, refuting the second hypothesis. An equal incentive system is correlated with reduced unfavourable views among workers, as indicated by a P-value of.03, which is less than the level of significance. However, rho value of -.065 reveal that equitable reward system is negatively correlated with employee negative attitude. This implies that when there is equitable reward, employee negative attitude reduces. This agree with Ajmal, Bashir, Abrar, Khan and Saqib (2015) who opined that extrinsic reward and intrinsic reward do positively relates with the positively attitude of employee. Negative attitude in the organization will be minimized when there is equitable and satisfactory reward system (Ajmal, Bashir, Abrar, Khan & Saqib, 2015). Nazir, Qun, Akhtar, Shafi and Nazir (2015) maintained that the financial reward climate of an organization, do positively and significantly relates with the attitude of the employees in terms of positive job satisfaction, commitment and boost the output of the organization. Maben, Amadi and Amakiri (2017) observed that pay influences the employee work attitude in the organization.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between equitable reward system and isolation.

An equal incentive system was found to have a statistically significant inverse link with social isolation (Hypothesis 3). A p-value of.015 indicates a statistically significant correlation between an equitable incentive system and social isolation (the threshold at which results are considered reliable). In addition, the rho value of -.105 shows that fair rewards and social isolation are negatively correlated with one another. This means that when equitable reward increases, isolation reduces in the organization. Equitable reward system can help reduce the rate of isolation in the organization. Cooper and Narland (2002) remarked that employees feel isolated when they miss the opportunity of participating in developmental activities. Baskar and Rajkumar (2013) concluded that organizations should use different strategies to motivate their workforce, including reward system.

Conclusion and Recommendations

When employees in a company have a silo mentality, productivity and growth might be stunted. The two factors, silo mentality and organisational climate, are strongly correlated negatively. This implies that equitable reward system has a negative significant relationship with lack of emotional involvement, employee negative attitude and isolation. This means that lack of emotional involvement, employee negative attitude and isolation reduces when there is equitable reward system in the organisation.

The following suggestions are made based on this study's findings:

1. Keeping employees from engaging in undesirable behaviour requires the pension fund administrators' management to foster an amicable and pleasant workplace that promotes teamwork.
2. The pension fund managers should foster a positive work environment to encourage employees to invest more of themselves emotionally in the company.

3. In order to keep its employees from developing a bad attitude towards their work, the pension fund administrators' upper management should provide for fair compensation.

References

Aaker, D. (2013). *Spanning silos: the new CMO imperative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Armstrong, M. A. (2013). *Basic topology*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Armstrong, M. (2001). *A Handbook of Human Resources Management Practice* (8th ed). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1995). Emotion in the workplace. A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2), 97–125.

Balachandran, M., & Thomas, I. (2007). Dimensions of organizational climate. *The psychespace, 1*(1); 27-36.

Bannister, F. (2001). Dismantling the silos: extracting new value from IT investments in public administration. *Information Systems Journal*, 11:65 – 84.

Biordi, D. L., & Nicholson, N. R. (1995). Social isolation. In I. M. Lubkin (Ed.), *Chronic illness: Impact and interventions* (pp. 168–190). Boston: Jones and Bartlett.

Brehm, J. W. (1999). The intensity of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 2–22.

Chisita, C. T., & Abdullahi, I. (2012). *Rising above the grain silo mentality through collaboration*: Creating opportunities between the LIS educators and practionners in developing countries. Helsmki, World library and information congress.

Christian, M. L., & Wobiaraeti, O. G. (2016). Pension fund administration and infrastructure financing in Nigeria. *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade*, 13(2), 1 – 13.

Cilliers, F., & Greyvenstein, H. (2012). The impact of silo mentality on team identity: An organisational case study. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 38(2), 1-9.

Diamond, M. A., & Allcorn, S. (2009). *Private selves in public organizations – The psychodynamics of organizational diagnosis and change*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ekpulu, G. A., & Bingilar, P. F. (2016). Pension fund in Nigeria: an appraisal. *Quarterly Journal of Contemporary Research*, 1 & 2; 196 – 209.

Fenwick, T., Seville, E. & Brunsdon, D. (2009). *Reducing the impact of organisational silos on resilience*. New Zealand, Resilience organization.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1974). Attitudes towards objects as predictors of single and multiple behavioral criteria. *Psychological Review*, 81, 59-74.

Forehand, G. A., & Gilmer, B. V. H. (1964). Environmental variation in studies of organizational behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 62*, 361-382.

French, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Van Harrison, R. (1982). *The mechanisms of job stress and strain* (Vol.7). Chichester [Sussex]; New York: J. Wiley.

Gulati, R. (2007). Silo busting: How to execute on the promise of customer focus. *Harvard Business Review*, May, 1-9.

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (1974). Organisational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies. *Academy of Management Journal, 17*, 255-280.

Kristof- Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals'fit at work: a meta- analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281-342.

Lerner, J., & Keltner, D. (2000). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 146–159.

Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social change New York*. Harper Torchbooks, 1964

Margalit, R., Thompson, S., Visovsky, C., Geske, J., Collier, D., Birk, T., & Paulman, P. (2009). From professional silos to interprofessional education: campuswide focus on quality of care. *Quality Management in Healthcare*, *18*(3), 165-173.

McManus, S., Seville, E., Brunsdon, D., & Vargo, J. (2007). *Resilience management: A framework for assessing and improving the resilience of organisations*. Christchurch, New Zealand, resilient organisations research programme.

Mohapeloa, T. (2017). *Effects of Silo mentality on Corporate ITC's business model*. Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on business excellence 1009 – 1019.

Mujtaba, B. G. (2008). *Coaching and Performance Management: Developing and Inspiring Leaders*. ILEAD Academy Publications; Davie, Florida, USA

Mujtaba, B.G. & Shuaib, S. (2010). An Equitable Total Rewards Approach to Pay for Performance Management. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice* 11(4), 111-121.

Neebe, A.W. (1987). An Improved, Multiplier Adjustment Procedure for the Segregated Storage Problem. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 38(9), 815-825.

Newhouse, R. P., & Spring, B. (2010). Interdisciplinary evidence-based practice: Moving from silos to synergy. *Nursing outlook*, *58*(6), 309-317.

Obisi, C. (2005). *Substance of Employee, Industrial and Labour Relations*. Lagos: Megavous Limited.

Poon, J. M. L., & Ainuddin, R. A. (1990). Relationships between perceived organisational climate and job satisfaction and performance *Malaysian Management Review, 25*(1), 24- 35.

Ribeiro, F., Giacoman, A. & Trantham, M. (2016). *Dealing with market disruption*: seven strategies for breaking down silo New York, PWC disclaimer.

Roberts, R.L. (2005). *Relationship between Rewards, Recognition and Motivation at Insurance Company in the Western Cape*, University of the Western Cape.

Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organisational behaviour: global and Southern African perspectives*. Cape Town, Pearson Education South Africa.

Rounds, J. B., & Tracey, T. J. (1990). From trait-and factor to person-environment fit counseling: Theory and process. *Career Counseling: Contemporary Topics in Vocational Psychology*, 1–44.

Rounds, J. B., Dawis, R., & Lofquist, L. H. (1987). Measurement of person-environment fit and prediction of satisfaction in the theory of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 297-318.

Schneider, B. (1990). The Climate for Service: An application of the climate construct. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organisational Climate and Culture* (pp. 383-412). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sells, S. B. (2008). *The taxonomy of man in enclosed space*. In J. Rasmussen (Ed.), *Man in isolation and confinement* (pp. 281–304). New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Serrate, O. (2010). Bridging organisational silos. Washington DC: Asian development bank, 1-5.

Shirey, M. R. (2006). On entrepreneurship from silo to collaboration. *Clinical nurse specialist*, 20(5): 229 – 232.

Stone, F. (2004). Deconstructing silos and supporting collaboration. *Employment relations today*, 31(1): 11 – 18.

Syverson, C. (2011). What determines productivity? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 49(2), 326-36.

Van Maanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). 'Real feelings: emotional expression and organizational culture', *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 11, 43–103.

Wasiu, B. O., & Adebajo, A. A. (2014). Reward system and employee's performance in Lagos State (a study of selected public secondary schools). *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review,* 3(8) 14-28

Watson, J. (2012). *Supported decision making for people with severe or profound intellectual disability*: 'We're all in this together, aren't we? Paper presented at the 6th Roundtable on Intellectual Disability Policy Services and Families Working Together, Bundoora: LaTrobe University.

Weisbord, M., & Janoff, S. (2005). Faster, shorter, cheaper may be simple; it's never easy. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*(1), 70. http://dx.doi. org/10.1177/0021886304273248

Wirth, W. (2006). Involvement. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Psychology of entertainment* (pp. 199–213). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.