

## AN EVALUATION OF STAFF MOTIVATION, DISSATISFACTION AND JOB PERFORMANCE IN AN ACADEMIC SETTING

**Mohammed Abubakar Mawoli**

*Department of Business Administration  
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State  
[sabe1120@yahoo.com](mailto:sabe1120@yahoo.com)*

&

**Abdullahi Yusuf Babandako**

*Department of Business Administration  
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State*

### ABSTRACT

*This study seeks to ascertain academic staff level of motivation, dissatisfaction and performance at work. The study employed a survey research method to collect research data from academic staff of Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Nigeria. A total of 141 or 64% of the academic staff of the University were sampled out of a population of 219 academic staff. Descriptive statistical tools were used to measure the research variables. The study reveals that academic staffs are very highly motivated at work and also highly contented with the working environment. The study further revealed that staff performance as it relates to teaching is very high while their performance in the areas of research and other publications is moderate. It is therefore recommended that universities and other tertiary institutions should take the issue of academic staff motivation seriously to facilitate effective teaching and delivery of knowledge.*

**Keywords:** *Motivation, Teaching Performance, Research Performance, Academic Staff, Uni*

### INTRODUCTION

Motivation is the inner drive that pushes individuals to act or perform. Specific theories may propose varying set of factors influencing motivation (Harder, 2008) but many scholars agree that motivation is the psychological process that causes the arousal, direction, intensity and persistence of behavior (Locke and Latham, 2004; Pinder, 1998).

Fundamentally, motivation is the process that leads to behaviour, and this process cannot be directly measured or observed. Consequently, earlier researchers on motivation have identified various factors that could be applied in measuring motivation. In particular, Herzberg (1966) empirically identified satisfaction/no-satisfaction factors and dissatisfaction/no-dissatisfaction factors as the determinants of staff motivation and staff contentment at work respectively. Satisfaction/no-satisfaction related factors motivate and/or de-motivate workers, while dissatisfaction/no-dissatisfaction factors provide hygienic and conducive working environment or non-hygienic and non-conducive working environment, which could either eliminate or encourage workers' complaints about working conditions. Jaafar, Ramayah and Zainal (2006) affirm that hygiene issues can minimize dissatisfaction if handled properly and can only dissatisfy if they are absent. Nelson and Quick (2003) note that motivation factors are the more important of the two sets of factors because they directly affect a person's motivation drive to do a good job. They added that hygienic factors only support *the motivators* but they (the hygienic factors) do not directly affect a person's motivation to work; they only influence the extent of the person's discontent.

### Statement of Problem

Several models have been developed for measuring individual motivation. Herzberg Two-Factor theory was particularly developed to measure what motivates workers at work. Nelson and Quick (2003) contend that a combination of motivation and hygiene factors could be used in measuring motivation and that a job high in motivation and hygiene factors leads to high motivation and few complaints among employees. For example, Gunu (2003) adopted the Herzberg's satisfaction/motivation model to determine job satisfaction among staff of public enterprises in Kwara State. In addition, Jaafar, Ramayah, and Zainal (2006) utilized Herzberg's satisfaction/motivation model to assess managers' job satisfaction in a construction company in Malaysia. Herzberg's hygiene and motivation factors was also applied to evaluate employees' *job attraction* and

*motivational factors* in agro industry (see: Abdulsalam, Damisa, and Iliyasu, 2007). However, evidence of the application of Herzberg Two-Factor model to evaluate employees' performance in an academic setting is to the best of our knowledge, lacking. Hence, this study adopts same model (Herzberg's motivation model) to measure academic staff level of motivation at work. The study has gone a step further to adopt Herzberg's hygiene factor to assess academic staff level of dissatisfaction at work.

In addition, the researcher observed [after all, much of what we know comes from observation (Cooper and Schindler, 2003)] that university lecturers often miss their lessons, and fail to mark students' continuous assessment (CA) assignments, tests and practical works perhaps due to excess workload or lack of motivation. Hence, it was considered pertinent to evaluate academic staff level of teaching performance. The researcher equally observed that quite a number of university lecturers' research outputs, though enough to gain promotion is far short of their optimality. Hence, the need to empirically ascertain academic staff performance as it relates to research publications.

### **Objectives of the Study**

This study is set out to achieve the following objectives:

1. To assess the academic staff level of dissatisfaction with their working environment.
2. To ascertain academic staff level of satisfaction and/or motivation at work.
3. To evaluate academic staff level of teaching performance.
4. To examine the academic staff level of research performance.

### **Research Questions**

To facilitate effective realization of the aforementioned research objectives, the following research questions are posed:

1. To what extent are the academic staffs dissatisfied with the working environment?
2. To what extent are the academic staffs satisfied or motivated on their jobs?
3. What is the level of teaching performance of the academic staff?
4. What is the level of research performance of the academic staff?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **The Concept of Motivation**

Motivation, a Latin word "movere" means *to move*. Motivation is the activation or energization of goal-oriented behavior (Wikipedia, 2010). To Nelson and Quick (2003), motivation is the process of arousing and sustaining goal-directed behavior. Yet, Luthans (1998) sees it as the process that arouses, energizes, directs, and sustains behavior and performance, while Pinder (1998) defines work motivation as the set of internal and external forces that initiate work-related behavior, and determine its form, direction, intensity and duration.

The cited definitions shared some implicative commonalities. First, motivation is in-built in every human being and only needed to be activated or aroused. Second, motivation is temporal as a motivated person at one time can become de-motivated another time. Hence, individual motivation must be sustained and nourished after it has been effectively activated. Third, the essence of individual motivation in management or an organizational setting is to align employees behavior with that of the organization. That is, to direct the employees thinking and doing (performance) towards effective and efficient achievement of the organizational goals.

### **Job Performance**

Performance is behavior exhibited or something done by the employee (Campbell, 1990). According to Motowidlo, Borman and Schmidt (1997), job performance is the behavior that can be evaluated in terms of the extent to which it contributes to organizational effectiveness (see: Onukwube, Iyabga and Fajana, 2010). Hillriegel, Jackson and Slocum (1999) see job performance as individual's work achievement after having exerted effort. Viswesveran and Ones (2000) regard it as the behavior and outcomes that employees engage in or bring about that are linked with and contribute to organizational goals (see: Onukwube *et al.*, 2010). It is clear from these definitions that job performance is related to the extent to which an employee is able to accomplish the task assigned to him or her and how the accomplished task contributes to the realization of the organizational goal.

Job performance is not a single unified construct but a multidimensional construct consisting of more than one kind of behaviour. Onukwube *et al.* (2010) affirm that job performance was traditionally viewed as a single construct. However, Austin and Villanova (1992) and Campell (1990) argue that job performance is a complicated and multidimensional factor. Thus, Campbell (1990) proposed an eight-factor model of performance based on *factor analytic* research that attempts to capture dimensions of job performance existent (to a greater or lesser extent) across all jobs:

- i. Task specific behaviours which include those behaviours that an individual undertakes as part of a job. They are the core substantive tasks that delineate one job from another.
- ii. Non-task specific behaviour are those behaviours which an individual is required to undertake which do not pertain only to a particular job.
- iii. Written and oral communication tasks refer to activities where the incumbent is evaluated, not on the content of a message necessarily, but on the adeptness with which they deliver the communication. Employees need to make formal and informal oral and written presentations to various audiences in many different jobs in the work force.
- iv. An individual's performance can also be assessed in terms of effort, either day to day, when there are extraordinary circumstances. This factor reflects the degree to which people commit themselves to job tasks.
- v. The performance domain might also include an aspect of personal discipline. Individuals would be expected to be in good standing with the law, not abuse alcohol, etc.
- vi. In jobs where people work closely or are highly interdependent, performance may include the degree to which a person helps out the groups and his or her colleagues. This might include acting as a good role model, coaching, giving advice or helping maintain group goals.
- vii. Many jobs also have supervisory or leadership component. The individual will be relied upon to undertake many of the things delineated under the previous factor and in addition will be responsible for meting out rewards and punishment. These aspects of performance happen in a face to face manner.
- viii. Managerial and administrative performance entails those aspects of a job which serve the group or organization but do not involve direct supervision. A managerial task would be setting an organizational goal or responding to external stimuli to assist a group in achieving its goals. In addition, a manager might be responsible for monitoring organizational sources.

### Theories of Motivation

There have been attempts to present models of motivation which list a specific number of motivating needs, with the implication that these list are all-inclusive and represent the total picture of needs. Unfortunately, each of these models has weaknesses and gaps, and thus leaving the existing literature without a general theory of motivation.

The existing literature reveals several classifications of motivational theory. Motivational theories are generally classified into two (2): content motivation theories and process motivation theories (Anonymous, 2009). Content theories try to explain why people are motivated in different ways and in different work setting. In this category belongs 'need theories' (see: Maslow, 1954; Alderfer, 1972; and McClelland, 1965), job content theory (see: Herzberg, 1966; and Hackman and Oldham, 1975). The need theories maintain that an individual is motivated to do something if he or she experiences a specific need that may be fulfilled directly or indirectly by performing that action. However, the job content theories maintain that only aspects related to job content satisfy and motivate people to work. Specifically, Herzberg (1966) proposed a two factor (motivation-hygiene) motivation theory. The *satisfier/motivators* include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement and growth, while the *hygiene* factors include company policy and administration, supervision, relationship with supervisor, working conditions, personal life, salary, relationship with subordinates, status, and security. Motivators are the factors that fulfill individual's needs for meaning and personal growth; hygiene factors create dissatisfaction when they are mishandled. Cole (2005:98) states:

*To take motoring analogy, hygiene factors can be considered as filling up the petrol tank, i.e. the car will not go, if there is no fuel, but refueling of itself does not get the vehicle under way. For forward movement, the car electric must be switched on and the starter operated – this is the effect created by the motivators.*

Process or cognitive motivation theories attempt to understand how and why people are motivated. According to Cardona, Lawrence and Espejo (2003), cognitive development motivation tries to explain how people initiate, sustain, and terminate work motivation. Vroom's Expectancy Theory, Adam's Equity Theory, Locke's Goal Setting Theory and Skinner's Reinforcement Theory, etc. are example of process theories. Vroom's

expectancy theory is founded on the basic notions that people desire certain outcomes of behavior and performance, which may be thought of as rewards or consequences of behavior, the performance they achieve, and the outcome they receive (Nelson and Quick, 2003). Equity theory suggest that individuals are motivated when they find themselves in situations of inequity or unfairness (Adams, 1963). Inequity occurs when a person receives more, or less, than the person believes is deserved based on effort and/or contribution. The goal setting theory assumes that human behavior is guided by conscious goal (see: Locke, 1968). Skinner's reinforcement theory hold that behavior can be controlled through the use of reward (see: Anonymous, 2002).

Other motivation theories are intrinsic and extrinsic motivation theories, incentive theories, drive-reduction theories, broad theories, outcome theories, unconscious motivation theories, etc.

### **Previous Research on Level of Staff Motivation, Job Dissatisfaction and Job Performance in the Private and Public Sectors**

Previous studies on the level of staff motivation and job performance in the profit and non-profit organizations have yielded differing results. A study by Eze (1995) revealed that there is significant difference between the high-order motivators and the lower-order motivators and that being preoccupied with the motivators in one set would inhibit the urge to satisfy the motivators in the other set. The lower-order motivators (e.g. human physiological needs such as needs for food, clean water, clothing, shelter, and sex/marriage) are basic to Nigerian workers and more proponent than the higher order motives (Eze, 1995). Employees of the Kwara State Government, Nigeria were dissatisfied with their physiological needs (e.g. salary) (see: Gunu, 2003). Thus, Karwai (2005) argues that as long the human basic needs (or lower-order motivators) remain the major problem of workers in Nigeria, the quest for money which is the ultimate means of acquiring goods and service through whatever means (e.g. corruption, fraud, thuggery, militancy, robbery) will remain the order of the day and as such, a serious societal problem.

Gunu (2003) established employees' satisfaction with their esteem needs (e.g. promotion), and safety needs (e.g. work itself). High level of staff motivation and job satisfaction was found to exist among the employees of an agribusiness in Zarai, Nigeria (see: Abdulsalam, Damisa and Iliyasu, 2007). Isaac (2008) observed poor attitude to work among civil servants of Akwa Ibon State, Nigeria, which instigated him to probe into causes of such behavior. His study revealed low motivation among the staff, and high absenteeism from work, low punctuality to work, indolent to work, and fraudulent behavior. Furthermore, a significant relationship was established between motivation and employees' punctuality to work, motivation and indolent behavior, motivation and attitude to work, motivation and fraudulent behavior, and motivation and absenteeism (Isaac, 2008). Abejirinde (2009) used two motivational indicators, namely growth and promotion, to determine the level of staff motivation in the Nigerian public and private sectors. He established high rate of growth and promotion opportunities for the employees in both private and public organization. He equally established high rate of job performance among the staff.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The study is based on a single case study conducted in a state government owned university, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai in 2010 (5 years after its establishment). A case-study approach is particularly appropriate for individual researchers because it gives opportunity for an aspect of a problem to be studied in some depth within a limited time scale (Bell, 2004). He further state that the great strength of the case study method is that it allows the researcher to concentrate on a specific instance or situation and to identify, or attempt to identify, the various interactive at work. Thus, Nisbet and Watt (1980) affirm that sometime it is only by taking a practical instance that we can obtain a full picture of this interaction.

The study adopted a survey research method (otherwise called communication approach). The communication approach involves surveying people and recording their responses for analysis (Cooper and Schindler, 2003).

### **Research Population, Sample size and Sampling Procedure**

At the time of the study, the University had 15 departments and 217 numbers of academic staff. Consequently, Guilford and Flruchter (1973)'s formula for estimating sample size was applied to determine the study sample.

$$\frac{N}{1+\alpha^2N} = \frac{219}{1+(0.05^2)(219)} = \frac{219}{1+0.5475} = \frac{219}{1.5475} = 141.52 \approx 141$$

Where: N = size of population; and  $\alpha$  = alpha (0.05)

The formula yielded 141 samples, which represented 64% of the population. Since the academic staff of the University can be conveniently divided into strata of departments, stratified proportionate random sampling was applied in selecting the staff to form the study sample size. Specifically, 64% of the academic staff were proportionately selected from each department (see appendix 1). Peretomde (1992) and Owojori (2002) maintain that a sample size that is not less than 10% of the study population is a good representative of the population.

**Research Data and Instrument for Data Collection**

Primary data is most suitable for this kind of study. Hence, a closed-ended questionnaire was designed for effective collection of primary data from the target respondents. Hair, Bush and Ortinau (2000) identified interview and questionnaire as the main instruments used in generating data in a survey. In a study on job satisfaction among staff of selected public enterprises, Gunu (2003) used questionnaire instrument to gather primary data from 68 employees. While measuring employees’ performance and motivation, Herpen, Praag and Cools (2003) used mail questionnaire instrument to collect data from 1479 employees of a Dutch company listed in Amsterdam Stock Exchange.

**Measurement of Research Variables**

All the variable used in the study – motivation (MTiv), dissatisfaction (DSat), teaching performance (TPerf), and research performance (RPerf) - were measured using nominal scale – the 5 point Likert type rating scale. Specifically, the respondents were asked to rate each one of the 6 items on MTiv scale, each one of the 10 items on DSat scale, each one of the 10 items on the TPerf scale, and each one of the 12 items on the RSat scale. The responses were evaluated and used to compute descriptive statistics (frequency, weighted score, mean, standard deviation) for each of the explained variables. A single index (in form of grand mean) was obtained in respect of MTiv, DSat, TPerf, and RPerf. Consequently, any score (mean and/or grand mean) between 1.00 to 1.99 was considered as an indication of *very low* MTiv, TPerf, and Rperf; 2.00 to 2.99 was an indication of *low* MTiv, TPerf, and Rperf; 3.00 to 3.49 was an indication of *moderate* MTiv, TPerf, and Rperf; 3.50 3.99 was an indication of *high* MTiv, TPerf, and Rperf; and 4.00 to 5.00 was considered to be *very high* MTiv, TPerf, and Rperf. On the contrary, dissatisfaction (Dsat) was measured differently. Any score (mean and/or grand mean) between 1.00 to 1.99 was considered as an indication of *high job dissatisfaction*; 2.00 to 2.99 was an indication of *job dissatisfaction*; 3.00 to 3.99 *no job dissatisfaction*; and 4.00 to 5.00 was considered to be *highly not dissatisfied* on the job.

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

**Reliability Test**

The reliability of the scales were determined using Cronbach’s alpha method. Analysis revealed that motivation scale is reliable by 64%, job dissatisfaction by 74%, teaching performance by 76%, research performance by 89% (see table 1). Cronbach’s alpha measures the average of measurable items and its correlation, and if the result is generally above 0.5 (or 50%), it is considered to be reliable (see Peighambari, 2007).

**Table 1:** Reliability Coefficients of the Research Variables

Factor	Number of items	Cronbach Alpha
Motivation	6	0.64
Job dissatisfaction	9	0.74
Teaching performance	10	0.76
Research performance	12	0.89

Source: Researchers’ Computation, 2010

### Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 2 shows the respondent's demographic profile. First, the respondents were classified based on sex. The analysis revealed that 90.9% of the respondents are *Males* while 9.1% are *Females*.

The data analysis also revealed that majority of the respondents (27 or 49.09%) are within the age group 36 – 45 years, followed by those whose age group fall between 26 - 35 years (16 or 29.09%), while 7 or 12.73% are within the age bracket 46 - 55 years. However, the analysis further revealed that fewer respondents amounting to 3 or 5.45% and 2 or 3.64% are within the age groups 18 -25 years and 56 years and above, respectively.

As regards the marital status of the respondents, analysis revealed that 49 or 83.64% are *married*, and the remaining 9 or 16.36% are *single*. None of the respondent is a *widow* or *divorced*. Furthermore, majority of the respondents (40 or 72.73%) are Muslims, while 13 or 23.64% are Christians. Only 2 of the respondents practice other religions.

The respondents were further classified according to their educational qualifications. It was found that majority of the respondents (41 or 74.55%) have Masters Degree, 12 or 21.82% have PhD or Doctoral Degree, while 2 or 3.64% have Bachelor Degree. Results of the analysis also revealed that majority of the respondents (37 or 67.3%) earned N101,000–N150,000, followed by 9 or 16.36% who earned between N151,000–N200,000 monthly. The respondents in the “N200,000-and-above” earning bracket are 6 or 10.91%, while those earning N51,000–N100,000 monthly are only 3 or 5.45%.

**Table 2: Profiles of the Respondents**

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>Sex</b>	Male	100	90.0
	Female	10	9.10
<b>Age</b>	18 – 25	6	5.45
	26 – 35	32	29.09
	36 – 45	52	47.27
	46 – 55	14	12.73
	56 years and above	6	5.45
<b>Marital status</b>	Single	18	16.36
	Married	92	83.64
	Divorced	Nil	0
	Widowed	Nil	0
<b>Religion</b>	Islam	80	72.73
	Christianity	26	23.64
	Traditional	Nil	0
	Others	2	1.81
	<i>Invalid</i>	2	1.81
<b>Highest Qualification</b>	Bachelor Degree/ HND	4	3.64
	Master Degree	82	74.55
	PhD	24	21.82
<b>Income</b>	≤ N50000	0	0
	Between N51000 - N100000	6	51.45
	Between N101000 - N150000	74	67.30
	N151000 – N200000	18	16.36
	N201000 & above	12	10.91

n = 110

**Source:** Field survey, 2010.

### Extent of Job Dissatisfaction among the Academic Staff

The study investigated the level of staff dissatisfaction on their job. Analysis revealed the mean scores for each of the 9 items/determinants of academic staff job dissatisfaction (see appendix 3 for frequency distribution on staff dissatisfaction). On a five-point scale, the mean score for **company policy** is 3.9818 (sd = 0.8049), **supervision** is 4.0000 (sd = 0.7935), **relationship with supervisor** is 4.1273 (sd = 0.7215), **work conditions** is 3.9273 (0.9594), **salary** is 4.0182 (sd = 0.8712), **relationship with subordinates** is 3.3273 (sd = 0.9439), **status** is 3.6364 (sd=1.1116), and **job security** is 3.8000 (sd = 0.9699). The results indicate that academic staff are *highly not dissatisfied* on each of 3 job dissatisfaction factors – relationship with supervisors, salary, and supervision – in the arranged descending order. However, the result shows that staffs are *not dissatisfied* on the remaining 6 job dissatisfaction factors – company policy, working condition, job security, personal life, status, and relationship with subordinates in that descending order (see table 4). Overall, the academic staff are *not dissatisfied* in their job (Grand mean = 3.8323).

**Table 4: Respondents Level of Dissatisfaction at Work**

Statement Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ranking
Company Policy	3.9818	.8049	4 <sup>th</sup>
Supervision	4.0000	.7935	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Relationship with Supervisor	4.1273	.7215	1 <sup>st</sup>
Working Conditions	3.9273	.9594	5 <sup>th</sup>
Personal Life	3.6727	1.0010	7 <sup>th</sup>
Salary	4.0182	.8712	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Relationship with Subordinates	3.3273	.9439	9 <sup>th</sup>
Status	3.6364	1.1116	8 <sup>th</sup>
Job Security	3.8000	.9699	6 <sup>th</sup>

Grand mean = 3.8323

Source: Survey Data (2010)

### Academic Staff's Level of Motivation

Analysis revealed the mean scores for each of 6 item/determinants of motivation (see appendix 2 for frequency distribution on motivation). On a five-point scale, the mean score for **achievement** is 4.2000 (sd = 0.8477), **recognition** is 4.0545 (sd = 0.7308), **work itself** is 4.2182 (sd = 0.6856), **responsibility** is 4.0727 (0.9786), **advancement** is 4.0182 (sd = 8712), and **personal growth** is 3.6727 (sd = 0.9823). The results indicate that academic staff are very highly motivated on each of 5 motivational factors - work itself, achievement, responsibility, recognition, and advancement – in the arranged descending order. However, the result shows that staffs are only *highly motivated* on one motivational factor – personal growth (see table 3). In general, the result revealed a *very high* level of motivation among the academic staff (Grand mean = 4.0394).

**Table 3: Respondents Level of Motivation**

Statement Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ranking
My <b>achievement</b> on the current job is satisfactory	4.2000	.8477	2 <sup>nd</sup>
I am given due <b>recognition</b> at work.	4.0545	.7308	4 <sup>th</sup>
The <b>work itself</b> is interesting and challenging	4.2182	.6856	1 <sup>st</sup>
I am given due <b>responsibilities</b> at work to execute.	4.0727	.9786	3 <sup>rd</sup>
My <b>advancement</b> (i.e. promotion) on the current job is satisfactory.	4.0182	.8712	5 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Personal growth</b> (i.e. skills acquired through training and development) on the current job is satisfactory.	3.6727	.9823	6 <sup>th</sup>

Grand mean = 4.0394

Source: Survey Data (2010)

### Academic Staff Job Performance on the Basis of Teaching

It was considered pertinent to ascertain academic staff's level of job performance via teaching activities. Data analysis revealed a mean scores of between 4.00 to 4.49 for all 10 determinants of teaching performance (see table 4). This indicates that job performance, in terms of teaching, by the academic staff of the University is very high.

**Table 4: Respondents Level of Job Performance (Teaching)**

Statement Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
I attend my lessons according to the time-table.	4.0364	.9616
I attend to my lessons always.	4.4364	.6876
I enter my class at the right time (i.e. not late).	4.4727	.6900
I leave my class at right time (i.e. not earlier than supposed).	4.4182	.7623
I give notes to my students.	4.1636	1.0674
I give test, assignment and field/practical works to the students in every course I teach.	4.2182	1.0486
I mark all the assignments given to students.	4.3636	.8247
I return all continuous assessment (CA) marked scripts to students.	4.1091	.9559
I release the CA scores to students before examination commences.	4.0364	1.0709
I read and correct students' project.	4.1455	.8259

**Grand mean = 4.2400**

**Source:** Survey Data (2010)

### Academic Staff Job Performance on the Basis Research

It was considered pertinent to ascertain academic staff's level of job performance via research activities. On a five-point scale, data analysis revealed a mean score of 4.0909 for 'participating in a national conference annually'. Out of the 12 indicators of the academic staff's job performance based on research, 3 indicators namely publication in conference proceedings, participation in international conferences, and publications in an academic journal have mean that lie between 3.50 to 3.99, indication *high job performance* in terms of research. Seven indicators of research performance (e.g. publications in foreign journal, publication in edited books, co-authored a book, publications in book of readings, publications in newspaper and/or magazine, publication in participation in national research, and authorship) have mean scores of 3.00 to 3.49, indicating *moderate research performance*. Staff participation in international research is, however, low (mean = 2.7455). On the average, the performances of the academic staff on the basis of research projects is *high* (Grand mean = 3.7455). Scores and for all 10 determinants of teaching performance (see table 4). This indicates that job performance, in terms of teaching, by the academic staff is very high.

**Table 5: Respondents Level of Performance (Research)**

Statement Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
I attend at least on national conference per annum.	4.0909	.8876
I attend at least one international conference in every three (3) years.	3.7091	1.1000
My conference papers are published in conference proceedings.	3.9636	1.0177
I publish my research articles with a university, polytechnic or C.O.E.	3.9273	1.1683
My research articles have been published by a foreign journal.	3.4727	1.3173
I have authored a book(s.)	3.1091	1.4488
I have co-authored a book(s).	3.2000	1.4707
I have contributed chapters in an edited book.	3.3818	1.4592
I have contributed chapters in Book of Readings.	3.1818	1.5527
My research articles have been published in a newspaper/magazine.	3.1455	1.4835
I have participated in sponsored national research.	3.1091	1.3834
I have participated in sponsored international research.	2.7455	1.2797

**Grand mean = 3.4197**

**Source:** Survey Data (2010)

## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Having set out to determine the level of academic staff of IBB University dissatisfaction on their jobs, the study found that there was no job dissatisfaction among the staff. Impliedly, there is hygienic and conducive working environment in the University, which boosts staff contentment with their working conditions. Jaafar, Ramayah and Zainal (2006) affirm that hygiene issues can minimize dissatisfaction if handled properly and can only dissatisfy if they are absent. Since hygiene factors are supportive of staff motivation (Nelson and Quick, 2003), hygiene provision by the University will expectedly lead to high motivation.

The study investigated the level of staff motivation in an academic setting and found that staffs are very well motivated. Our finding is in tandem with earlier findings, for example, Abdulsalam *et. al.*, (2007) found that employees of agribusiness in Nigeria are highly motivated on their jobs. Gunu (2003) established high job satisfaction and motivation among staff of public enterprises in Kwara State, Nigeria. The consistency in the results suggest that staff motivation in both public and private organizations is prioritized by the employers leading to mutual gains to both parties – job satisfaction to employees and high productivity to organizations.

Essentially, the study revealed that academic staff's job performance in terms of teaching is very high. This could be as a result of high motivation among the academic staff of the University. Since a motivated person is always ready to act (Kotler and Keller, 2010), the action of the motivated academic staff has been manifested in the form of *adequate teaching* of students. Such behavior, if sustained, can lead to the production of *full-baked* graduates instead of *half-baked ones* needed to fast track the socio-economic and technological development in Nigeria and Africa.

In one of the research revelations, the academic staff's job performance in terms of research undertaking is moderate. Comparatively, the University staff devotes more time and energy to teaching than research. This could be attributed to the fact that teaching does not require any direct expenditure or funding by a lecturer, while research projects are personally funded by individual researcher or lecturer. Often, a researcher may identify a problem that calls for research, develop interest to conduct the research, and be ready to devote time to carry out the research but will be unable to commence not to talk of completing the project due to lack of funds. Perhaps, the level of research in Nigerian universities could have been less if research publication is not a prerequisite for academic staff promotion.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The working conditions in IBB University are very encouraging there by boosting academic staff contentment on the job. Essentially, the university's commitment to academic staff motivation is overwhelming and remarkable. The impressive working conditions and outstanding employee motivation have benefited the University in the form of high academic staff performance and productivity, which if sustained can assist the institution in realizing its big dream: "To be a world class centre of learning, driven by people, partnership, and technology."

Noting that academic staff performance in research undertakings is relatively low, the study recommends that the University should set aside special fund for sponsoring viable research projects. The study also recommends that the University should establish a research center to encourage local or community research.

## FURTHER STUDY

Being a survey research, this study is most likely to provoke some other studies as a follow up in a bid to establish the likely effect of motivation on performance. Specifically, to enhance the prospect of generalizing the findings of the current study, it is necessary to expand the scope in terms of the sample size and the selection strategy. It is therefore suggested that the study be replicated by using a much larger sample selected more broadly from public and/or private universities in Nigeria.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdulsalam, Z., Damisa, M.A. Iliyasu, B. (2007), Analysis of Workers Motivational Factors in Agribusiness Organization: A Case study of Sunseed Nigeria Plc, Zaria, *Journal of Business Administration*, Vol. 1, No. 1 & 2, pp. 15-27.
2. Abejirinde, A.A. (2009), Motivation and Workers Performance within Public and Private Enterprises in Nigeria, *Lapai International Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 101-112.
3. Adams, J.S. (1963), Toward an Understanding of Inequity, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 67, pp. 422-436.

4. Alderfer, C.P. (1972), *Existence, Relatedness and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Setting*, New York: Free Press.
5. Anonymous (2009), *What is Motivation and How Does it Affect Performance?* New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
6. Austin, J.T. and Villanova, P. (1992), The Criterion Problem: 1917 – 1992, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 77, No. 1, pp. 836-874.
7. Bell, J. (2004), *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-time Researchers in Education and Social Science* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill House.
8. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
9. Cardona, P., Lawrence, B.S. and Espejo, A. (2003), Outcome-Based Theory of work Motivation, *University of Navarra IESE Working Paper No. D/495*. Web-site: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1262271>.
10. Cole, G.A. (2005), *Personnel and Human Resource Management* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), London: Book Power.
11. Cooper, D.R. and Schindler, P.S. (2003), *Business Research Methods* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.), New-York: McGraw-Hill.
12. Eze, N. (1995), *Human resource Management in Africa, Lagos: Zomex Press*.
13. Guilford and Flucher (1973), *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology Education*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
14. Gunu, U. (2003), Job Satisfaction Among Staff of Selected Public Enterprises in Kwara State, *The Abuja Management Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 219-228.
15. Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1975), Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60, pp. 159-170.
16. Hair, J.F., Bush, R.P. and Ortinau, D.J. (2000), *Marketing Research: A Practical Approach for New Millennium*, Singapore: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
17. Harder, M. (2008), How Do Rewards and Management Styles Influence the Motivation to Share Knowledge? *Centre for Strategic Management and globalization (SMG) Working Paper No. 6*. Web-site: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1098881>.
18. Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S.E. and Slocum, J.W. (1999), *Management*, Cincinnati: South-Western College Publishing.
19. Herpen, M., Praag, M. and Cools, K. (2003), The Effects of Performance Measurements and Compensation on Motivation, *Tinbergen Institute (TI) Working Paper*, No. 048/3.
20. Herzberg, F. (1966), *Work and Nature of Man*, Cleveland: World.
21. IBBUL (2010), *Handbook of Underground Students (2010 - 2015)*.
22. Isaac, A. (2008), Motivating Civil Servants for Higher Productivity, *Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 2, No. 1 & 2, pp. 54-68.
23. Jaafar, M., Ramayah, T. and Zainal, Z. (2006), Work Satisfaction and Work Performance: How Project Managers in Malaysia Perceive It? *Academy of World Business, Marketing and Management Development Conference Proceedings*, Vol. 2, No.113, pp. 1305-1313.
24. Karwai, S.A. (2005), Motivation and Frustration in Organizations, *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 10, pp. 97-106
25. Kotler, P. and Keller, K.I. (2010), *Marketing Management*, (12<sup>th</sup> ed.), New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd.
26. Lawler, E.E. (1994), *Motivation in Work Organization*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
27. Locke, E.A. (1968), Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, Vol. 3, pp. 157-189.
28. Locke, E.A. and Letham, G.P. (2004), What Should We Do About Motivation Theory? Six Recommendations for the Twenty-First Century, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 29, Vol. 3, pp 388 – 403.
29. Lathans, F. (1998), *Organizational Performance* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.), Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill
30. Maslow, A.H. (1954), *Motivation and Personality* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), New York: Harper.
31. McClelland, D.C. (1964), Toward a Theory of Motive Acquisition, *American Psychologists*, Vol. 20, pp. 321-333.
32. Mitchell, T.R. (1982), Motivation: Need Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 80-88.
33. Nelson, D.L. and Quick, J.C. (2003), *Organizational Behaviour: Foundation, Realities and Challenges* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Australia: Thomson South-Western.
34. Nisbet, J. and Watt, J. (1980), Case Study, *Rediguide* 6.
35. Onukwube, H.N., Iyabga, R. and Fajana, S. (2010), The Influence of Motivation on Job Performance of Construction Professionals in Construction Companies in Nigeria, *Construction, Building and Real*

*Estate Research Conference of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors*, held at Dauphine Universite, Paris. (2-3 September, 2010).

36. Owojori, A.A. (2002), *Managerial Research*, Ado-Ekiti: Kaycee Publishers.
37. Peighambari, K. (2007), *Developing and Testing a Model for Explaining Customer Retention Formation*, *Master Thesis*, Department of Business Administration and Social Sciences, Tarbiat Modares University. Website: <http://luth.se/1653-0182/2007/066/LTU-PB-EX-07066-SE.Pdf> (25/08/2008).
38. Peretomode, V.F. (1992), *Basic Research Method for Education and Social Sciences*, Owerri: Total Publishers Ltd.
39. Pinder, C.C. (1998), *Work Motivation in Organizational Behaviour*, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
40. Wikipedia (2009), Motivation. Web side: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/motivation>.
41. Wikipedia (2010), Job Performance. Web side: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/job\\_performance](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/job_performance).

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Population of the Academic Staff in IBBUL and the Study Sample Size

S/N	Department	Population	Sample Size (64% of the population)
1	Business Administration	23	15
2	Economics	12	8
3	Mass Communication	6	4
4	Political Science	23	15
5	Sociology	11	7
6	Biological Science	13	8
7	Chemistry	13	8
8	Geography and Geology	14	9
9	Mathematics & Computer Science	22	14
10	Physics	11	7
11	Agriculture	19	12
12	Adult Education And Community Development	6	4
13	History and Archeology	9	7
14	Language and Linguistics	24	15
15	Education and Counseling Psychology	13	8
	<b>Total population &amp; Sample Size</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>141</b>

Source: Academic Planning Unit, IBBUL (2010)

### Appendix 2: Motivation Scale (Frequency Distribution)

S/N	Statement Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		5	4	3	2	1
1	My <b>achievement</b> on the current job is satisfactory	46	44	18	0	2
2	I am given due <b>recognition</b> at work.	26	70	8	6	0
3	The <b>work itself</b> is interesting and challenging	38	60	10	2	0
4	I am given due <b>responsibilities</b> at work to execute.	44	42	12	12	0
5	My <b>advancement</b> (i.e. promotion) on the current job is satisfactory.	36	46	22	6	0
6	<b>Personal growth</b> (i.e. skills acquired through training and development) on the current job is satisfactory.	26	34	40	8	2

N=110

Source: IBBUL (2010)

**Appendix 3: Job Satisfaction Scale (Frequency Distribution)**

S/N	Statement Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Company Policy and administration are robust	32	46	30	2	0
2	Supervision is satisfactory	30	54	22	4	0
3	Relationship with Supervisor is cordial	34	58	16	2	0
4	Working Conditions is not hazardous	36	40	24	10	0
5	Personal Life has improved	28	32	36	14	0
6	Salary is encouraging	38	40	28	4	0
7	Relationship with Subordinates is cordial	10	42	32	26	0
8	Status has improved	22	42	26	14	4
9	Job Security is guaranteed	28	44	28	8	2

N=110

Source: Survey Data (2010)

**Appendix 4: Teaching Performance Scale (Frequency Distribution)**

S/N	Statement Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		5	4	3	2	1
1	I attend my lessons according to the time-table.	38	50	12	8	2
2	I attend to my lessons always.	58	44	6	2	0
3	I enter my class at the right time (i.e. not late).	62	40	6	2	0
4	I leave my class at right time (i.e. not earlier than supposed).	58	44	6	0	2
5	I give notes to my students.	56	36	8	6	4
6	I give test, assignment and field/practical works to the students in every course I teach.	56	36	8	6	4
7	I mark all the assignments given to students.	56	44	6	2	2
8	I return all continuous assessment(CA) marked scripts to students.	44	44	14	6	2
9	I release the CA scores to students before examination commences.	42	38	16	10	2
10	I read and correct students' project.	42	46	18	4	0

N=110

Source: Survey Data (2010)

**Appendix 5: Research Performance Scale (Frequency Distribution)**

S/N	Statement Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
1	I attend at least on national conference per annum.	40	46	20	2	2
2	I attend at least one international conference in every three (3) years.	30	36	32	6	6
3	My conference papers are published in conference proceedings.	42	32	28	6	2
4	I publish my research articles with a university, polytechnic or C.O.E. affiliated journals.	42	38	18	4	8
5	My research articles have been published by a foreign journal.	34	20	30	16	10
6	I have authored a book(s.)	24	26	20	18	22
7	I have co-authored a book(s).	28	24	22	14	22
8	I have contributed chapters in an edited book.	36	20	20	18	16
9	I have contributed chapters in Book of Readings.	32	22	14	18	24
10	My research articles have been published in a newspaper/magazine.	28	24	14	24	20
11	I have participated in sponsored national research.	24	20	28	20	18
12	I have participated in sponsored international research.	12	22	22	34	20

N=110

Source: Survey Data (2010)