

**THE PERCEIVE IMPACT OF MOTIVATION ON  
LECTURERS' PERFORMANCE IN AHMADU BELLO  
UNIVERSITY, ZARIA**

**MOHAMMED HABIBU SABARI PhD\***

***ABSTRACT***

For continuous survival of a University, its work force must have to be under examination from time to time. This is because it is one of the major determinants of achieving goals. The study basically evaluates the perception of academic staff in Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, with a view to determining whether motivation offers by the University has impact on their performance or not, and also establishing whether factors that are rely upon to motivate really do so or not. Primary data were collected through questionnaire administration. The techniques employed for analysis were simple percentage and Chi square. Based on the data analysis and hypothesis testing, the results of the study provide evidence for the failure to reject the two null hypotheses formulated. The study therefore concludes that motivational factors and motivation offer by the University management have no significant relevance and effect on the performance of the academic staff. We recommend that the University management should strive hard to ensure that they provide more motivations to the staff due to multiplier effect that it has on the continuous existence, qualitative teaching, and researches that formed the basis of establishing the University. This could be attainable by issuing questionnaires to the academic staff asking them specifically to state what they believe would motivate them, and then compared with the motivational factors use by other international standard Universities, and then come up with the hybrid that would produce substantial impact.

\* DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA.

**Keywords: Motivation, Motivational Factors, Lecturers' Performance**

### **Section 1: Background to the Study**

University is a vital educational organisation that is set up basically for the purpose of providing higher level qualitative education to students, and at the same time conducting researches that lead to country's growth and development.

Ahmadu Bello University (ABU), whose law was enacted on 14<sup>th</sup> October 1962, has its origins in the defunct Nigerian College of Arts, Science and Technology, Zaria, founded in 1955; the Clerical Training Centre; Kongo Campus, founded in 1957; the Samaru Agricultural Research Station established in 1924; and the Shika Livestock Farm, Started in 1928. The University was named after Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sardauna of Sokoto and Premier of Northern Nigeria who, as the first Chancellor of the University, performed the opening ceremony on October 4, 1962. The philosophy of the University is predicated upon the cardinal principle of importing knowledge and learning to men and women of all races without any distinction on the grounds of race, religious or political beliefs (Revised Student Handbook, 1999).

For continuous survival of a University, its work force must have to be under examination from time to time. This is because it is one of the major determinants of achieving goals. In the University set up, roles that academic staff are expected to play are in the areas of lecturing and conducting researches. On one hand, they are expected to be provided with all the necessary facilities and equipments that could enable them discharge their works effectively and efficiently. On the other, they are expected to remain dedicated to their works. While that can be considered a clear line of expectations between what academic staff required and also what are required from them, according to the World Bank Report (2004), 23,000 qualified academic staff are emigrating from Africa each year in search of better working conditions, and it is estimated by the Report that 10,000 Nigerians are now employed in the United States alone.

The emigration led to the creation of short-fall in the number of qualified academic staff and the short-fall problem varies from University to University, and from department to department

within Universities. Many factors are considered to be the causes of the short-fall. One of the factors is weak institutional management capacity in the area of personnel. According to Aluko (2002), a study conducted in Nigeria revealed that academic staff spent 48 percent of their time on administration, but only 29 percent on teaching. Another factor is the erosion of salaries and purchasing power that prompts many faculty members to give minimal time to University work and seek one or more income-generating activities to supplement their academic salaries.

Although, factors militating academic staff performing at expected level are identified and motivation as the set of processes that moves a person toward a goal is considered to play significant role in providing solution to the problem, there is a great concern as regard the approach that is used in determining staff motivation. There are some authorities that are of the view that motivation is an abstract and factors that are considered to motivate may not necessarily motivate every worker and hence, posed measurement problems in terms of perceive impact or effect on workers motivated. Others are of the view that it is not an abstraction, and it is measurable using both quantitative and qualitative attributes.

In spite of the various attempts at evaluating the relationship between motivation and performance, to the best of our knowledge, we have not come across previous works that have been carried out to empirically evaluate the perception of academic staff across all the faculties/institutes of ABU as regard whether motivation given to them by the University really impacted on their performance or not.

Given the fact that divergent views exist in the literature, and all the motivation theories and approaches were arrived at based on studies conducted on settings that are distinct from ours, there is every need to carry out an empirical study with a view to determining whether academic staff in ABU perceive motivation to have impact on their performance or not, and also establishing whether factors that are rely upon to motivate really do so or not.

The study is expected to be of significance to the management of the University as it shall serves

as a guide on how to go about evaluating motivation in relation to the staff's performance. This will assist management in choosing and applying the best motivation theory, and also can lead to motivation benchmark establishment that will stimulate staff to discharge responsibilities conferred on them effectively and efficiently, and at the same time curtail academic staff emigration to foreign Universities.

On the basis of the above background, the study formulated the following hypotheses for testing:

H<sub>01</sub>: ABU's academic staff do not perceive motivation to have any significant impact on their performance.

H<sub>02</sub>: Motivation factors are not perceived by ABU's academic staff to have relevance on their performance.

H<sub>03</sub>: There exists no significant relationship between perceived motivational factors and performance of ABU's academic staff.

The remaining part of this paper is divided into the following sections. Review of related literature is in section 2. The methodology adopted for the purpose of the study is dealt with in section 3. Section 4 addressed data presentation and analysis, and section 5 presented conclusion and recommendations.

## Section 2: Review of Related Literature

Two vital theories in the literature that explain what motivates people at work are content theories and process theories. On one hand, content theories have to do with what motivates people, the type of needs that cause actions, and the class of goals toward which people strive. Notable among these theories are Maslow's theory, Herzberg's 2-factor theory, McClelland theory,

Alderfer's ERG theory and Goals theory. On the other, process theories are concerned with how behaviour is initiated, directed and sustained. They attempt to identify relationship among dynamic variables that make up motivation. Notable among the theories are Reinforcement theory, Expectancy theory, Equity theory, and Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory (Kovach, 1987).

Maslow's (1943) theory appears as the most prominent theory of motivation in which there are five fundamental needs of a person i.e., physiological, security, affiliation, esteem, and self-actualization. This theory is applicable to teachers in which case their physiological needs that may include pay, benefits, health and medical facility, accommodation and transportation, and comfortable working environment. As for the security's needs, similarities also exist between teachers and other workers. These needs include job security and fair treatment, among others. Affiliation needs of a teacher comprise of participation in departmental decisions and existence of collegiality. Esteem needs of teachers have to do with recognition from all the members of the department.

On the one hand, according to Herzberg (1959), there are two factors that should be considered in organisations. These factors are those that would directly motivate employees which he described as motivators. The other factors are those that de-motivate employees if not present in the working environment, which in themselves do not actually motivate employees to work harder, which he describes as hygienic factors. Both motivators and hygienic factors are expected to be adopted simultaneously. Examination of teachers' motivation in accordance with this theory reveals that hygiene factors for a teacher in higher education can be the salary, support, interpersonal relationship with supervisors and work conditions. Herzberg (1959) has also described motivators as internal motivating factors which always stimulate the employee's motivation to put his best efforts. These motivators for teachers include recognition from departmental head, empowerment, students' achievement or career advancements.

There are various studies conducted on motivation and how it affects various aspects of educational settings. In a study conducted by Benware and Deci (1984) on the relevance of intrinsic motivation on achievement and learning outcomes in both elementary and secondary

school classrooms, it is found that motivation correlates positively with the two variables. In another study Conti (2000) found that in college students, high intrinsic motivation was associated with having personally well-thought-out goals for achievement.

In other series of studies conducted on extrinsic motivation, it is found that it leads to decrease in learning, notable among the studies are Benware and Deci (1984) and Grolnick and Ryan (1985).

As for the relationship between motivation and achievement, various studies were conducted. In a study conducted by Bank and Finlapson (1980), the findings of the study revealed that successful students were found to have significantly higher motivation for achievement than unsuccessful students. A similar confirmation is found in a study conducted by Ajayi (1998) in which an agreement between academic performance and motivation was revealed.

Some other studies dealt with factors that motivate teachers. In studies conducted by Mbanefoh (1982), Amadi (1983) and Elton (1984) on what motivates teachers, the findings of the studies show that teachers and other school workers tend to remain contented and reasonably motivated as long as salaries are paid on time and they are promoted regularly. This finding is in conformity with Kazeem (1999) and Ubom (2002) in which they respectively found regular salaries and allowances payments couple with normal promotions as key factors that shape teachers attitudes toward assignments and responsibilities conferred on them.

In spite of identifying financial inducements as factors that motivate teachers by so many studies, there exist other series of studies and arguments that prove to the contrary. Studies conducted by Ejiogu (1983), Akinwunmi (2000), Baike (2002), Francis (1998), and Obanya (1999) show that other underlying factors such as social status, school leadership and management style if not properly administered undermine teachers' responsibilities toward their work.

In a study conducted by Adams (1965), it was highlighted that students' achievement can be a factor of motivation for teachers, i.e., if students are hardworking, talented and high achievers, teachers will be more motivated. This is due to a strong relationship between teachers' satisfaction and students' achievement. In another study carried out by Clarke and Keating (1995), they have also found similar outcomes as in the case of Adams (1965), in which case they asserted that students can be more satisfying aspect for teachers than an administrative support.

Study conducted by Bohlender and Snell (2001) emphasised that compensation is one of the important considerations in human resource management and therefore stressed for its need in accordance to the need fulfillment of employees, teachers inclusive. However, in a study conducted by Fuhrman (2006), compensation alone is not considered as motivating factor but also couple with job descriptions and other relevant factors. He argued that an unclear job description, stressful working environment, irrelevant administrative assignment can create overburden upon teachers and lead them to job dissatisfaction. In a similar study, Dessler (1980) concluded that high workloads, large number of students in classes and burden of non teaching activities are the problems in creating a good job design for teachers in higher education institutions.

In his study, Ofoeqbu (2004) established that teachers need different resources like technology and facilities for effective classroom management and institution's improvement. Institution's support in providing class aids and academic resources can prove to be effectual motivators for teachers in order to have their extreme efforts.

The fact that all the works reviewed above were conducted in different Universities and environments where their peculiarities are different from ABU's; there is every tendency that similar works in ABU may not necessarily yield the same outcomes.

### Section 3: Research Methodology

The research methods adopted by this study are descriptive and survey. The data gathered for the purpose of analysis came from primary source. The research instrument adopted is questionnaire.

The population of this study is the academic staff of ABU and they are 1944 in number as at the year 2010. The sample size for the study is 331 academic staff derived from all the faculties/centres/institute and they are arrived at by using Yamane (1967) formula which is represented thus:

$$S = N \div 1 + N(e)^2$$

Where S=Sample Size

$e^2$ = Level of precision

N= Population Size

A 95% Confidence level is used and P = 0.05 are assumed.

As regard the potential respondents that questionnaires are administered to, the study adopted Bedward (1999) stratified random sampling formula, which is represented thus:

$$n = n_1 \div N_1 \times N$$

Where:

$n$  = Number of Potential Respondents from each faculty

$n_1$  = Number in each Group

$N_1$  = Population Size of the Potential Respondents

$N$  = Total Sample Size of the Potential Respondents

The following Table presents the faculties/centres/institute, academic staff, and the proportional distribution of the sample size:

**Table 1: Proportional Distribution of Sample Size**

S/N	Names of Faculties	Academic Staff	Proportion
-----	--------------------	----------------	------------



1.	<i>Administration</i>	120	20
2.	<i>Agriculture</i>	118	20
3.	<i>Arts</i>	117	20
4.	<i>Education</i>	131	22
5.	<i>Engineering</i>	141	24
6.	<i>Environmental Design</i>	159	27
7.	<i>Law</i>	44	7
8.	<i>Library</i>	52	9
9.	<i>Medicine</i>	229	39
10.	<i>Pharmaceutical Science</i>	74	13
11.	<i>Sciences</i>	251	43
12.	<i>Social Science</i>	89	15
13.	<i>VTH</i>	12	3
14.	<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	101	17
15.	<i>Institute of Education</i>	202	34
16.	<i>DAC</i>	76	13
17.	<i>Centres</i>	28	5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1944</b>	<b>331</b>

Source: Establishment Division ABU and Author's Computation (2010)

From the Table above, Faculty of Science has the highest number of academic staff of 251, followed by Faculty of Medicine with a staff number of 229, and then Institute of Education with

a staff number of 202. The Faculty with the least number of academic staff is VTH with a staff number of 12.

The selection of the subjects was done in such a way to include all faculties/institutes/centres of the University and also cuts across all gender. This was done in anticipation that such a sampling of the subject will provide the necessary variety of information required of this study.

The techniques used for the purpose of data analysis and hypothesis testing are simple percentage, Chi-Square Test, and Spearman rank correlation. The formula that is used for computing the Chi-Square is given as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum (fo-fe)^2 \div fe$$

Where:

$\chi^2$  = Chi-Square

$fo$  = Observed Frequency (From Questionnaire administered)

$fe$  = Expected Frequency (Computed from Formula)

The Expected Frequency is calculated thus:

$$fe = [\text{row total} \times \text{column total}] \div \text{grand total}$$

Ninety-five percent (95%) confidence level is adopted for the study.

The decision rule for  $\chi^2$  test is that the computed value of  $\chi^2$  is compared with the critical value at 0.05 level of significance, if the computed value is greater than the critical value, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted and vice-versa.

The Chi-square test is applied because it leads to an inference from a sample to the population sampled, and it also enables us to know the perceptions of academic staff on the subject matter

under study.

As for the Spearman's rank correlation, the formula is represented thus:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d_i^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Where:

$\rho$  = Spearman's Coefficient

$n$  = Number of Pairs of Observations

$\sum d_i^2$  = Summation of Deviation Square of the Observations

The following approximate student t distribution formula is used for testing for the significance of the coefficient with  $n-2$  degrees of freedom under the null hypothesis:

$$t = \rho \sqrt{n-2} / \sqrt{1-\rho^2}$$

The Spearman's rank correlation test is applied because it enables us to establish whether relationship or lacks of it exists between motivational factors and performance of academic staff as ranked by the academic staff themselves.

#### Section 4: Presentation and Discussion of Results

As earlier stated, the study used primary data and questionnaire administration is adopted as the instrument. The Questionnaires were drawn and administered amongst the academic staff of ABU. On the whole, a total number of 331 questionnaires were administered and 210 were returned.

The following Table presents demographic data of the respondents that were administered the

questionnaires.

**Table 2: Personal Data of Respondents**

Names of Faculties/ Institutes/ Centres	Number of Questionnaire Administered	Number of Questionnaire Returned	Qualifications		Years of Experience	
			BSc. PhD	MSc.	3-5 9-12 13 & above	6-8
Administration	20	18	5 4	9	3 6	5 4
Agriculture	20	15	2 7	6	2 7	4 2
Arts	20	12	0 4	8	2 4	3 3
Education	22	14	1 6	7	1 3	5 5
Engineering	24	16	0 10	6	3 2	8 3
Environmental Design	27	15	2 8	5	2 6	4 3
Law	7	6	0 2	4	0 2	3 1
Library	9	7	2 2	3	3 2	2 0
Medicine	39	14	0 9	5	2 3	5 4
Pharmaceutical	13	8	0	2	3	2

<i>Science</i>			6	3	0
<i>Sciences</i>	43	23	6	9	8
			8	6	4
<i>Social Science</i>	15	10	1	3	3
			6	3	0
<i>VTH</i>	3	3	0	0	0
			3	3	0
<i>Veterinary Medicine</i>	17	11	0	5	2
			6	5	1
<i>Institute of Education</i>	34	26	7	12	9
			7	7	4
<i>DAC</i>	13	9	3	4	3
			2	2	0
<i>Centres</i>	5	3	0	2	3
			1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>69</b>
			<b>91</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>34</b>

Source: Questionnaire Administered 2010

From Table 2 above, Faculty of Science has the highest staff figure of 43. It is then followed by the Faculty of Medicine with a figure of 39. The Faculty with the least number of staff is VTH with a figure of 3, which is then followed by Centres and Faculty of Law with respective figures of 5 and 7.

On the overall 331 questionnaires were administered to the academic staff of the various Faculties/Institutes/Centres based on the proportion of their staff, out of which 210 representing 63 percent were successfully completed and returned, and hence the analysis is based on the returned figure.

In terms of qualifications and years of experience in the University, the response indicates that 29 respondents or 14 percent have first degree qualifications, while 90 respondents constituting 43 percent indicate that they have second degree as their qualifications. As for the terminal degree, the number of respondents is 91, constituting 43 percent. 43 of the respondents or 20 percent have working experience ranging between 3 to 5 years. The age range of 6 to 8 and 9 to 12 are respectively having figures of 69 and 64 representing 33 and 30 percent. Those academicians with experience of 13 years and above are 34 in number and they represent 16 percent. The qualifications and working experiences of the respondents serve to provide credibility to the quality of the data that are to be analyzed.

The following table presents the response of the academic staff as regard whether they perceive motivation offer to them to have any significant impact on their performance.

**Table 3: Academic Staff Motivation versus Performance**

<i>Possible Options</i>	<i>Scores from Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of Scores to Total Respondents</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	15	7.14	5th
<i>Agree</i>	36	17.14	3rd
<i>Un-decided</i>	43	20.48	2nd
<i>Disagree</i>	86	40.95	1st
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	30	14.29	4th

<i>Total</i>	<i>210</i>	<i>100</i>	
--------------	------------	------------	--

Source: Questionnaire Administered 2010

From the Table above, 86 respondents representing 40.95 percent are of the view that they disagree motivation has effect on their performance. The second option in terms of ranking has to do with those respondents that are un-decided on motivation's effect on their performance. The third, fourth and fifth options in terms of ranking are agree, strongly disagree and strongly agree and they are having percentages of 17.14, 14.29, and 7.14 respectively.

The options agree and strongly agree have to do with the response of the respondents that support the argument that motivation has effect on their performance. Their opinion is in line with Mbanefoh (1982), Amadi (1983), Elton (1984), Kazeem (1999), and Ubom (2002) in which they find motivation as component of key factors that shape teachers attitudes toward assignments and responsibilities conferred on them.

The un-decided option has to do with those respondents that cannot vividly establish the effect of motivation on their performance. Their opinion seems to tally with the studies conducted by Ejiogu (1983), Akinwunmi (2000), Baike (2002), Francis (1998), and Obanya (1999) in which they argue that certain other underlying factors apart from motivation if not properly administered undermine teachers' responsibilities toward their work and by extension their performance.

The options disagree and strongly disagree have to do with the respondents that are supporting the irrelevancy of motivation in relation to performance. The opinion of the respondents as regards this situation contradicts Ajayi (1998) in which an agreement between academic performance and motivation was revealed.

In an effort to ascertain the perception of academic staff as regard whether they perceive motivation offer to them to have any significant impact on their performance, the respondents' opinions in Table 3 are broken down into various components that made up the Table and then

subjected to chi-square test.

**Table 4: Academic staff's response on the effect of motivation on their performance**

<i>Fa</i> <i>c.</i>	<i>Ad</i> <i>m</i>	<i>Ag</i> <i>r.</i>	<i>Ar</i> <i>ts</i>	<i>Ed</i> <i>uc.</i>	<i>En</i> <i>g.</i>	<i>En</i> <i>v.</i>	<i>La</i> <i>w</i>	<i>Li</i> <i>b.</i>	<i>Me</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>Ph</i> <i>a.</i>	<i>Sc</i> <i>i.</i>	<i>So</i> <i>c.</i>	<i>Vt</i> <i>h</i>	<i>Ve</i> <i>t.</i>	<i>In</i> <i>st.</i>	<i>D</i> <i>ac</i>	<i>Ce</i> <i>nt.</i>	<i>Tot</i> <i>al</i>
<i>SA</i>	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	15
<i>A</i>	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	36
<i>Un</i> <i>d.</i>	5	3	3	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	3	5	2	0	43
<i>DA</i>	6	5	5	3	8	9	3	2	2	4	1	3	1	4	13	5	2	86
<i>S.</i> <i>DA</i>	1	2	0	2	2	1	0	2	10	1	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	30
<i>Tot</i> <i>al</i>	18	15	12	14	16	15	6	7	14	8	3	10	3	11	26	9	3	210

Source: Questionnaire Administered 2010

On subjecting Table 4 to the Chi square test, the results of the analysis reveal the computed chi-square value of 64.2, a degree of freedom (df) of 64, and a p-value of 0.469, which appears not significant. The full results are contained in Appendix I. The implication of these findings is that contrary to the expectations of the University management that there have been improvement in salary and relatively stable promotion, couple with other inducement factors that management believes to provide to academic staff, they perceive them not sufficient to have significant impact on their performance. By extension the likely explanation for having such outcome could be attributed to the academic staff expectations of standardizing the University to an international



level.

The following table presents the response of the academic staff as regard whether they perceive motivation factors to have relevance on their performance.

**Table 5: Academic Staff versus Motivational Factors**

<i>Possible Options</i>	<i>Scores from Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of Scores to Total Respondents</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	47	22.38	2nd
<i>Agree</i>	43	20.48	3rd
<i>Un-decided</i>	26	12.38	5th
<i>Disagree</i>	42	20.00	4th
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	52	24.76	1st
<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>100</b>	

Source: Questionnaire Administered 2010

From the Table above, 52 respondents representing 24.76 percent are of the view that they strongly disagree that motivation factors have relevance on their performance. The second option in terms of ranking has to do with those respondents that strongly agree motivation factors have relevance on their performance. The third, fourth and fifth options in terms of ranking are agree, disagree and un-decided and they are having percentages of 20.48, 20.00, and 12.38 respectively.

In an effort to ascertain the perception of academic staff as regard the relevancy of motivational

factors, the respondents' opinions in Table 5 are broken down into various components that made up the Table and then subjected to chi-square test.

**Table 6: Academic staff's response on the relevancy of motivational factors**

<i>Fa</i> <i>c.</i>	<i>Ad</i> <i>m</i>	<i>Ag</i> <i>r.</i>	<i>Ar</i> <i>ts</i>	<i>Ed</i> <i>uc.</i>	<i>En</i> <i>g.</i>	<i>En</i> <i>v.</i>	<i>La</i> <i>w</i>	<i>Li</i> <i>b.</i>	<i>Me</i> <i>d.</i>	<i>Ph</i> <i>a.</i>	<i>Sc</i> <i>i.</i>	<i>So</i> <i>c.</i>	<i>Vt</i> <i>h</i>	<i>Ve</i> <i>t.</i>	<i>In</i> <i>st.</i>	<i>D</i> <i>ac</i>	<i>Ce</i> <i>nt.</i>	<i>Tot</i> <i>al</i>
SA	2	2	5	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	5	3	1	3	6	3	2	47
A	5	3	3	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	3	5	2	0	43
Un																		
<i>d.</i>	1	2	0	2	2	1	0	2	6	1	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	26
DA	2	3	2	3	2	4	1	2	2	4	5	3	1	4	2	1	1	42
S.																		
DA	8	5	2	1	7	5	0	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	10	3	0	52
<b><i>Tot</i></b>											2							21
<b><i>al</i></b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

Source: Questionnaire Administered 2010

On subjecting Table 6 to the Chi square test, the results of the analysis reveal the computed chi-square value of 63.8, a degree of freedom (df) of 64, and a p-value of 0.483, which appears not significant. The full results are contained in Appendix II. These show that factors use by the University management in motivating academic staff are not considered sufficient by the staff, and can be deduced to be responsible for making the staff to perceive motivation to have no significant impact on their performance.

As for the hypothesis three that deals with whether significant relationship or lacks of it exists

between motivational factors and academic staff performance, responses from table number three and five are used and they are subjected to Spearman's rank correlation coefficient computations. The results of the analysis reveal the computed  $\rho$  value of -0.8, a degree of freedom (df) of 3 and a p-value of -2.31. The full results are contained in Appendix III. These show significant inverse relationship between motivational factors and lecturers' performance in the University.

### Section 5: Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the data analysis and hypothesis testing, the results of the study provide evidence for the failure to reject the three null hypotheses formulated. The study therefore concludes that motivational factors and motivation offer by the University management have no significant relevance and effect on the performance of academic staff in ABU. We recommend that the University management should strive hard to ensure that they provide more motivations to the staff due to multiplier effect that it has on the continuous existence, qualitative teaching, and researches that formed the basis of establishing the University. This could be attainable by issuing questionnaires to the academic staff asking them specifically to state what they believe would motivate them, and then compared with the motivational factors use by other international standard Universities, and then come up with the hybrid that would produce substantial impact.

### Reference

- Adams, J.S. (1965): Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ajayi, K. (1998): "Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Nigeria". *The Nigerian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 3, No 1 April.
- Akinwumi, F.S. (2000): Impact of motivation and supervision on teacher productivity in secondary schools in Oyo State Nigeria. An Unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to The Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan Nigeria.
- Aluko M.A. (2002): "Assessing State and Universities in Nigeria." Conference Paper on Brain Drain in Nigeria. Nicon-Hilton Abuja.
- Amadi, P. (1983): "The dilemma of the Nigerian teacher." *The Fountain Vol. 20 (14) pp. 114-16.*

- Baike, A. (2002): Recurrent Issues in Nigeria Education. Tamaza publishing co. ltd. Zaria.
- Bank, C. and Finlapson, W. (1980): Successful Motivation of Students in Academic Activities in McClelland, D.C. Appleton-Century-Crafts.
- Benware, C., and Deci, E. L. (1984): "Quality of learning with an active versus passive motivational set." *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 755–765.
- Bohlander, G., and Snell, S.A. (2001): Managing Human Resources. South-Western College Publishing.
- Clarke, R., & Keating, W. F. (1995): A fresh look at teacher job satisfaction. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 391 795.
- Conti, R. (2000): "College goals: Do self-determined and carefully considered goals predict intrinsic motivation, academic performance and adjustment during the first semester?" *Social Psychology of Education*, 4, 189–211.
- Dessler, G. (1980): *Human Behavior: Improving Performance at Work*. Reston Publishing Company, Inc.
- Ejiogu, A. (1983): School Personnel Management: A Nigerian perspective, Lagos University Press.
- Eton, E.O. (1984): "Causes of indiscipline in teachers." *Journal of Cross River Educator* Vol. 3 (1) pp39-45.
- Francis, P. (1998): "Hard lessons: Primary Schools Community and Social Capital in Nigeria." The World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Fuhrmann, T. D. (2006): Motivating Employees. *Advances in Diary Technology* , 18, 93-101.
- Grolnick, W.S., and Ryan, R.M. (1985): Self-regulation and motivation in children's learning: An experimental investigation. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester*.
- Herzberg, F.M.(1959): *The Motivation of Works*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kazeem, S.O. (1999) Correlates of job motivation of workers in selected public and private secondary schools in Ife-Ijesa Zone, Osun State, Nigeria. Master of Arts in Education thesis.

Department of Educational Foundations and Counselling, Faculty of Education. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

Kovach, K.A. (1987): "What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers." *Business Horizons*, Vol. 30. 58-65.

Maslow, A.H. (1943). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Mbanefoh, B.N. (1982): Factors responsible for teachers' attrition in secondary schools. Dissertation Abstract International Volume 2 No. 1.

Obanya P.A.I. (1999): 10 Questions Nigerians Want Answered About UBE. Punch Newspaper December 4.

Ofoegbu, F. I. (2004): Teacher Motivation as an Essential Factor for Classroom Effectiveness and School Improvement. *College Student Journal*. Department of Educational Administration and Foundations, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria , 3 (1), 54-69. Revised Student Handbook (1999): Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, ABU Press.

Ubom, I.U. (2001): Value orientation, needs satisfaction and job performance of public servants in Akwa Ibom State. A Ph.D. dissertation, University of Calabar.

World Bank Development Data Group (n.d.). (2004): Data by country.

Yamane, T. (1967): *Statistics, An Introductory Analysis*, 2nd Ed., New York: Harper and Row.

Appendix I

Chi-square Contingency Table Test for Independence

2	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	15
4	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	1	36
5	3	3	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	3	5	2	0	43
6	5	5	3	8	9	3	2	2	4	11	3	1	4	13	5	2	86
1	2	0	2	2	1	0	2	10	1	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	30
18	15	12	14	16	15	6	7	14	8	23	10	3	11	26	9	3	210

1.29	1.07	.86	1.00	1.14	1.07	.43	.50	1.00	.57	1.64	.71	.21	.79	1.86	.64	.21	15.00
3.09	2.57	2.06	2.40	2.74	2.57	1.0	1.2	2.40	1.3	7	3.94	1.71	.51	1.89	4.46	1.5	36.00
3.69	3.07	2.46	2.87	3.28	3.07	1.2	1.4	2.87	1.6	4	4.71	2.05	.61	2.25	5.32	1.8	43.00
7.37	6.14	4.91	5.73	6.55	6.14	2.4	2.8	5.73	3.2	8	9.42	4.10	1.2	3	10.6	3.6	86.00
2.57	2.14	1.71	2.00	2.29	2.14	.86	0	2.00	1.1	4	3.29	1.43	.43	1.57	3.71	1.2	30.00
18.0	15.0	12.0	14.0	16.0	15.0	6.0	7.0	14.0	8.0	23.0	10.0	3.0	11.0	26.0	9.0	3.0	210.0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

64.2 chi-square  
64 df  
.469 p-value  
.484 contingency coefficient



Appendix II

Chi-square Contingency Table Test for Independence

2	2	5	4	2	2	3	1	2	1	5	3	1	3	6	3	2	47
5	3	3	4	3	3	2	1	1	1	4	2	1	3	5	2	0	43
1	2	0	2	2	1	0	2	6	1	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	26
2	3	2	3	2	4	1	2	2	4	5	3	1	4	2	1	1	42
8	5	2	1	7	5	0	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	10	3	0	52
18	15	12	14	16	15	6	7	14	8	23	10	3	11	26	9	3	210

4.03	3.36	2.69	3.13	3.58	3.36	1.3	1.5	1.7						2.0			47.00
3.69	3.07	2.46	2.87	3.28	3.07	1.2	1.4	1.6						1.8			43.00
2.23	1.86	1.49	1.73	1.98	1.86	.74	.87	1.73	.99	2.85	1.24	.37	1.36	3.22	1	.37	26.00
3.60	3.00	2.40	2.80	3.20	3.00	1.2	1.4	1.6						1.8			42.00
4.46	3.71	2.97	3.47	3.96	3.71	1.4	1.7	1.9						2.2			52.00
18.0	15.0	12.0	14.0	16.0	15.0	6.0	7.0	14.0	8.0	23.0	10.0	3.0	11.0	26.0	9.0	3.0	210.0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

63.8 chi-square  
64 df  
.482 p-value  
.483 contingency coefficient

**Appendix III**  
**Spearman's rank correlation computation using internet calculator**

Spearman Rank Order Correlation - Ungrouped Data	
Statistic	Value
Correlation (not corrected)	-0.800000
Correlation (corrected)	-0.800000
t-Test (n>10)	-2.309401
Degrees of Freedom	3
Critical 2-sided T-value (5%)	3.182000
Critical 1-sided T-value (5%)	2.353000
D-square value (calculated)	36.000000
D-square value (expected)	20.000000
Standard Deviation	10.000000
z-Test	1.600000
Probability	0.107400
Observations	5

Student Distribution Probability (mathematical equation plotter)	
T-Test	-2.3094010767585
D.F.	3
Tails (1 or 2)	2

I J M R A