



## EXPLORING THE DIMENSIONS OF MOTIVATION IN WORK PRODUCTIVITY AMONG UNIVERSITY OF UYO NON-ACADEMIC STAFF

<sup>1</sup>Moses T. Imbur, <sup>1</sup>David O. Iloma & <sup>2</sup>Cynthia N.C. Udeze

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Uyo, Uyo,

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka,

Correspondence: E-mail: mosimbur@yahoo.com; Tel: 08039318260

### Abstract

*The present study examined the influence of motivation on work productivity, using 57 non-academic staff purposively selected from University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. An ex-post facto survey was employed in this study. Out of the 57 non-academic staff, 22 (38.6%) were males and 35 (61.4%) were females with a mean age of 43.65 and standard deviation (SD) of 9.48. The Employee Motivation Survey and the Endicott Work Productivity Scale were employed. After collation, coding and analytical engineering of data via Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 20), the independent t-test and Pearson Correlation were employed and results revealed a significant mean difference between extrinsically motivated and intrinsically motivated non-academic staff,  $t(55) = 1.78, p < 0.05$  confirming the first hypothesis. The finding is consistent with previous studies. The second hypothesis stating there will be a significant relationship between motivation and work productivity was not confirmed ( $r = -0.17, p > 0.05$ ). Probable explanation leaned on the possibility that job burnout and personality type may be confounding variables. From the foregone, recommendations for intervention strategies to holistically safeguard work productivity and ensure that motivation is all-encompassing among non-academic staff in tertiary institutions that will go a long way in achieving organizational objectives were made.*

**Keywords:** Work productivity, motivation, non-academic staff, organizational objectives.

### Introduction

The university environment is a peculiar one in the sense that it is a citadel of learning. Non-academic staff has overtime been very important in this regard; whereas various unions in the federal universities are always in constant conflict with either the



university management or the Federal Government (Albert, 2005). The umbrella union of the non-teaching staff is the Non-Academic Staff Union of Universities (NASU). NASU over the years has embarked on one strike or the other in their drive for better treatment and pay packages. Despite the prevailing ugly trend, in personnel management, there appears to be a significance relationship between motivation and work productivity which is dynamic and complex in nature. There is this common notion that workers who perform well at their jobs are those who are extrinsically motivated. In the word of Bryan (1989) highly motivated workers can bring about substantial better performance, and a substantial decrease in incidence of personnel related problem such as excessive strikes, absenteeism, redundancy and truancy.

Non-teaching staff plays an important role in universities and as such, their motivation should be amply considered and streamlined so as to ensure efficient and effective delivery of the services they render. Concomitantly, productivity among the non-teaching staff is amply indispensable as this count on the long run to the quality of treatment they offer to students who will eventually become leaders of tomorrow. Conversely, motivation plays an important role in all public and private organizations such that without motivating employees, organizations cannot run and cannot achieve their goals (Chintallo & Mahadeo, 2013). Various definitions have been given for employee motivation.

According to Chaudhary & Sharma (2012) the word motivation is derived from motive which implies needs, wants, and the desire of the persons. Nnabuife (2009) defined motivation as the internal or external driving force that produces the



willingness to perform an act to a conclusive end. Mee-Edoiye and Andawei (2002) viewed motivation as a human engineering approached being triggered by the individual needs; while Flippo (1982) defined motivation as a psychological process initiated by the emergence of needs involving a directed action and behaviour aimed at satisfying a particular desire. However, employee motivation shall be defined in this study by taking a cue from Robbins (cited in Ramlall, 2004) as: he willingness to exert high levels of effort toward organizational goals in order to satisfy some individual need.

In our contemporary educational system, work productivity is the key in organizational success and usually a reflection of the extent to which, for example, universities unions persuade workers to react to issues yet to be resolved and according to Todd (2009) is the total input of workers in their duties; it involves the overall dexterity of staff in his duties to achieve the organizational goals. This according to Ongori (2009) would manifest in various work attitudes such as low morale and inaction or lack of zeal for duties. As most conflicts are as a result of clamoring for better welfare, continuation of conflicts negatively influences workers' productivity and ultimately hinders the achievement of goals in the organization if not well handled. In order to tackle this menace, the procedure to enhance and sustain work productivity becomes paramount This includes the conduct of staff, what motivates staff, their skills, expertise, morale, interpersonal relationships with colleagues and their ability to abide with management policies without stress.



For proper understanding of this construct, two theories were proposed to guide this study: The Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory (1943, 1954) and the Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985). This latter theory is mainly an intrinsic motivation-based theory and posits satisfaction of three basic psychological needs will determine staff motivation for productivity: competence (perceived expertise or skill), autonomy (freedom to do their work), and relatedness (connection with students, academic staff and management)

Abraham Maslow postulated that five universal needs that motivates an individual. He arranged them as: *Physiological or Basic needs*. According to Anyim, Chidi, and Badejo (2012) physiological or basic needs are the basic need of a person. Chintaloo and Mahadeo (2013) also explain physiological needs as needs that basically satisfy the basic need of human. For example: Food, shelter, clothes, sleeping and breathing etc. *Safety needs*: Safety needs is the need for shelter and protection. In this need a person needs security, stability and dependency. *Belongings needs*: These needs are also known as social needs. It includes love and belongings. These needs can be fulfilled by interaction with coworker and colleagues. For example, the feelings of friendship, feelings of love, caring of family or relative etc. *Esteem needs*: Esteem needs are also known as egoistic needs. In this a man needs self-respect and the esteem of other. Man needs or reputation, prestige, status, fame, glory, dominance and recognition. *Self-actualization needs*: This is the highest need. A man wants self-realization and optimal self-development.

An empirical finding according to Ongori (2009) indicates that organizations are adversely affected by conflicts in terms of performance and wastage of scarce resources.



Dugguh (2012) in determining how certain theories of motivation could be applied to increase productivity in Cement Manufacturing Companies in Nigeria drew from various literatures on motivation and productivity and concludes that motivation has a link to productivity since motivated employees are productive employees.

Nyameino, Manyasi, and Musiega, (2014) recruiting 69 non-academic staff found that there is a positive statistically significant linear correlation between HR factors and productivity. Furthermore, Chowdhury, Alam, & Ahmed (2014) identifying the motivation factors for non-teaching staff of a public university in Bangladesh, recruited 49 employees and their findings supported the idea that what motivated employees differed given the context in which the employee worked. What was clear, however, was that employees ranked pay as the most important motivational factor followed by full appreciation of work well done.

Maduka and Okafor (2014) using 2000 workers revealed that salaries paid to junior staff in the company were very below the stipulations of Nigerian National Joint Industry Council. It further shows that the junior staff is rarely promoted and the junior staff prefers financial incentives than non-financial incentives.

Thereafter, Zameer, Ali, Nisar and Amir (2014) while trying to investigate the impact of motivation on employee performance, recruited 150 in three brewing company in Pakistan and found out that motivation plays a vital role toward the performance of employees in beverage industry of Pakistan. However, the American Educational Research Association (2019) tested the extent to which self-determined motivation served as a predictor of university faculty member' s research productivity.



Analysis of a large-scale USA sample of 1,980 faculties from 21 institutions using structural equation modelling found autonomous motivation (enjoyment, value) positively related to self-reported research productivity and number of publications, beyond time spent on research. External motivation (rewards) had a relatively small positive relationship with research productivity, while intrinsic motivation (guilt) had no relationship with research productivity. To this end, the study is aimed at examining the difference between extrinsically motivated non-academic staff and intrinsically motivated non-academic staff on work productivity and to investigate the relationship between motivation and work productivity among non-academic staff of University of Uyo. Thus, this study will contribute to understanding the important of the different forms of motivation in achievement of the general organisational goal.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants were 57 non-academic staff of the University of Uyo participated in the study. Out of the 57, males were 22 (38.6%) and females were 35 (61.4%) and their ages ranging from 28 to 65, with a mean age of 43.65 and standard deviation (SD) of 9.48. Participants responded to their marital status showing that out of the 57 staffs, 9 (15.8%) were single, 36 (63.2%) were married, 6 (10.5%) were separated, 4 (7.0%) were widowed, and 2 (3.5%) were divorced. Participants also indicated their ethnicity revealing that 30 (52.6%) hailed from Ibibio, 11 (19.3%) were Efik, 6 (10.5%) were Oron, 6 (10.5%) were Annang, and 4 (7.0%) were Igbo.



## **Instruments**

In order to measure motivation, the following scales were compiled and employed as scales of measurement.

### **Employee Motivation**

This was measured by Kovach (1995) job motivation scale. This scale is composed of ten job motivating items that were considered to be intrinsic and extrinsic factors (Kovach, 1995; Wong, Siu, & Tsang, 1999). Two questions were added to the original ten factors: monetary incentives for a job well done and public celebration for a job well done. These items were added based on the review of related literature that highlighted the importance of compensation (Weaver, 1988; Rynes, Gerhart, & Minette, 2004), and public celebrations (McClelland, 1961). These questions were answered in a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=Very Unimportant to 5=Very Important. The scale recorded an internal consistency of 0.69 in the present study. Scores above the norm 43.09 indicates extrinsically motivated non-academic staff whereas scores below the norm indicates intrinsically motivated non-academic staff.

### **Work Productivity**

This was measured by a 25-item Endicott Work Productivity Scale (EWPS) (Endicott & Nee, 1997). The EWPS is a brief self-report questionnaire designed to enable investigators to obtain a sensitive measure of work productivity. The "maximum possible score" is 100 and the lowest possible score is 0. In addition, information is collected regarding the number of hours of work usually expected, the number worked, and the reason(s) why the subject worked less than usual. All productivity questions



use a five-point scale from "never" to "almost always." However, in the present study, Cronbach alpha reliability of 0.53 was obtained.

### **Procedure**

All the purposefully selected participants were volunteers and were required to sign consent form as a criteria to participate in the study. The questionnaire was distributed to the participants at individually at the offices and was returned after they have completed the questionnaire. As each copy of questionnaire were distributed to the participants, the first author explained the purpose of the research briefly and the directions for completing each survey. The researcher explained that the respondents identities were kept confidential. However, during collation period and analysis by the second author, only 57 administered instruments were properly filled out of the 67 distributed and hence utilized in the final analysis representing 87.69% response rate.

### **Design and Statistics**

Ex post facto was adopted for this study. The design was used in comparing university staff worker's productivity in line with their type of motivation. Independent t-test and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient were applied for statistical analysis.

### **Result**

Descriptive statistics result indicated that participants responses tilted toward good working conditions (82.5%) **E** , good wages (82.5%) **E** , gratitude for a job well done (80.7%) **I**, promotion or career development (80.7%) **I**, public celebration for a job well done (63.2%) **E**, and monetary incentives for a job well done (63.2%)**E**. Others were: A feeling of being involved (43%)**I**, Job security (43%)**E**, Supervisors help with personal



problems (33%)**I**, Management/Supervisor loyalty to employees (25%)**I**, Interesting work (11%)**I**, and Tactful discipline (11%)**E**.

This implies that the non-academic staff were more extrinsically motivated, but showed that gratitude for a job well done and promotion or career development (intrinsic motivators) were also very important for their overall work productivity.

**Hypothesis one:** Significant difference will exist between extrinsically motivated non-academic staff and intrinsically motivated non-academic staff on work productivity.

**Table 1: Summary of t-test of Independence showing the influence of motivation on work productivity.**

| Motivation | N  | Mean  | SD   | df | T    | p   |
|------------|----|-------|------|----|------|-----|
| Extrinsic  | 22 | 31.50 | 3.58 |    |      |     |
| Intrinsic  | 35 | 29.09 | 6.66 | 55 | 2.00 | .05 |

Result above showed a significant mean difference between extrinsically motivated non-academic staff and intrinsically motivated non-academic staff,  $t(55) = 2.00$ ,  $P < .05$ . Mean difference was also observed between the two groups. Therefore, the first hypothesis was confirmed. This finding is consistent with that of Zameer, Ali, Nisar & Amir (2014).

**Table 2: Summary of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of Motivation and Work Productivity.**

| Source            | N  | r     | df | Sig.  |
|-------------------|----|-------|----|-------|
| Motivation        | 57 | -0.17 | 1  | >0.05 |
| Work Productivity | 57 | -0.17 | 1  | >0.05 |



The second hypothesis stated that there will be a significant relationship between motivation and work productivity of non-academic staff. To investigate this, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to know the association between motivation and work productivity. Table 2 also shows that motivation is negatively or inversely related to work productivity with p value of 0.220 which is not statistically significant.  $R=.17$ ,  $p>0.05$ . ( $r= -0.17$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). This means that as one variable increases in value, the second variable decreases in value. In other words, when motivation is increasing, work productivity is decreasing.

## **Discussion**

This finding ideally is not obtainable and is not in line with several findings (Dugguh, 2012; Dugguh, 2012; Nyameino, Manyasi, & Musiega, 2014; Zameer, Ali, Nisar & Amir, 2014). Nevertheless, few findings agree with the present finding. First, Chowdhury, Alam, and Ahmed (2014) in their research supported the idea that what motivated employees differed given the context in which the employee worked; and the American Educational Research Association (2019) found no relationship between introjected motivation (which is a form of intrinsic motivation) and research productivity. The researchers therefore conclude that the effect of motivation on worker' s productivity is of paramount important to the university system.

In order to meet up with the current dynamic rate of the innovation, research, skill and knowledge development, the management of tertiary institutions (which is the wheel of progress of any society) need to explore alternative approach to manage non-academic staff performance to the maximum in order to make meaningful impact on the



nation' s growth and development. This will in turn increase the work productivity of the non-academic staff in our tertiary institutions.

To this end, the key to motivating non-teaching staff is to know what motivates them and designing a motivation program based on those needs. Qualitative findings reveal that extrinsic motivating factors such as good working conditions, good wages, public celebration for a job well done, monetary incentives for a job well done, and intrinsic factors such as gratitude for a job well done and promotion or career development were very important for their overall work productivity. While quantitative finding indicates that there is a significant mean difference extrinsically motivated non-academic staff and intrinsically motivated non-academic staff; more so, when motivation is considered as a composite variable, it does not relate to work productivity. Therefore, future studies should consider other variables such as burnout and personality factors alongside motivation in determining work productivity.

In the light of the foregone, the University management and Educational Boards should be proactive with the working conditions, welfare, and promotion/career development of the non-academic staff. Integrating more intrinsic motivation assessment in organizational recruitment and not neglecting extrinsic motivation will bring about efficient and effective workforce in the administrative sector of our ivory towers. In so doing, this will give the non-teaching a sense of belonging and being appreciated will make them to be more focused and completely committed to their duties. The study is limited in some ways, for instance, the number of participants recruited and one university for this study may not be sufficient to generalize findings. Furthermore, future studies will improve on this study by using other universities from



other regions of the country as well as increasing the number of participants and include moderating and mediating variables for work productivity to be better understood.

## References

- Albert, I. O. (2005). Conflict Management and Resolution in Research Supervision. A paper presented at the workshop on students supervision organized by postgraduate school, University of Ibadan.
- American Educational Research Association (2019). Does Enjoyment, Guilt, and/or Rewards Motivate Faculty Research Productivity? A Large-Scale Test of Self-determination Theory. Submission for Division J Section 4: Faculty, Curriculum, and Teaching at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Anyim, C. Chidi, O., & Badejo, A. (2012). Motivation and employees' performance in the public and private sectors in Nigeria: *International Journal of Business Administration*, 3, 1-5.
- Bryan, I. (1989). *Corporate personnel management*. Pitman publishing, Inc. 128, long Acree, London.
- Chaudhary, N. & Sharma, B. (2012). Impact of employee motivation on performance (Productivity) In Private Organization: *International Journal of Business Trends and Technology*, 2, 4-9.
- Chintaloo, S. & Mahadeo, J. (2013). Effect of motivation on employees' work performance at Ireland Blyth Limited: Proceedings of 8th Annual London Business Research Conference Imperial College, London, UK, 8 ISBN: 978-1-922069-28-3.
- Chowdhury, M. S., Alam, Z., & Ahmed, S. (2014). Understanding employee motivation: The case of non-teaching staff of a public university. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 2, 6, 17-24.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dugguh, S. I. (2012). Using motivation theories to enhance productivity in cement manufacturing companies in Nigeria: An overview. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, 1, 1-8.



- Endicott, J. & Nee, J. (1997). Endicott Work Productivity Scale (EWPS): A new measure to assess treatment effects. *Psychopharmacology bulletin*.
- Flippo, E. B. (1982). *Personal management*. 5th Edition. McGraw Hill Inc, London.
- Kovach, K.A. (1995). Employee motivation: addressing a crucial factor in your organization' s performance. *Employment Relations Today*, 22, 2, 93-107.
- Maduka, C. E. & Okafor, O. (2014). Effect of motivation on employee productivity: A Study of Manufacturing Companies in Nnewi. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 2, 7, 137-147.
- Maslow A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. Harper and Row New York, New York.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). *A theory of human motivation*. *Psychological review*, 50, 4, 370-376.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- Mee Edoiye, M. & Andawei, M. M. (2002). Motivation, An Alternative to improve workers performance in today construction industry. *The Quantity surveyors*, 40, 3, 2-8.
- Nnabife, E. K. (2009). Organizational behavior and management theory.
- Nyameino, S. O., Manyasi, J. & Musiega, D. (2014). Human resource factors influencing productivity in public universities in Kenya: A case study of MMUST. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Entrepreneurship*, 1, 11, 594-605.
- Ongori, H. (2009). Organizational conflict and its effects on organizational performance. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 3, 16-24.
- Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 5, 1/2, 52-63.
- Rynes, S.L., Gerhart, B., &Minette, K.A. (2004). The importance of pay in employee motivation: discrepancies between what people say and what they do. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 4, 381-394.
- Todd, J. M. (2009). *Mediation and the dynamics for collective bargaining*. Washington: Bureau of National Affairs.
- Weaver, T. (1988). Theory m: motivating with money. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 29, 3, 40-45.



- Wong, S., Siu, V., & Tsang, N., (1999). The impact of demographic factors on Hong Kong hotel employees' choice of job-related motivators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11, 5, 230-241.
- Zameer, H., Ali, S., Nisar, W., & Amir, M. (2014). The impact motivation on the employee' s performance in beverage industry of Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 4, 1, 293-298.