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Abstract

The study examined how lecturers in Nigerian universities can be motivated towards better service delivery. The study also examined the level of motivation as well as job performance of the lecturers. The descriptive survey design was used for the study. The population consisted of lecturers and students of three government owned universities in Ondo and Ekiti States. The sample comprised of 220 lecturers and 500 students randomly selected from three institutions. Two self-designed instruments were used to collect the relevant data for the study. The data were analysed using the frequency counts, percentage scores and bar charts. The study revealed that the level of lecturers’ motivation and job performance was moderately high. The study further showed the various strategies that can enhance better service delivery by the university lecturers, if well implemented. They include: increasing pay package, creating opportunity for professional growth, promoting lecturers when due and providing safe and healthy environment for teaching-learning among others. Based on the findings, it was recommended that the government should give more attention to the teaching-learning environment which can help impact on the quality of outputs being turned out from the universities. It was again recommended that the various strategies suggested in this paper should be put in place by the university management in order to ensure better service delivery by the university lecturers.
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1. Introduction

Education has been adjudged to be the greatest force that can bring about desired change in every society. It is also the best investment that a nation can make for quick and all round development of its economic, political, sociological and human resources. Universities, on their own, have the role of human capital development, research and technological innovation. All over the world today, investment in university education is a propelling force for national development.

The Federal Government of Nigeria, in the National Policy on Education (2004), shapes the focus of Nigerian University towards achieving the following objectives:

1. The acquisition, development and inculcation of the proper value orientation for the survival of the individual and society;
2. Development of the intellectual capacities of individuals to understand and appreciate their environments,
3. Acquisition of both physical and intellectual skills which will enable individuals to develop into useful members of the community, and
4. The acquisition of an objective-view of the national and international environments.

In spite of the laudable goals and objectives which universities are expected to perform, the
various problems confronting the system have practically made it impossible for these objectives to be realised. Akintayo (2008) posited that measures to promote higher education and improve the quality of university education to meet the challenges of a globally and constantly changing environment are often hampered by under-funding and inadequate financial resources. Okebukola (2006) also highlighted the various problems facing the Nigerian university system as over-enrolment, dilapidated structures, obsolete equipments, inadequate funding, admission of poor quality students and quality and quantity of academic staff.

It is a known fact that the Nigerian university system is bedevilled by myriads of problems; however, it appears that none of these problems is agonizing as the low morale of lecturers which leads to the poor quality of graduates being turned out every year. Durosaro (2006) asserted that:

Quantitatively viewed, the Nigerian educational system seems highly productive. This conclusion is based on the rate at which the educational institutions at all levels turn out graduate each year. But, if examined qualitatively, such a conclusion could be deceptive.

The above assertion is a pointer to the fact that the educational institutions in Nigeria have not been productive qualitatively and the university system is not an exception. The strength and quality of graduates to an extent is rooted in the degree of interaction between the teaching staffs and the students (Achibong & Okey 2006). Ajayi and Oguntoye (2003) also argued that the quality of education which a nation enjoys cannot be isolated from the effects of the teachers.

It appears that lecturers in Nigerian universities are not motivated on their job. Apart from the fact that they are not well remunerated compared to their contemporaries in other parts of the world (Utile, 2008), the school environment in most cases are not conducive for effective teaching and learning due to poor facilities (Okebukola, 2006); personal offices for lecturers are not conducive (Ezenwafor, 2006). All these problems appear to have made lecturers in the nation’s universities develop a number of behaviours typical of unmotivated individuals such as frustration, aloofness and withdrawal, aggression, disillusionment and above all incessant strikes and work-to-rule actions.

Motivation is an inner drive that activates or moves an individual to action in which an individual is compelled to act in a certain manner by his inner drive (Ibukun, 1997). Oyedeji (1998) and Ezenwafor (1999) also defined motivation as a process of arousing enthusiasm in an individual so that he can perform his duties with pleasure and high interest in pursuit of the organization and personal goals.

According to Yamoah and Ocansey (2013), motivation constitutes a central element in going through the process of human learning. If an organization does not possess the ability to motivate its employees, the knowledge within the organization would not be practically optimised. Thus motivation refers to how much a person tries to work hard and well to the arousal, direction and persistence of effort in work settings.

According to Ajayi and Oguntoye (2003), if workers are expected to perform well on their job, they have to be motivated. If the needs of the workers are consistently unsatisfied and there is no possibility of satisfaction, they may be frustrated and disenchanted with the organization and consequently they may perform below expectation. Studies such as those of Peretomode (1991), Ibukun (1997), Adepoyu (1998), Ajayi and Ayodele (2002) have shown that motivation is a determinant of productivity. This implies that lack of motivation is likely to lead to poor job performance or low productivity. In a study conducted by Lope (2004) the main reasons why the major players in the teaching profession (the teachers) are not putting in their best include low salary, lack of promotion opportunities, unsatisfactory leader behaviour, variety of workload, student discipline problems and unconducive working environment. It presupposes that if teachers/lecturers are faced with the negative tendencies they may not put in their best in the teaching profession. Akinfolarin and Ehinola (2014) also argued that lack of good working conditions and motivation mechanism has no doubt translated into lecturer’s low morale which invariably affects students’ academic performance negatively.

Munyengabe, Haiyan, Yiyi and Jeifei (2017) listed the following as factors that can aid lecturers’ motivation: promotion and incentives; adequate salary; conducive classroom environment, codes of conduct, cheer love of career.
2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find the level of lecturer's job performance in the universities in Nigeria. The study also examined the strategies to be adopted to motivate lecturers for better service delivery in the universities.

3. Research Questions

Three research questions have been raised to pilot the study.

1. What is the level of lecturer’s motivation in Nigerian universities?
2. What is the level of lecturer’s job performance in Nigerian universities
3. What are the strategies that can ensure better service delivery by the lecturers?

4. Methodology

The research design for this study was a descriptive research design of the survey type. The population consisted of lecturers and students of the three government-owned universities in Ondo and Ekiti States. They are Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Federal University of Technology, Akure, and Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko. The sample consisted up of 500 students and 220 lecturers drawn from the three institutions using simple random sampling techniques.

Two self-designed instruments were used for the study. The first one was “Lecturers’ Motivational Factor Questionnaire (LMFQ)”. Both instruments contained three sections. Section A of the instruments sought bio-data information of the respondents. Section B of the LMFQ sought information on the extent to which lecturers were motivated while Section B of LJPQ sought information on the extent to which lecturers perform their duties. Section B of both instruments sought information on the strategies that can ensure better service delivery by the lecturers. The LMFQ was administered on the lecturers while LJPQ was administered on the students.

The two instruments were validated by research experts in Tests and Measurement and Educational Management of Ekiti State University (formerly University of Ado-Ekiti). To ensure the reliability of the instruments, the test-retest method was adopted while Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine their reliability coefficient which stood at 0.67 and 0.73 for LMFQ and LMPQ respectively. The data collected were analysed using frequency counts and percentage scores.

5. Results

The results are presented below according to the research questions:

5.1 Research Question 1: What is the level of lecturer’s motivation in Nigerian universities?

In analysing the level of lecturers’ motivation, Section B of LMFQ was used. Frequency counts and percentage scores were used to analyze the responses on items 1 – 2 of Section B of LMFQ. The mean score and the standard deviation of the responses were used to classify the level of lecturers’ motivation into High, Moderate and Low levels. The low level was determined by subtracting the standard deviation score from the mean score (54.63 – 16.86 = 37.77). Moderate level was got by mean score of the respondents (54.63) while the high level also got by adding the mean score and the standard deviation score of the response of lecturers’ motivational factor instrument (54.63 + 16.86 = 71.49). As a result, the low level of lecturers’ motivation starts from 25.00 to 37.77, moderate level of lecturers’ motivation starts from 37.78 to 54.63 and high level of lecturers’ motivation starts from 54.64 to 100. See table 1.
Table 1: Level of Lecturers’ Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of lecturers’ motivation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (25.00 – 37.77)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (37.77 – 54.63)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (54.64 - 100)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 showed that 34 lecturers representing 15.5% had low level of motivation. Those who had moderate level were 125 representing 56.8% while those that had high level of motivation were 61 representing 27.7%. This means that the level of motivation of lecturers in the universities was moderate.

Figure 1 gives further illustration on the level of lecturers’ motivation in the universities.

---

5.2 Research Question 2: What is the level of lecturers’ job performance in Nigerian Universities?

In analysing the level of lecturers’ job performance, Section B of LJPQ was used. Frequency counts and percentage scores were used to analyse the responses on items 1 – 15 of Section B of LJPQ. The mean score and standard deviation of the responses were used to classify levels of lecturers’ job performance into High, Moderate and Low levels. The low level was got by subtracting the standard deviation from the mean score (82.07 – 14.06 = 68.01), moderate level was determined by the mean score of the respondent (82.07) while the high level was determined by adding the mean score and the standard deviation score of the responses lecturers’ job performance instrument (82.07 + 14.06 = 96.13). However, the low level of job performance of lecturers start from 25.00 to 68.01, moderate level of job performance starts from 68.02 to 82.07 and high level of job performance starts from 82.08 to 100. See table 2.

Table 2: Level of Lecturers’ Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of lecturers’ job performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (25.00 – 68.01)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (68.02 – 82.07)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (82.08 - 100)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 showed the level of job performance of lecturers in the area covered. The results showed that 93 representing 18.6% attested to the fact that the lecturers had low level of job performance. 312 representing 62.4% agreed that lecturers had high level of job performance. This showed that the level of lecturers’ job performance in the universities was moderate.

Figure 2 gives further illustration on the level of lecturers’ job performance.

![Figure 2: Level of lecturers’ job performance in Nigerian universities](image)

5.3 Research Question 3: What are the strategies that can ensure better service delivery by the lecturers?

In analysing the question, the responses to item 1 – 18 in section C of both LMFQ and LJPQ were used. See table 3.

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Items (N=720)</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase in the pay package of lecturers</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Create opportunity for professional growth</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide comfortable personal offices for lecturers</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Equip lecturers’ offices with communication gadgets</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide lecturers with personal computers</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide allowances for excess workload</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide allowances for result computation</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sponsor lecturers to national and international conference</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Subsidized cost of productions</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Award study leave with full pay to lecturers for higher degrees</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adequately furnish and equip lecture rooms and laboratories</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A well-equipped and standard library</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reduce the number of years required for sabbatical leave</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Provide accommodation for lecturers (both within or outside the campus)</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Recognize lecturers for outstanding performance</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Provide safe and healthy working environment</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Promote lecturers as at when due</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Create opportunity for lecturers to participate in decision making</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results in Table 3 showed that 94.9% of the respondents agreed that increase in the pay package for lecturers is a good strategy for ensuring lecturers’ better service delivery. While 94.4% of the respondents agreed that there is a need to create opportunity for professional growth. 90.7% of them agreed that there is the need to provide a safe and healthy working environment for the lecturers. Of the respondents, 88.9% agreed that lecturers should be promoted as and when due; 86.7% agreed that a well-equipped and standard library should be provided.

The table also showed that 86.4% of the respondents agreed that allowance should be provided for excess workload, 85.3% agreed that lecturers should be sponsored for national and international conferences. Again 85.3% also agreed that lecturers should be given the opportunity to participate in decision making. While 84% agreed that the number of years required for sabbatical leave should be reduced, 83.9% of them agreed that there is the need to equip lecturers’ offices with communication gadgets. Besides, 79.7% of the respondents agreed that lecturers’ room and laboratories should be adequately furnished and equipped. While 74.4% agreed that comfortable personal offices should be provided for lecturers, 73.2% also agreed that personal computers should be provided as well.

Of the respondents, 70.8% agreed that lecturers with outstanding performances should be recognized as well as provision for accommodation should be made for them within or outside the campus. Other strategies as revealed in the table are: provide allowance for result computation (69.9%), award study leave with full pay to lecturers for higher degrees (68.9%) and subsidise the cost of publications (66.7%).

6. Discussion

The study revealed that the lecturers recorded moderate level of motivation and job performance. This presupposes that the lectures are doing well on the job. This is contrary to the notion that the poor quality graduates being turned out of the universities was as a result of lecturers’ non-challant attitude to their duties which might have been as a result of poor motivation. However, the poor performance of students/graduates and some other vices seen among the university students which appear to be indicators of lectures’ poor job performance may not be unconnected with moral decadence in the society as well as poor intake of students from the secondary schools.

The study also showed that various ways by which the lecturers in Nigerian universities can still be motivated to ensure better service delivery. These include: increase in the pay package of lecturers; creation of opportunity for professional growth; a safe and healthy working environment; promotion of lecturers as and when due, and provision of well-equipped and standard libraries.

Other strategies include provision of allowances for excess workload; sponsoring lecturers for national and international conferences; reduction in the number of years required for sabbatical leave; equipping lecturers’ offices with communication gadgets as well as furnishing and equipping the lecture rooms and laboratories.

The study also revealed that providing lecturers with comfortable personal offices, personal computers as well as recognizing outstanding performance can help boost their morale for better service delivery. Promotion of accommodation, allowance for result computation, study leave with full pay to lecturers as well as subsidizing the cost of publications are all found out from the study to be strategies that can be put in place to ensure better service delivery by the university lecturers. The findings of this study corroborate Ibukun (1997), Oyedeji (2008), Ezenwafor (2009) and Ajayi and Oguntoyе (2003).

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that lecturers in the universities in the sampled area are doing well in their job and that the poor quality graduates being turned out in the universities was not directly linked to lecturers’ job performance. It was therefore recommended that the management of the universities should give more attention to other factors such as teaching-learning environment which can have a direct impact on the quality of graduates from the system. Despite the fact that the lecturers are doing well, there is still room for improvement. Hence, there is
need for the government as well as the university management to get the lecturers highly motivated for more effectiveness. Therefore, the suggested strategies in this study will be of immense benefits towards getting the best out of lecturers.
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