ISSN: 2287 – 80X1
Volume 11, Number 3, 2023
Innovative Journal of Social Science, Arts and Management
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, The University of Sydney, Camperdown NSW 2006, Australia

ORGANIZATIONAL INCENTIVES AND ACADEMIC STAFF PERFORMANCE IN THE FEDERAL UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES, DELTA STATE

[1]Prof. Kelly B. O. Ejumudo and [2]Tobi Ejumudo
[1]Department of Public Administration, Novena University, Ogume, Delta State, Nigeria
[2]Department of Entrepreneurship, Dennis Osadebey University, Anwai, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria
Email: profkellynovena@gmail.com.

ABSTRACT
This study ascertained the interplay between organizational incentives an academic staff performance in the Federal University of Petroleum Resources in Delta State. The data was collected through structured questionnaire from sampled respondents in the studied university in Delta State. The finding revealed that, there is a significant relationship between organizational incentives and lecturers' academic performance in the institution. Based on the above, it's recommended that, monetary and nonmonetary incentives should always be given to lecturers for optimal performance. Besides, organizations should set up a policy for performance evaluation with corresponding incentives.

Keywords: Organizational Incentives, Academic Staff Performance, Delta State

INTRODUCTION

Academic achievement and organizational incentives are connected concepts that affect educational quality. According to Ododho (2013) and Kennedy (2016), the quality of education is determined by how well it meets learners' fundamental needs, enhances their lives, and improves their overall quality of life. The education system needs to receive enormous investments of physical, financial, and human resources in order to meet the aim of providing high-quality education (Kennedy, 2016). When it comes to being effective, client-centered, and inclusive of all parties involved, the quality of education is crucial. Higher education quality is mostly dependent on instructors, who require the right kind of motivation in order to deliver the intended learning outcomes. Lecturers play a crucial role because education is one of the key components that contributes to the rapid social and economic development of any given country. To guarantee and improve academic performance in the higher education system, however, the government and the institution's management must work together to implement effective and efficient incentive schemes.

In any community, becoming a lecturer is one of the most significant careers. In addition to raising exam scores, Kennedy (2016) asserts that excellent instructors have a long-term favorable impact on students' socioeconomic situation twenty to thirty years from now. Learning objectives are directly impacted by a lecturer's delivery style. In order to achieve high-quality education, lecturers must be provided with incentives. It is impossible to overstate the importance of lecturers in education, especially at institutions of higher learning like universities and colleges. Lecturers have various important roles and attributes, including performing experiments, actively participating in research, writing academic papers, publishing their findings, and advancing knowledge in their domains. The results of this study may have bearing on the standing of the organization they work for. Additionally, lecturers frequently act as mentors for their students, offering advice on things pertaining to their studies and careers. They might help students choose their classes, look for research opportunities, and get ready for their future professions. Lecturers are essential to the success of academic institutions since they shape students' educational experiences in a significant way. Their influence extends beyond the classroom as lecturers shape their students' intellectual development and future careers (Orodho, 2013).

Objective of the Study

To ascertain organization incentives and academic staff performance of federal university of petroleum

Research Question

What is the interplay between organizational incentives and academic staff performance?

Hypothesis of the Study

Ho_1: there is no significant relationship between organizational incentives and academic staff performance

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Conceptual Review

Concept of Organizational Incentive

Incentives are an external persuasive element that supports the motivation that positively steers the person to work harder and meet the institution's performance requirements in order to receive the incentive. According to Alfandi and Alkahsawneh (2014), incentives can also be defined as concrete and moral ways for individuals to satiate their moral and material desires, as well as ways that organizations use to motivate staff to work with a positive attitude. Palmer (2012) defined incentives as the outside pressures and motivating elements that push a person to put in more effort. These are provided as a reward for the person's exceptional work because a happy employee will put in more effort and produce better work. Furthermore, if the pay is sufficient to enable the employee to recognize the worth of their work while simultaneously meeting their basic needs, incentives can also be defined as taking exceptional performance into account (Palmer, 2022).

In practice, incentives are all of the tangible and moral support that organizations provide to staff members in order to positively motivate them and raise output and performance. This is important because it satisfies staff members' needs and ensures that they will remain devoted to the organization (Alfandi & Alkahsawneh, 2014). Since incentives have a significant impact on workers' productivity, the concept of incentives attracts a lot of attention, particularly when hiring qualified staff members who can effectively accomplish the institution's goals. The need for an employee to be acknowledged and valued for their work is the root of incentive importance. In fact, one of the most important ways to satiate a person's inner desires is to reward others for their efforts with incentives. Individuals require an incentive system that stimulates their internal motives and motivates them to work extremely hard in order to achieve high productivity; otherwise, their skills alone will not be sufficient (Locke & Braver, 2018; Alfandi & Alkahsawneh, 2014).

It has been discovered that one strategy that organizations can use to inspire employees and improve performance is offering them adequate incentives. Numerous studies (Al-Nsour 2022; Olubusayo, Stephen & Maxwell, 2014) look at the effects of monetary and nonmonetary incentives on organizational variables. Incentive programs are put in place by various organizations to compensate and reward performance of employees who perform more than expectation (Olubusayo, Stephen & Maxwell, 2014). Incentive packages are financial or non-financial rewards offered to employees to compel them to exert more effort into any giving task (National Commission on Productivity and Work Quality 2015).

Employees may be influenced by incentives to act in particular ways. Depending on the situation, they may decide to work as hard as they can at a job, work as little as possible, or work just enough to get by (Griffin, 2012). In the meantime, incentives are intended to elicit the best work possible from staff members and aid in keeping the most productive ones on board (Arnold 2013). Employers have a number of options when it comes to rewarding staff for their performance,

but in order to achieve the intended outcomes, it is important to think about utilizing the best employee incentives.

According to Olubusayo, Stephen, and Maxwell (2014), incentives play a crucial role in driving employee motivation and performance. They offer numerous advantages and have the capacity to inspire employees to give their all in any given task. According to Olubusayo, Stephen, and Maxwell (2014), "High productivity may be determined by workers' ability to work, and therefore employees that are not well rewarded produce less." These incentives were separated into two categories by Luthans (2018): monetary incentives and non-monetary incentives, sometimes referred to as financial or non-financial incentives. Employee motivation, meanwhile, can come from internal or external sources. According to Ryan (2000), intrinsic motivation refers to an individual's internal drive that propels them to work effectively and efficiently toward achieving organizational productivity. According to Olubusayo et al. (2014), it results from basic psychological needs like the need for competence and autonomy. An employee experiences this as a self-generated drive that motivates them to work more. They are associated with social and professional incentives such as the chance to apply one's skills, engaging work, opportunities for professional growth, acknowledgment of a job well done, a feeling of accomplishment and challenge, involvement in decision-making, and considerate and caring treatment, among other things. Conversely, when actions are taken in order to receive rewards from outside sources, this is known as extrinsic motivation.

"Tangible" rewards like pay and salaries, perks, bonuses, cash, security, promotions, wall plaques, complimentary dinner or movie tickets, etc. are examples of extrinsic motivation (Pattanayak, 2015). Employee motivation, dedication, and satisfaction in the workplace can be ensured through the use of both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Thus, non-monetary incentives as a tool for motivation can be said to address the concepts of both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. The only way to categorize financial incentives is as a contributing factor to extrinsic motivation. According to Olusayo and Maxwell (2014), in order for employees to continue being effective, productive, and competitive, management must comprehend the reasons behind the actions of both individuals and groups. This will enable them to maintain a high level of satisfaction and productivity.

Employers of labor use monetary incentives to help them retain their brightest employees and to award them with money for a job well done and exceptional performance. (Nelson, 2013; Stephen Olubusayo & Maxwell, 2014) According to Pattanayak (2015), incentives can take many different forms, including base pay, insurance, profit sharing, retirement plans, employee stock, overtime pay, attendance incentives, competitions and contests, output-driven merit increases, performance bonuses, piecework, safety incentives, suggestion awards, and more. Plans that tie incentives to productivity standards either directly or indirectly referred to as monetary incentives (Alaba & Owodunni, 2007).

Non-monetary incentives are used to provide opportunities for rewarding employees who perform exceptionally well on the job (Olubusayo, Stephen & Maxwell, 2014). According to Hijazi, Awar, and Mehbood (2007), it typically takes the form of written recognition, gifts, formal dinners, casual parties, plaques, incentives, assurances of job security, welfare packs, management participation, promotions, holidays, and better working environments.

Lecturers' Job Performance

The act of completing a task is referred to as "job performance" (Griffin, 2022; Nurharani, et al. 2013). A lecturer's job performance could be described as the tasks they complete within the school system at a specific time to help the organization reach its objectives (Obilade, 2019). The job satisfaction and attitudes of lecturers, such as their commitment, sense of challenge, meaningfulness, and sense of responsibility, can be used to gauge how well they are doing their jobs (Cheng, 2022). An individual's performance at work may improve when they are content. He usually gives his work his all. To guarantee the caliber of instruction delivered in the classroom, job

performance is crucial. The "X" and "Y" theories developed by McGregor (1960) established the theory of job performance. According to theory "X," a negative attribute results in low performance, while theory "Y" asserts that a positive attribute produces high performance.

Theory Y holds that a lecturer's behavior affects their performance level (Adeyemi, 2018; Nurharani, et al., 2013). Inadequate compensation, a poorly designed career path, few opportunities for advancement, subpar facilities, a lax disciplinary code, the conduct of the HOD, students' unfavorable work attitudes, and the conduct of lecturers are some of the factors that lead to subpar performance from lecturers (George, et al., 2018; Nurharani, et al. 2013). According to Cheng (2013), a lecturer's performance is largely determined by the internal organizational activities and practices of the institution. Numerous studies have linked a lecturer's work performance to the output or final product of the academic goals of the institution, such as the semester result, or a combination of these (Osinowo & Akanbi, 2016).

Performance is all about how well and efficiently things are completed overall. In essence, it's a ratio used to assess how successfully a company uses its resources to produce goods and services. However, in an educational setting, the effectiveness of lecturers can be evaluated using qualitative instruments, such as student test results (Schaer & Thum, 2004). Students' academic performance is the main instrument (indicator) of school performance, particularly when it comes to the CGPA level. The performance is poor if the majority of students taking the examination CGPA is lower than average, which demonstrates the level of lecturers' commitment. However, the performance is rated highly if the majority has CGPA above average (Atanda & Waheed, 2016).

According to Blankstain (2016), there are other factors besides lecturers' influence that affect students' academic achievement in schools, so grades and test scores do not accurately reflect the quality of instruction. However, education researchers have been very concerned about students' ability to evaluate their lecturers' effectiveness. According to research by Barnett et al. (2003) and Pozo-Munoz et al. (2000), student ratings are useful measures of how well a lecturer is doing their job. Students' ratings should never be the only indicator of a lecturer's performance on the job; rather, they should be part of a comprehensive evaluation system, according to Nuher (2004) and Pozo-Munoz et al. (2000).

The performance of lecturers on the job has been assessed by the school administrators. Head of department' evaluations of a lecturer's effectiveness in raising student achievement and the lecturer's success in doing so, as determined by the value-added approach, were found to be positively correlated by Jacob and Lefgren (2016). The study has shown that the most thorough system of evaluation for determining a lecturer's effectiveness in an institution is one that focuses on the welfare and commitment of the lecturer. One way to define lecturers' job performance is the tasks they carry out within the school system at a given time to help the system achieve its objectives. It could also be defined as the capacity of educators to integrate pertinent information to improve the processes of teaching and learning.

All the same, the degree to which lecturers participate in the day-to-day operations of the school, their regular attendance, the discipline of their students, and the effective use of instructional materials to support the learning process all determine how well they perform (Kennedy, 2016). It has been observed that educators exhibit varying behaviors depending on the context. Hence, by recognizing their needs and making an effort to meet them through suitable, pertinent, and sufficient motivational techniques, principals can promote the efficient productivity of their lecturers (Orodho, 2013).

Additionally, according to Owoeye (2019), effective teaching, lesson note preparation, efficient use of the work plan, effective supervision, monitoring of students' work, and disciplinary ability are qualities that teachers/lecturers should effectively uphold in the educational system. In this sense, an annual report detailing the lecturer's activities in terms of performance in the classroom, lection note, presentation, subject matter mastery, competence, dedication to the profession, and extracurricular activities could be used to gauge the lecturer's effectiveness. Effective leadership,

effective supervision, effective work monitoring, motivation, classroom management, and the lecturers' capacity for discipline are additional domains of assessment. It is common knowledge in organizational psychology that a leader's ability and motivation determine how productive their work is (Dugu, 2000; Kennedy, 2016).

Empirical Review

Understanding the interplay between organizational incentives and academic performance in federal tertiary institution in Delta State is crucial, given the significance of a lecturer's role in a student's education. Numerous studies have shown that organizational incentives may have an impact on lecturers' academic performance. For example, Duo et al. (2022) discovered that in rural India, the use of financial incentives in conjunction with monitoring decreased lecturer absenteeism by 21 percentage points and raised test scores by 0.17 standard deviations for students. Additionally, Muralidharan and Sundararaman (2021) discovered that student math and language scores improved by 0.27 and 0.17 standard deviations, respectively, when government lecturers in India received performance-based pay.

Barrera-Osorio and Raju (2017) discovered, however, that while student enrollment and exam participation rose, providing bonuses to Pakistani lecturers did not result in an improvement in test scores. Although the findings of Besley and Ghatak (2018) suggest that public employees are likely to differ systematically from private sector employees, for instance, in terms of their motivation level or image concerns, their model does not take into account the possibility that they may also react differently to extrinsic incentives.

According to Glewwe et al. (2020), performance-linked pay has a positive effect on subjects that are incentivized; however, lecturer attendance did not improve. The study involved primary school teachers in Kenya. The experimental studies' heterogeneous results emphasize the need for further research into the ways in which lecturers' responsiveness to incentives varies depending on the context. In a group-based lecturer incentive pay program, Imberman and Lovenheim (2015) calculated the effect of financial incentive strength on student achievement. Lecturers can hold each other accountable by putting themselves in groups, which adds another layer of peer pressure. By using the percentage of students in a grade-subject enrolled in a lecturer's classes, awards were given out based on how well students performed within a grade, school, and subject. The findings demonstrate unequivocally that when the stakes are sufficiently high, lecturers respond to incentives, and that increased lecturer effort leads to higher student achievement in response to stronger group incentives.

In the USA, Figlio and Kenny (2016) also looked at students' performance and individual lecturer incentives. The findings demonstrated that schools with individual financial incentives for strong performance have higher test scores. The strongest impact was seen in schools with potentially less effective parental supervision systems. Additionally, the findings showed that the relationship between lecturer incentives and student performance could be explained by lecturers putting in more effort as a result of lecturer incentives or by better schools implementing lecturer incentives. Vegas and Umansky provide a condensed schema of the seven key elements of a successful system to draw in, keep, and inspire highly qualified lecturers across several Latin American nations in a 2005 World Bank study. The study primarily focuses on two topics: 1) incentives for lecturers that influence their tenure in the profession; and 2) incentives that influence the work that lecturers do in the classroom. Based on the literature, the study's hypothesis that:
Ho_1: There is no significant correlation between organizational incentives and academic performance in federal tertiary institution in Delta State.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical underpinnings of this work include the Fredrick Herzberg Two Factor Theory, the Clayton Alderfer ERG Theory, Theories X and Y and Resource Based View Theory

Clayton Alderfer-ERG Theory

Alderfer (2002) created a method that goes beyond Maslow's needs theory to comprehend employee motivation through incentives. He discovered that a person experiences frustration when they are unable to find what they are looking for and feels satisfied when they have what they are seeking (Samuel & Joshua, 2016). The primary distinction between the two groups is that Alderfer could not locate any data to back up Maslow's theory that needs were arranged in a hierarchy. Although to differing degrees of strength, he claimed that each of his three categories of needs can be met (Samuel & Joshua, 2016).

Fredrick Herzberg Two Factor Theory

Herzberg et al. (2009) examined a modified version of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and they found that there are two factors that contribute to motivation and came to the conclusion that factors related to job satisfaction comprise motivation. They also explained how people relate to their work, including the type of work they do, the responsibilities they have, and the recognition they receive. Hygienic considerations Instead of encouraging excellent performance, the second self-factor—dubbed hygiene factors—serve to avoid discontent. They determined that the following particular factors contribute to good hygiene: job security, pay status, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relationships, company policy and administration, etc.

Theories X and Y

Douglas (1960) developed the theory that when managers try to persuade others, they have to assume that these individuals will respond differently to incentives that differ from their own, which informs the organizational structure that they implement. According to Samuel and Joshua (2016), every managerial action is predicated on one of the two tenets of theories X and Y, which discuss the dual nature of humanity.

Resource Based View Theory

Wernerfelt (1984) developed the resource-based view theory with the express purpose of identifying an organization's resources that can be effectively and efficiently utilized to acquire and maintain an advantage over rival brands or businesses in a given industry. According to the theory, some companies have better financial performance than others, and this is explained by the resource profile of the company (Winnie & Francis 2016; Idenedo, et al., 2020). Businesses need essential resources, skills, and qualities that are rare, valuable, hard to replicate, and non-substitutable in order to gain a sustainable competitive advantage. These resources must also be effectively deployed in the targeted markets (Baker & Sinkula, 2005). Because they offer fresh perspectives and solutions for the advancement of the country's economy, academic staff members can be viewed as a resource for an institution's innovation and rating (Anna & Fang, 2018). Higher education institutions will have a stronger competitive advantage if they use incentives to drive their academic staff. Using incentives to drive academic staff will result in superior, non-replaceable capabilities and give the higher education institution a long-term competitive advantage (Idenedo et al., 2023; Winnie & Francis, 2016).

METHOD

This study will adapt a correlational research design. The Federal University of Petroleum, with 181 academic staff in Delta State, constitutes the population. The entire staff participated in the study. A questionnaire was utilized as the instrument of primary data collection. Respondents were required to tick from 1 to 5 on a Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. To justify the study instrument, a comprehensive reliability test was conducted, with a threshold of 0.7 set by Nunnally (1978), while the opinion of scholars and practitioners with relevant experience on the study constructs was used to validate the instrument.

The data collected for the study was analysed and hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS Version 20.0).

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULT

Data Presentation

Table .1: Questionnaire Analysis

Numbers	Questionnaire	Percentage (%)
No. Sent out	181	100%
No. Returned	150	83%
No. Not Returned	31	17%

Source: Field Survey Data 2023

Table 1 shows that a total of 181 copies of questionnaire were distributed, out of which 150 (83%) were retrieved while 31(17%) were not retrieved. However, 150 (83%) of the retrieved questionnaire were useful. The 31(7%) of the not retrieved questionnaire were not correctly or completely filled and were consequently discarded.

In determining the extent of the relationship that exists between the variables of the study, the categorization adopted by Dunn (2001) is used.

Table 2: Range of Relationship and Descriptive Level of Association of Relationship

Range of r values	Degree of association of r
± 0.80 to 1.00	Very strong
± 0.60 to 0.79	Strong
± 0.40 to 0.59	Moderate
± 0.20 to 0.39	Weak
± 0.00 to 0.21	Very weak

Source: Adopted from Dunn (2001) degree of relationship categorization

The plus sign on the table connote positive relationship while the minus sign means negative relation. The r sign clarify the direction of the relationship that exists between the variables.

Hypotheses Testing

Decision Rule

The null hypotheses should be rejected and conclude a significant relationship if the probability value (PV) < (0.05) Significance level. The null hypotheses should be accepted and conclude an insignificant relationship if the probability value (PV) > (0.05) Significance level

Table 3: Correlation Analysis between Organizational Incentives and Lecturer's Academic Performance

Correlations

		Organizational Incentive	Lecturer's Academic Performance
Organizational Incentive	Pearson Correlation	1	.697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	150	150
Lecturer's Academic Performance	Pearson Correlation	.697**	1

Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	150	150

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: (SPSS Output 2023).

Table 3 shows that the Pearson's correlation (r) = 0. 697**, this value is high, implying that a strong relationship exists between organizational incentive and lecturer's academic performance. The positive sign of the correlation coefficient means that a positive relationship exists between them. That is to say that an increase in lecturer's academic performance is associated with the level of organizational incentive given to lecturers of the studied federal university in Delta State.

Hypothesis 1

Ho_1: There is no significant relationship between organizational incentives and academic staff performance of Federal University of Petroleum in Delta State.

As shown above, the PV is (0.000), this value is < (0.05) significance level, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and the researchers conclude that a significant relationship exist between organizational incentives and academic staff performance of Federal University of Petroleum in Delta State.

Discussion of Findings

The study earlier hypothesized that there is no significant relationship between organizational incentives and academic staff performance at the Federal University of Petroleum in Delta State. However, the tested hypothesis revealed a significant relationship between the variables. As shown in Table 7, Pearson's correlation (r) = 0.697**; this value is high, implying that a strong relationship exists between organizational incentive and academic staff performance. This finding coheres with the existing literature on the variables. For instance, Muralidharan and Sundararaman (2021) found that performance-based pay for government lecturers in India led to an increase in student math and language scores by 0.27 and 0.17 standard deviations, respectively.

Glewwe et al. (2020), involving Kenyan primary school teachers, suggest a positive impact of performance-linked pay on incentivized subjects. Imberman and Lovenheim (2015) estimated the impact of monetary incentive strength on student achievement under a group-based lecturer incentive pay program. The idea of grouping the lecturers introduces an additional peer pressure treatment that allows lecturers to hold each other accountable. Awards were based on the performances of students within a grade, school, and subject by using a share of students in a grade-subject enrolled in a lecturer's classes. The results show comprehensively that lecturers respond to incentives when the stakes are high enough, and student achievement rises in response to stronger group incentives because of increases in lecturer effort.

Figlio and Kenny (2016) also studied individual lecturer incentives and student performance in the USA. The results showed that test scores are higher in schools with individual financial incentives for good performance. The effect was strongest in schools that may have weaker parental monitoring mechanisms. Further, the results revealed that the relation between lecturer incentives and student performance could be attributed to either better schools adopting lecturer incentives or lecturer incentives causing more effort from lecturers. However, the current findings contradict Barrera-Osorio and Raju (2017), who found that giving bonuses to lecturers in Pakistan did not lead to improvement in test scores, though enrolment and exam participation among students increased.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results, the study draws the conclusion that academic staff performance at Federal University of Petroleum, Delta State, and organizational incentives are significantly correlated. On the basis of this, it is suggested that lecturers should always receive both monetary

and non-monetary incentives for their best work. Organizations should also set up policies for performance reviews and provide incentives accordingly.

REFERENCES

Adeyemi, T.O. (2018). Organizational climate and lecturers' job performance in primary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria: An analytical survey. *Asian Journal of Information Technology, 7*(4), 138-145.

Al-Nsour, M. (2022). Relationship between Incentives and Organizational Performance for Employees in the Jordanian Universities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(1), 34-51.

Alderfer, J.H. (2022). New trends in reward allocation preferences. *An Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 408-428.

Alfandi, A. M., & Alkahsawneh, M. S. (2014). The role of the incentives and reward system in enhancing employee's performance "a case of Jordanian travel and tourism institutions. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 4*(4), 1-16.

Alaba, R. A., & Owodunni, A. (2017). *Personnel testing and selection in organization*, Triumph Publishers, Lagos.

Anna, S. C. & Fang, W. (2018). *Customer innovation and marketing strategy*: A Review of the Literature and Future Research Directions

Arnold, A. (2013). *The best employee incentives*; Demand Media, Houston Chronicles, Texas.

Atanda, K., & Waheed, H. (2016). Group Cohesion and Nurse Satisfaction: Examination of a Education in Kenya: Focus on Strategies Applied to Cope with School-Based Challenges Inhibiting Effective Implementation of Curriculum. *Journal of Education and Research*; 1(1), 1-10.

Baker, W.E. & Sinkula, J.M. (2005). Environmental marketing strategy and firm performance: Effects on new product performance and market share. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, *33* (4), 461-475.

Barrera-Osorio, H., & Raju, K. (2017). Influence of motivation on lecturer's productivity in public schools in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business Education*, 5(5), 70-82.

Blankstain, R. (2016). *Understanding and improving quality in Tanzania primary schooling*. Doctorate Thesis Dissertation, University of East Anglia, Norwich: England.

Barnett, E., Louw, D., & Badenhorst, G. (2013). Job Satisfaction among Urban Secondary School Lecturers in Namibia. *South African Journal of Education*, 28(7), 135-154.

Besley, E., & Ghatak, P. (2018). Employees rewards and lecturers' academic performance in Shuperi. *International Journal of Business Education*. 3(7), 34-47.

Cheng, M. (2022). *A handbook of human resource management practice*, (9thEd). London: Kogan Page Publishing.

Cheng, M. (2013). *A handbook of human resource management practice*, (10th Ed). London: Kogan Page Publishing.

Duo, I., Udofia, U. I., & Ikipe, U. N. (2012). Financial incentive and lecturer's absenteeism in public Secondary Schools in Cross River State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(2), 305-311.

Dungu, L. (2020*). Accommodation and job performance of primary school lecturers in Rakaidistrict*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

Douglas, E. L (2017). When trying to win, competition and intrinsic motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 7(1), 79-83.

Figlio, H., & Getzler, P. (2012). The impact of incentive on lecturer's job performance. *Academic Journal of Business*, 7(3), 45-58.

George, R., Louw, M., & Badenhost, S. (2018). The impact of reward and recognition programs on employee's motivation and satisfaction in empirical study. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(4), 270-279.

Griffin, R. (2012). *Management*, Boston Houghton Mifflin Co.

Gleizerman, A., & Seifullah, U. (2012). Job conditions and wellness among finnish upper secondary school lecturers in Chicago, Illinois. *Psychology and Health*, 18(4), 441-456.

Glewwe, H. Harold, J., & Haki, E. (2020). Incentive and academic performance among primary school lecturers in Kenyan. *International Journal of Management*, 5(7), 12-22.

Imberman, O., & Lovenheim, E. (2015). Monetary incentive and employees job performance. A Paper Presented at the Seminar Of Norwegian Post-Primary Education Programme for Africa 13-14.

Hijazi, S., Anwar, A., & Mehbood, S. (2017). Impact of non-financial rewards on employee motivation. *The Business Review*, 7 (2), 272-277.

Idenedo, O. W., & Ebenuwa, A., Sunny, Igwe, S. R. (2020). Customer involvement practice and competitive advantage of apparel designers in Port Harcourt. *Journal of Contemporary Marketing*, *5*(1), 11-25.

Idenedo, W.O. & Ebenuwa, A. (2022). Work-life-balance of contact employee and customer loyalty of healthcare firms in South-South, Nigeria. *International Academic Journal of Management and Marketing*, *7*(1), 19-40.

Idenedo, W. O., Ebenuwa, A. & Ehimen, S. (2023). Value co-creation adoption and customer loyalty of apparel designers in Nigeria; the moderating role of social media network. *Indian International Journal of Research in Accounting, Marketing and Management Delhi University – North Campus*, *8*(1), 117-129.

Jacob, P., & Levitt, N. (2013). The prevalence and predictors of lecturer cheating under incentives schemes in Chicago public schools. *Educational Journal*, 112(2), 206-216.

Jacob, N. M., & Lefgren, A. (2016). *Social Origins and Academic Performance at University Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Kennedy, N. G. (2016). Motivational strategies and lecturers' productivity: lessons of experience from public secondary schools in Kisii County, Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education,* 6(4), 33-38.

Luthans, F. (2018). *Organizational behavior,* Boston, McGraw- Hill Irwin.

Mumanyire, M. (2015). *Factors affecting lecturer motivation in secondary schools in Mukono district*. Unpublished (Masters of education) dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

Muralidharan, T., & Sundararaman, S. (2011). Financial incentive and academic performance among government lecturers in India. *International Journal of Education Development*, 20(2), 407-421.

National Commission on Productivity and Work Quality (2015). *Employee incentives to improve state and local government productivity*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Print.

Nurharani, S. Nur, Z. S., & Nur, S. M. K. (2013). The impact of organizational climate on lecturers' job performance. *Educational Research Journal*, 2(1), 71-82.

Obilade, S. O. (2019). *Leadership qualities and styles as they relate to instructional productivity.* The Manager Ibadan: Department of Educational Management, University of Ibadan, 25-32.

Okojie, M. (2019) Social origins and academic performance at university Ekiti. Ekiti: Ekiti University press.

Olaniyan, A. D. (2020). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Greek lecturers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *15*(7), 354-358.

Osinowo, A., & Akanbi, P. (2016). Job satisfaction of secondary school lecturers*. Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 34 (1), 29-46.

Olubusayo, F. H., Stephen, I. A., & Maxwell, M. (2014). Incentives packages and employees' attitudes to work: a study of selected Government Parastatals in Ogun State, South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science IJRBS,* 3(1), 62-74.

Orodho, J .A. (2013).Progress towards attainment of Education for All (EFA) among nomadic pastoralists: Do home-based variables make a difference in Kenya? *Research on Humanities and social sciences,* 3(5), 54-67.

Orodho, A.J, Waweru, P.N, Ndichu, & Thinguri.(2013).Basic education in Kenya: Focus on strategies applied to cope with school-based challenges inhibiting effective implementation of curriculum. *International Journal of Education and Research,* 1(11), 1-10.

Orodho, A.J., Waweru, P.N., & Getange, K. N. (2014). Progress towards attainment of Education For All (EFA) among nomadic pastoralists: How do we dismantle the gender Differential jinx in Mandera County, Kenya*. International Organization of Scientific Research (IOSR) Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IOSR-JHSS),* 19(2), 106-117.

Owoeye, S. (2019). Moving into the third, outer domain of lecturer satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*(4), 379-396.

Palmer, W. (2012). Incentive and disincentive: will they affect performance. *International Journal of Management*, 4(2), 9-21.

Pattanayak, B. (2015). *Human resources management*: Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

Pozo-Munoz, J., Frankel, R., & Warren, N. E. (2000). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Ryan. (2020). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(6), 227-268.

Samuel, T. A., & Joshua, T. K. (2016). The role of financial incentives as a motivator in employee's productivity in Nigeria electricity distribution companies. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 3(1), 1-8.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 5*(6), 171-180.

Winnie, G. N. & Francis, N. K. (2016). Marketing practices, market orientation, and performance of tour firms in Kenya: a mediated approach. *DBA Africa Management Review*, *6*(4), 33-49