Assessing the Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation on Productivity in Private Universities

Iwelumor, O. S.[1,2,3], Odesanmi, A. F.[1,3], Oye, J. A.[1,2], Obuene, H. U.[1,2], Bada, A. B.[4], and Ayodele, J. A.[5]

[1]Department of Sociology, College of Business and Social Sciences, Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria

[2]Landmark University SDG 4 (Quality Education), Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria

[3]Landmark University SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria

[4]Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto, Nigeria

[5]Department of Sociology, College of Business and Social Sciences, Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100601292

Received: 28 June 2026; Accepted: 03 July 2026; Published: 17 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Employee motivation plays a critical role in enhancing staff productivity, organizational competitiveness, and employees' career advancement. This study investigated the influence of motivation on staff productivity in a private university, drawing on Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory as its theoretical framework. A descriptive survey design was adopted to examine the variables relevant to the study objectives. Using a three-stage sampling procedure, respondents were selected from Landmark University. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire, yielding 129 valid responses, and analyzed using linear regression. The findings revealed that intrinsic motivational factors influenced 74.4% of the respondents, while 89.7% reported that extrinsic motivational factors affected their work performance. Regression analysis indicated that intrinsic motivation had a significant positive effect on academic productivity, explaining 13.2% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.132$; $F = 19.278$). Similarly, extrinsic motivation showed a significant relationship with academic productivity, accounting for 17.5% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.175$; $F = 26.941$). The study concludes that implementing sustainable and multidimensional motivational strategies is essential for improving academic productivity in universities. It recommends that university management should regularly assess employee satisfaction and morale to identify workplace challenges and introduce appropriate incentive systems that enhance job satisfaction and overall staff performance.

Keywords: Intrinsic Motivation; Extrinsic Motivation; Staff; Job Satisfaction; Academic Productivity

INTRODUCTION

Motivation has been commonly identified to be key to the success of organizations, especially in tertiary educational institutions where development of intellectual capital is of utmost importance. This not only determines the attitudes and behaviors of faculty and staff but also the quality and quantity of their scholarly products, such as teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and institutional development, in general (Reza and Neogy, 2024; Yener, 2021). The university being a knowledge-based organization highly relies on the long-term motivation of its employees to achieve its mission of making research innovations, teaching quality and development of the society.

Schools are successful in terms of the intellectual input of their students and teachers. This is quantified on the basis of productive capacity. Productivity is a basic parameter on which the world is compared and evaluated in terms of organizational and national performance. It is one of the main sources of economic development and

competitiveness in companies (Aithal and Aithal, 2023; Dornyei and Ushioda, 2021). Though productivity has various definitions, according to the context of this study, academic productivity is quantifiable in terms of research publications, teaching performance, curriculum, community service, and attendance at scholarly conferences. It is the bane of the reputation and development of the university (Yener, 2021).

In an academic setting, employees, either faculty or non-academic staff, constitute some of the core pillars to realizing institutional goals. Their dedication, creativity, and commitment are driven by institutional motivation strategies. It is argued in organizational theory and justified by empirical data that inspired academic staff are more persistent, productive, and creative. These people also tend to be more devoted to the institutional missions, more satisfied, and eventually lead to increased student performance and organizational effectiveness (Al-Alwani, 2025; Wambui, 2022).

Some of the motivators applied at Landmark University to employees are a sense of accomplishment through meaningful work, prompt payment of salaries, career development (free data to browse, payment for journal publications, and conference sponsorship), and a safe and comfortable environment. In the case of other universities in Nigeria, and Landmark University, in particular, however, the role of motivation is challenged by other complex issues such as funding constraints, infrastructural constraints, and augmented needs of world competitiveness. Since the process of transforming higher education in Nigeria into a setting that can deliver internationally competent graduates and research that can transform the world remains, the focus on the motivational dynamics of the faculty and staff members is essential. Thus, a study of the role of motivation in academic productivity is timely and key to the long-term success of academic institutions in the ever-competitive higher education environment.

The objectives of the study are to:

i. Examine the impact of intrinsic motivation on faculty and staff academic productivity in Landmark University.

ii. Determine how extrinsic motivation influences academic productivity in the situation of the Nigerian higher education, namely in Landmark University.

The study analyzed the following hypotheses:

Ho: Intrinsic motivation has no significant effect on academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff.

Ho: Extrinsic motivation has no significant impact on academic productivity within Landmark University.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivation denotes the intricate combination of internal and external stimulators that prompt, undeterred, and persistent goal-oriented action. Motivation in the academic context defines the level, the direction, and the perseverance of the effort put in by both the staff and the faculty to meet the institutional and personal goals (Ahmad, 2021; Dörnyei, & Ushioda, 2021, Egbide et al., 2022). Motivation is, however, not static; it is a dynamic psychological state that may vary depending on situational and personal variables (Yener, 2021).

Scholars have, over the decades, given different definitions and theoretical frameworks in an attempt to explain and understand the motivational process. Some of them are concentrated on the goal-oriented character of motivation (Herzberg, 2015; Lawler, 2001), whereas others are concerned with the cyclical connection between motivation and beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors (Ibrahim et. al., 2023). Motivation is also described as dual, as it may be internally motivated, which involves doing some activity as a result of its intrinsic satisfaction, more than a result of some distinct outcome. It is driven by the feeling of self-interest, pleasure, or difficulty (Dornyei and Ushioda, 2021; Herzberg, 2015). Faculty or staff that is intrinsically motivated may, for instance, engage in research because they are intellectually curious, because they derive satisfaction out of mentoring students, or because they take pleasure in trying out new teaching strategies. Hence, autonomy, mastery, purpose, curiosity,

and enjoyment are the attributes of intrinsic motivation (Ibrahim et. al., 2023; Ahmad, 2021). Conversely, extrinsic motivation is the performance of an activity to obtain disaggregated results, i.e., earning a salary, getting promotions, getting praise or awards, or evading sanctions. Competitive pay, career growth, favorable performance reviews, and publicity of academic contributions are examples of extrinsic motivators in academic institutions (Elfahmi, Chandrarin and Manan, 2021).

Several empirical studies indicate that intrinsic motivation is likely to be more sustainable and linked to higher quality of engagement and output, whilst extrinsic motivation can be efficient in reaching compliance, but also, under the condition of improper use or overuse, it can impair intrinsic motivation (Ibrahim et al., 2023; Ghazi, Shahzada and Khan, 2013). On the same note, academic productivity, being a multifaceted construct, has been traditionally quantified by measures, including the number of publications, number of citations, number of grants, and number of teaching hours provided (Le et al., 2023; Ahmad, 2021). Nonetheless, a growing body of higher education acknowledges the shortcomings of these measures; the concept of productivity is not merely the amount of output but also the quality and innovation, impact, and societal interactions (Wambui, 2022; Balzer, 2020).

Wambui (2022), Wiechetek and Pastuszak (2022), and Balzer (2020) argued that the key metrics of academic performance include: research output, publication in peer-reviewed journals, and conference proceedings. Academic success is measured by research output, pedagogical quality, community participation, and professional service. A fair gauge of scholarly performance takes into consideration the qualitative and quantitative elements of the work that are able to reflect the real measure and value of the work. According to Wambui (2022), the quantity of publications and the quality of the work of an academic are important signs of his or her involvement in the production of knowledge and the achievement of a significant intellectual milestone in the field of his or her work. Balzer (2020) admits that quantity is required, but it is imperative that academic publications prove tangible concepts and extensive approaches and enhance existing academic debates in the field. In this manner, they are making substantial progress in the field. The quantitative research impact indicators are citation and impact measures, such as h-index, citations per article, and the impact factor of a journal.

Such measures show the extent to which other researchers recognize and use the work of another scholar, which is evidence of influence and participation in academic discourse. Nevertheless, Wiechetek and Pastuszak (2022) warn against over-applying citation metrics, noting that it fails to reflect all the diversities that exist in disciplines or settings in publishing. In order to obtain a more comprehensive image of impact, they propose that the above metrics should be accompanied by qualitative observations. The contribution to teaching is also a significant part of the overall academic contribution that describes how the scholar contributes to the creation, sharing, and growth of knowledge. This contribution is marked by not just the student assessment, the recognition and teaching awards, but also the implementation of new learning practices and more inclusive learning practices that encourage student learning. Balzer (2020) believes that the effectiveness of teaching goes beyond the classroom and includes the design of a curriculum, mentorship, and the power to inspire.

Grant and funds also enhance the profile of an academic and show that he/she is competent in acquiring funds to conduct research. According to Wambui (2022), the fact that one won competitive grants is an indicator of his/her academic reputation and originality and a high probability of obtaining a large amount of money to conduct research in the future. Moreover, accountability and good organizational skills (which can only be demonstrated by the ability to finish funded research projects in a satisfactory manner) are indicators of accountability and good organizational skills, which are key towards career and the institution. In recent years, the contribution made by an individual to society has begun to become a significant parameter when assessing performance. This criterion examines the way the individual uses his or her knowledge beyond the university to impact social policy, help communities, and collaborate with the business sector. Wiechetek and Pastuszak (2022) also focus on such a social aspect as academic citizenship, active involvement of scholars in the process of problem-solving and social betterment.

Other professional recognitions may include serving as an editor, being a leader, reviewing articles, and mentoring young scholars, among others. Balzer (2020) calls this process academic stewardship and argues that

it is the duty of scholars to be ethical, foster collaboration, and support other scholars. These operations contribute to the integrity and sustainability of fields.

The six components mentioned above, such as research output, citation and impact metrics, teaching effectiveness, grants and funding, societal impact, and professional contributions, offer an in-depth system of assessing one's scholarship. They involve development, sharing, and use of knowledge and give a balanced approach to the accomplishment of scholarship, which is in line with the modern needs of higher education institutions.

Standardized Academic Performance Indicators (API) are used to assess the contribution of teaching, research, and professional development in Nigeria. More recent approaches stress the importance of an inclusive approach to evaluation, which integrates both qualitative and quantitative evaluation, to capture the numerous dimensions of academic excellence, inclusive of teaching and service work, and to investigate output (Odunukwe, Dioha & Prince Okoli, 2025; Elomien, et al., 2021; Ruth, 2019). As the nature of productivity measures evolves, the motivation construct's effect on these multidimensional results needs an analytical perspective that focuses on the analysis of results other than deliverable quantification.

There is a healthy and well-established correlation between motivation and productivity, both at the organizational and educational levels. There are many studies conducted both in the business arena and academically that high motivation is positively associated with performance, innovation, and quality of work (Odunukwe, Dioha & Prince Okoli, 2025; Wiechetek & Pastuszak, 2022).

The role of motivation, especially intrinsic motivation, on the productivity of the faculty and staff in an academic setting is even stronger because of the levels of autonomy, creativity, and prolonged effort needed in teaching, research, and service (Le et al., 2023; Dornyei and Ushioda, 2021).

In the case of academic personnel, intrinsic motivation, including intellectual inquisitiveness, sovereignty, and pursuit of knowledge, have been associated with increased persistence, increased involvement in research, readiness to embrace new methods of academics, and perseverance under pressure. This, in its turn, contributes to the culture of innovation and academic excellence in the institution (Theng, 2023; Yener, 2021). On the other hand, extrinsic motivators, though useful in achieving short-term goals, might not be effective in maintaining desired behaviors and productivity without being created to complement intrinsic motivators and fulfill the basic psychological needs (Yener, 2021). At the staff level, intrinsic motivation (pride in serving the operations of the institution) or extrinsic motivation (salary, job security, organizational recognition) is one of the determinants of job satisfaction, performance, and organizational devotion. Non-academic employees play an indirect role in academic success, and their motivation promotes the holistic environment that fosters productivity throughout the board (Masinde and Coetzee, 2023; Slama and Choukir, 2019).

Faculty and staff in learning institutions where autonomy, competence, and relatedness are encouraged by intrinsic motivation and academic achievement are more likely to strive for higher goals, become more creative, and withstand the stress of institutional or systemic transition. It is important to note that intrinsic motivation leads to deep learning and meaningful knowledge transfer, which are primary principles of academic productivity (Masinde & Coetzee, 2023; Rietveld, Hiemstra, Brouwer and Waalkens, 2021).

On the same note, extrinsic motivation, which is represented by external rewards and recognition, is an important factor in cases where the interest in the first place can be low or where routine work is common. Academic institutions often use salary increases, incentives based on performance, and promotion opportunities to strengthen desirable behavior and motivate performance (Yener, 2021). Studies in Nigerian tertiary institutions have indicated that salary payment on time, good working conditions and career development are some of the primary motivating elements among faculty and staff, and they directly translate to improved productivity and loyalty to the institutions (Masinde and Coetzee, 2023; Rietveld et al., 2021).

However, there is also literature that claims that reliance on extrinsic motivators is not good. Over justification can, in the long run, decrease interest and poorer engagement and performance. The motivation-oriented strategies in complex academic spaces need to be balanced. Deprived intrinsic motivation can be assisted with

extrinsic drives and scaffolding, but excessive use can overturn the beneficial outcomes (Akerele, 2023; Ibrahim et al., 2023).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (Motivation-Hygiene Theory)

This study used Herzberg's Two Factor Theory, which was first developed in 1959 (Herzberg, 2015). This theoretical framework emphasizes two major persuasive dimensions, motivators and hygiene factors, in relation to job gratification. This theory helps understand and explain the cause of employee motivation and job satisfaction by differentiating the components of a job into two distinct categories: motivators and hygiene factors. As stated in the theory, each of the components can operate independently. Motivation can lead to better satisfaction, increased motivation, and enthusiasm towards the job.

Though hygiene factors can prevent dissatisfaction, they do not, however, generate motivation. Motivators are internal and are the driving forces that provide an employee with a sense of purpose and fulfillment in their job. Psychological factors associated with motivators include the job's intrinsic nature, and these were majorly identified by Herzberg as achievement, recognition, responsibility, development, and the work itself. Achievement as a factor relates to the success workers feel when they can complete a task that is not only meaningful but also challenging. This accomplishment leads to an increase in self-confidence and motivates the employee to continue striving. Recognition is the acknowledgment and positive feedback from supervisors, peers, or the organization regarding one's contributions to his/her work that reinforces an employee's sense of value. Acknowledging an employee as a valued member of the organization. Autonomy and control over work is clearly a matter of responsibility.

In a nutshell, the theory emphasizes that fulfilment and motivation of a job cannot be achieved merely through external factors such as salary or company policy, but also through the achievement of higher-level psychological needs associated with the job itself. Focusing on motivators, companies are able to develop a self-motivated and satisfied workforce, which leads to increased performance and eventual success. They have a direct relation with job satisfaction and high productivity. These are job-specific motivators that are long-term. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily make them dissatisfied (Ibrahim et al., 2023; Alshmemri, Shahwan-Akl and Maude, 2017; Herzberg, 2015). Unlike motivators, hygiene factors are those that relate to the extrinsic nature of the work environment of an employee. The elements are not always stimulating, but may cause dissatisfaction when they are not present or insufficient. Herzberg came up with some crucial hygiene factors that define the overall working experience and the sense of fairness among employees in the organization.

When supervised by efficient, just, and respectful managers, employees will feel more satisfied. Leadership is also essential in ensuring that things run smoothly; it also builds trust and open communication among the teams. Interpersonal relations involve relations among colleagues, between the bosses and the subordinates, and the upper and the lower ranks of the organization. Healthy relationships can be maintained through positive relationships and contribute to the creation of a healthy organization. Poor relationships may cause conflict and hurt the general job satisfaction. Irrespective of this, hygiene factors may not be the direct source of motivation, but still the minimum to enable one to be stable and satisfied with work.

By making sure that the mentioned factors are taken care of, the organization will be able to avoid dissatisfaction and provide an environment in which motivational drivers will be able to perform their work. These are not part of the job, but useful in averting discontentment; they do not necessarily play a role in long-term motivation or fulfilment. According to the theory, the presence of intrinsic motivators is what becomes central in terms of employee engagement and performance (Ibrahim et al., 2023; Alshmemri, Shahwan-Akl and Maude, 2017; Herzberg, 2015).

These factors play an especially important role in the academic field, where both extrinsic (institutional support, professional growth) and intrinsic (autonomy, intellectual stimulation) aspects have to be balanced to keep faculty and staff engaged. An illustration of this is that in academic institutions, the intrinsic motivators are in line with the identity and professional calling of the faculty and staff. The sources of such satisfactions are the

publication of research, mentoring of students, or the creation of innovative curricula. In the meantime, extrinsic hygiene factors are required to sustain morale and avoid disengagement; chronic insufficiency of pay, infrastructure, or institutional support may soon undermine job satisfaction and academic productivity. Faculty and staff at Landmark University can be unhappy with their jobs because of ineffective working conditions or vague policies (hygiene factors). Nonetheless, in order to increase productivity, the university needs to improve such motivators as recognition, autonomy, and growth opportunities.

This theory is an advantage over the others in that it promotes a more strategic view of employee motivation as opposed to the one-size-fits-all solutions. The theory however, has limitations in the sense that it assumes that all employees react to the motivators and hygiene factors in a similar manner, which may not be true in other cultures, personalities, or even in the nature of work.

Research Methodology

A descriptive survey was employed as the study design. The research was conducted in Landmark University (LMU), Omu-Aran, Kwara State, in the north-central geopolitical area of Nigeria. The population of the study was the total number of faculty (academic staff) and staff (non-teaching staff). The questionnaire was used as the instrument of data collection. Sample size was determined using Slovin's sample size formula (Tejada & Punzalan, 2012). The estimated number of faculty and staff is 620. However, a representative sample size of 138 respondents was chosen. However, out of the 138 distributed questionnaires, 133 were returned, and 129 were valid. This amounted to 93.5%. Data were analyzed and interpreted based on the 129 valid questionnaires.

Landmark University was purposefully selected for this study. A stratified sampling method was utilized to pick respondents who represented the faculty from the College of Business and Social Sciences, College of Agriculture, College of Pure and Applied Sciences, and College of Engineering. Staff were picked from Finance, Registry, College Offices, Directorate of Academic Planning, Health Centre, Departmental Offices, Directorate of Physical Planning and Development, Security Unit, Corporate Affairs, and Directorate of Student Affairs. Random sampling was then used for the questionnaire. Descriptive analysis was used to ascertain the variables' proportions and frequencies. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to examine the data, and the sample was used to do linear regression in order to make inferences about the population.

RESULTS

Frequency Distribution of Respondents Based on Socio-economic Demographic Characteristics

Analysis reveals that males, who account for about 71.3% of the respondents, had the highest proportion. This is a result of the dominance of the male population among Landmark University faculty and staff. In this research, the age groups 31-40 and 41-50 have the greatest number of respondents, with 34.1% and 45.7%, respectively. The results showed that the majority (79.1%) of respondents in this research are married, overshadowing the single respondents with 20.9% of the total sample size. Similarly, 12.4% of the respondents had HND/BSc as their highest academic qualification, and 87.6% have MSc/Ph.D. as their highest academic qualification. More than half of the respondents in this study are junior staff, with 53.5% of the total sample size. The senior staff also with 36.4% of the total sample size. 47.3% of the respondents were within the monthly income range of N151, 000-N200, 000 which is the highest. This can result from the majority of the respondents being junior staff. The second highest monthly income range is N201,000-N250,000 with a percentage of 29.5%, followed by N101,000-N150,000 and N251,000 and above with 14.7% and 8.5% respectively.

Table 5.1 Distribution of Respondents by Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Independent Variables	**F(n)**	**%**
Sex		
Male	92	71.3
Female	37	28.7

Age		
Below 30 years	8	6.2
31-40 years	44	34.1
41-50 years	59	45.7
Above 50 years	18	14.0
Marital Status		
Single	27	20.9
Married	113	79.1
Educational Status		
HND/BSC	16	12.4
MSc/PhD	102	87.6
Job Status		
Senior Staff	47	36.4
Junior Staff	69	53.5
Contract Staff	13	10.1
Monthly Income		
N101,000-N150,000	19	14.7
N151,000-N200,000	61	47.3
N201,000-N250,000	38	29.5
N251,000 and above	11	8.5
Total	**129**	**100**

Source: Researcher's fieldwork (2024)

Descriptive Analysis of Intrinsic Motivation

Table 5.2 shows the respondents' perception of their intrinsic motivation in the University. The overall results showed that the respondents' perception of the intrinsic motivational factors was favourable. A majority of the respondents (89.1%) agreed that they were satisfied with their present working conditions, while only 1.6% disagreed. Likewise, 90.7% said they felt safe at work, indicating that the University offers a safe working environment. In addition, 79.8% reported high levels of job satisfaction and an overwhelming 99.2% reported that they enjoy their profession when working at the University. Similarly, 89.2% said that the difficult environment at the University has motivated them to stay in the profession. The findings also showed that 63.5% felt that they were recognized and respected in the community when working at the University while 24.8% were not sure. In addition, 65.2% reported that the responsibilities associated with their positions provide them with a sense of responsibility and influence.

Certain institutional welfare were not satisfactory to the respondents. Specifically, 88.4% of the respondents disagreed that the University offers adequate leave and holiday benefits, which means that there is a need to improve the administration of leave. Attitudes towards the University's commitment to employees' health and safety were split, with 55.8% saying that the University has adequate measures in place, 27.9% undecided and 16.3% saying that it does not. As for work pressure, 76.7% of the employees acknowledged that work pressure causes stress, which means that, even though they feel satisfied with their work, they feel that they have a lot of work pressure. 74.4% of the respondents rated the overall contribution of intrinsic motivational factors to their morale as great and 25.6% rated it as small. Overall, the results indicate that the intrinsic motivational

factors (job satisfaction, professional fulfillment, workplace safety, meaningful work) are important aspects of motivation, despite concerns about leave and workload.

Table 5.2 Intrinsic Motivation

Questions	Opinions	Frequency	Percentage
1. I am okay with my present working conditions	Strongly Agree	79	61.2
	Agree	36	27.9
	Undecided	12	9.3
	Disagree	2	1.6
	Total	129	100.0
2. Work pressure puts stress on me	Strongly Agree	47	36.4
	Agree	52	40.3
	Undecided	18	14.0
	Disagree	12	9.3
	Total	129	100.0
3. I feel safe at work	Strongly Agree	76	58.9
	Agree	41	31.8
	Undecided	9	7.0
	Disagree	3	2.3
	Total	129	100.0
4. The Univeristy provides me with adequate leave and holiday	Strongly Agree	8	6.2
	Agree	4	3.1
	Undecided	3	2.3
	Disagree	74	57.4
	Strongly Disagree	40	31.0
	Total	129	100.0
5. My institution does a lot as regards the health and safety of it's employees	Strongly Agree	33	25.6
	Agree	39	30.2
	Undecided	36	27.9
	Disagree	16	12.4
	Strongly Disagree	5	3.9
	Total	129	100.0
6. Working in Landmark University gives me a great deal of job satisfaction	Strongly Agree	44	34.1
	Agree	59	45.7
	Undecided	5	3.9
	Disagree	13	10.1
	Strongly Disagree	8	6.2
	Total	129	100.0
7. I enjoy my profession	Strongly Agree	74	57.4
	Agree	54	41.9
	Undecided	1	.8
	Total	129	100.0
8. The challenging nature of the school has kept me in the profession	Strongly Agree	65	50.4
	Agree	50	38.8
	Undecided	8	6.2
	Disagree	5	3.9
	Strongly Disagree	1	.8
	Total	129	100.0

9. Working in Landmark University gives me recognition and respect from the community	Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree	59 23 32 13 2	45.7 17.8 24.8 10.1 1.6
	Total	129	100.0
10. The responsibilities I perform in Landmark University gives a sense of control over others	Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree	50 34 22 15 8	38.8 26.4 17.1 11.6 6.2
	Total	129	100.0
11. To what extent have the intrinsic motivators increase your morale to perform?	To a big extent To a small extent	96 33	74.4 25.6
	Total	129	100.0

Source: Researcher's fieldwork (2024)

Descriptive Analysis of Extrinsic Motivation

The result on extrinsic motivation shows a more diverse range of employees' attitudes toward external rewards and institutional support. In terms of income, 44.9% agreed that their income was enough to support their basic needs, 36.4% were undecided and 18.6% disagreed. This indicates that the level of satisfaction with salary was less than that of other extrinsic motivators. On the other hand, respondents had positive perceptions about some institutional benefits. Around 79.1% agreed that the University offers housing facilities, and 86.0% agreed that payments of salary are timely and prompt. Likewise, 66.7% stated that the University management assists employees financially in their financial challenges.

The results also highlighted lack of institutional support that respondents felt was lacking. Interestingly, 62.8% said that the University does not offer discounts on medical services and 77.6% said that the University does not hold social events for faculty members and their families. These findings suggest that employees feel there are areas of their welfare programmes that are lacking, other than salary and housing. The overall recognition for good performance was relatively positive with 72.9% agreeing that outstanding faculty members are being praised and recognised by management. However, these favourable attitudes did not seem to have a significant impact on respondents' morale, as extrinsic motivational factors were found to have little effect on this. The majority (89.7%) reported that extrinsic motivation has affected their morale only slightly, while 10.3% reported that it has affected their morale to a great extent.

Table 5.3 Extrinsic Motivation

Questions	Opinions	Frequency	Percentage
1. I am paid a salary that is enough to cater for my basic needs	Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree	19 39 47 12 12	14.7 30.2 36.4 9.3 9.3
	Total	129	100.0

2. The University management provides housing facilities	Strongly Agree	56	43.4
	Agree	46	35.7
	Undecided	16	12.4
	Disagree	8	6.2
	Strongly Disagree	3	2.3
	Total	129	100.0
3. Salary payment is prompt and on time	Strongly Agree	63	48.8
	Agree	48	37.2
	Undecided	16	12.4
	Disagree	2	1.6
	Total	129	100.0
4. The University management provides discounts for health care services	Strongly Agree	2	1.5
	Agree	8	6.3
	Undecided	38	29.4
	Disagree	53	41.1
	Strongly Disagree	28	21.7
	Total	129	100.0
5. It is possible to get advancement from the University management in case i have a financial problem	Strongly Agree	34	26.4
	Agree	52	40.3
	Undecided	33	25.6
	Disagree	6	4.7
	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1
	Total	129	100.0
6. The University Management organizes social events for faculties and their families	Strongly Agree	12	9.3
	Agree	14	10.9
	Undecided	3	2.3
	Disagree	66	51.2
	Strongly Disagree	34	26.4
	Total	129	100.0
7. Any faculty who performs is praised and recognized by the University management	Total	129	100.0
	Strongly Agree	40	31.0
	Agree	54	41.9
	Undecided	25	19.4
	Disagree	6	4.7
	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1
	Total	129	100.0
8. To what extent have the extrinsic motivators increase your morale to	To a big extent	13	10.3

perform?	To a small extent	116	89.7
	Total	129	100.0

Source: Researcher's fieldwork (2024)

5.4 Descriptive Analysis of Academic Productivity

Table 5.4 shows an exceptionally high perception across all dimensions assessed. All the respondents indicated excellent (100%) in terms of the quality of teaching, lecture notes/ modules, academic linkages and chapel attendance. The results show a workforce that is confident in their teaching effectiveness, research quality, professional engagement and commitment to institutional goals. One could argue that this may be due to the University's drive for academic excellence, quality assurance and uphold of professional standards. It is also important to note that these measures are self-reported. Nonetheless, these provide strong bases for examining the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on academic productivity.

Table 5.4 Assessment of Productivity

Questions	Options	No of respondents	Percentage
1. How would you rate the quality of your teaching?	Excellent	129	100.0
2. How would you rate the quality of your lecture notes/modules?	Excellent	129	100.0
3. How would you rate your knowledge in the use of modern teaching aids and promptness in the upload of lecture notes?	Excellent Good	112 17	86.8 13.2
	Total	129	100.0
4. How would you rate the quality of your publication?	Excellent Good	122 7	94.6 5.4
	Total	129	100.0
5. How would you rate your academic linkages?	Excellent	129	100.0
6. How would you rate your chapel attendance	Excellent	129	100.0
7. How would you rate your commitment to the University's core values?	Excellent Good	126 3	97.7 2.3
	Total	129	100.0

Source: Field survey, 2024

Testing of Hypotheses

Two hypotheses were generated during this study and were tested using inferential statistics (Linear regression analysis).

Hypothesis One:

H0: Intrinsic motivation has no significant effect on academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff.

H1: Intrinsic motivation has a significant effect on academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff.

Table 5.5: Model Summary on the Intrinsic Motivation Effect on Academic Productivity

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.363	.132	.125	0.368

Predictors: (Constant), How intrinsic motivators influence your productivity

Source: Researcher's fieldwork and SPSS (2024)

The summary of the model showed that there was a positive correlation between intrinsic motivation and academic productivity, with the correlation coefficient (R = .363). The coefficient of determination (R^2 = .132) shows that 13.2% of the variation in academic productivity could be explained by the model of intrinsic motivation, and the remaining 86.8% by other factors not included in this model.

Table 5.6 ANOVA: Effect of Intrinsic Motivation on Academic Productivity

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.612	1	2.612	19.278	< .005
	Residual	17.207	127	0.135		
	Total	19.819	128			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Productivity

b. Predictors: (Constant), Intrinsic Motivation

Source: Researcher's fieldwork, and SPSS (2024)

The ANOVA results as presented in Table 5.6. indicated that the regression model was statistically significant, $F(1,127) = 19.278$, $p < .005$, which suggests that intrinsic motivation has a significant influence on academic productivity.

Table 5.7 Coefficients of Intrinsic Motivation Effect on Academic Productivity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.014	.067		15.199	.000
	Intrinsic Motivation	.143	.033	.363	4.391	.000

Dependent Variable: Academic Productivity

Source: Researcher's fieldwork and SPSS (2024)

The regression coefficient also indicates that intrinsic motivation was positively and significantly related to academic productivity ($\beta = .363$, $B = .143$, $t = 4.391$, $p < .005$). That is, for every one-unit increase in intrinsic motivation, academic productivity increased by 0.143 unit. Thus, the null hypothesis that intrinsic motivation does not significantly affect academic productivity is rejected. These findings demonstrate that intrinsic motivation has a significant effect on academic productivity among faculty and staff of Landmark University.

Hypothesis Two:

H0: Extrinsic motivation has no significant impact on academic productivity within Landmark University.

H1: Extrinsic motivation has a significant impact on academic productivity within Landmark University.

Table 5.8: Model Summary on the Extrinsic Motivation Impact on Academic Productivity

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.418a	.175	.169	.14912

Predictors: (Constant), Extrinsic motivation

Source: Researcher's fieldwork and SPSS (2024)

The model summary showed that there is a positive relationship between extrinsic motivation and academic productivity ($R = .418$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .175$) indicated that the variance in academic productivity accounted for by the regression model was 17.5%, with the remaining variance accounted for by other variables not included in the regression model.

Table 5.9 ANOVA of Extrinsic Motivation Impact on Academic Productivity

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.599	1	.599	26.941	.000b
	Residual	2.824	127	.022		
	Total	3.423	128			

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Productivity

Predictors: (Constant), Extrinsic motivation

Source: Researcher's fieldwork and SPSS (2024)

The ANOVA results showed that the regression model was statistically significant, $F(1,127) = 26.941$, $p < .005$, which means that the regression model is statistically significant and that extrinsic motivation significantly predicts academic productivity.

Table 5.10 Coefficients of Extrinsic Motivation Impact on Academic Productivity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.986	.062		15.919	.000
	Extrinsic Motivation	.138	.027	.418	5.190	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Academic Productivity
Source: Researcher's fieldwork and SPSS (2024)

The regression coefficient indicates that there was a positive and statistically significant relationship between extrinsic motivation and academic productivity ($\beta = .418$, $B = .138$, $t = 5.190$, $p < .005$). That is, an estimated 0.138-unit increase in academic productivity would follow a one-unit change in extrinsic motivation. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected that there is no significant difference between the effect of extrinsic motivation on academic productivity.

These results show that extrinsic motivation impacts academic and staff productivity.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction are influenced by two different sets of factors: motivators (such as achievement, recognition, and personal growth) and hygiene factors (such as salary, company policies, and working conditions). These factors influence academic commitments and performance (productivity) at Landmark University. Recent studies have explored motivation for learning through the lens of Herzberg's two-factor theory, highlighting its relevance in educational contexts. Ibrahim et al. (2023) delved into the motivations for learning, providing insights that align with the theoretical framework. Similarly, Alshmemri, Shahwan-Akl, and Maude (2017) reinforced these findings in their research, emphasizing the effectiveness of Herzberg's model in understanding motivational factors. Additionally, Ghazi, Shahzada, and Khan (2013) contributed to this discourse by demonstrating the implications of the two-factor theory specifically for university educators, thereby reviving its significance in contemporary educational discussions. These studies asserted that what truly drives job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is embedded in Motivation-Hygiene Theory, and that the theory is a groundbreaking shift from earlier models of motivation. These findings can therefore guide universities leadership in their efforts to address motivation among academic and staff at Landmark University, and other institutions of higher learning.

Quantitatively, the study found that 71.3% of respondents were male. Similarly, respondents between the ages of 41-50 had the greatest number of 45.7%. Findings also showed that 12.4% of the respondents had HND/BSc degrees, while those with MSc/MA/PhD academic qualifications were 87.6%. In the same vein, 47.3% were within the monthly income range of N151,000 - N200,000. However, it must be noted that this study was conducted before the adoption of the present new minimum wage.

The findings from hypothesis one revealed that following a p-value of 0.000, which is less than the 0.05 threshold, and an F-value of 19.278, the Linear regression model shows that the value of R indicates the strength of the relationship between the variables. With an R value of 0.363, the analysis demonstrates a positive correlation between intrinsic motivation and academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant effect of intrinsic motivation on academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff, is rejected. This finding aligns with the research of Ghazi, Shahzada & Khan (2013) in their study on "An implication of Herzberg's two-factor theory to the university teachers". Similarly, it aligns with the works of Akerele (2023) on the link between motivation and organizational performance and Al-Alwani, (2025) findings on identifying key challenges in academic institutions.

The results from hypothesis two further demonstrated that, with a p-value of 0.000, well below the 0.05 significance threshold and an F-value of 26.941, the linear regression model confirms that the R-value reflects a strong relationship between the variables. With an R value of 0.418, the analysis demonstrates a strong and positive correlation between extrinsic motivation and academic productivity at Landmark University, with $B = 0.138$ ($t = 5.190$, $p < 0.05$.) Therefore, the null hypothesis, which states that there is no significant impact of extrinsic motivation on academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff, is rejected, and the alternative, which says there is a significant impact of extrinsic motivation on academic productivity among Landmark University faculty and staff, is accepted. This finding aligns with the research of Odunukwe, Dioha & Prince Okoli (2025) on self-motivation and performance of academic staff in federal universities in the South East, Nigeria. Similarly, it corresponds to Reza & Neogy (2024) on total rewards as a driver of employee performance, and Yener (2021) exploring the drivers of research productivity among academics.

CONCLUSION

This study explored the relationship between motivation and academic productivity at Landmark University, guided by Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. It affirmed that motivation is a critical catalyst for organizational success. Within the university context, fostering a supportive atmosphere that integrates both intrinsic rewards and extrinsic incentives plays a pivotal role in enhancing academic output and driving institutional progress. In the case of Nigerian universities—particularly Landmark University—the importance of motivation is heightened by complex challenges such as limited funding, infrastructural deficits, and the pressure to meet global standards. The study concludes that adopting sustained and multifaceted motivational strategies is essential for improving academic productivity at Landmark University and offers a replicable model for other higher education institutions."

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, these recommendations are made:

Universities, especially private institutions, should combine financial incentives with non-monetary recognitions—awards ceremonies, sabbaticals, and public acknowledgements—to sustain long-term engagement.

Tertiary institutions should periodically assess faculty and staff morale and satisfaction to identify emerging challenges and calibrate incentive schemes.

Universities should pilot programs integrating gamification elements into academic and staff workloads to assess effects on productivity and well-being.

Policy makers should introduce policy briefs aimed at national education bodies, advocating for funding models that prioritize faculty and staff motivation as a driver of institutional excellence.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, S. (2021). Motivation and performance: A psychological process. International Journal of Business and Management Research, 9(2), 104-112.
2. Aithal, P. S., & Aithal, S. (2023). How to increase emotional infrastructure of higher education institutions. International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences (IJMTS), 8(3), 356-394.
3. Akerele, O. O. (2023). The link between motivation and organizational performance: An exploration of factors influencing employee motivation and its impact on organizational success. EuroMid Journal of Business and Tech-Innovation, 26-36.
4. Al-Alwani, M. (2025). Identifying Key Challenges in Academic Institutions: Obstacles Impacting Performance and the Role of Universities in Solutions. HumanArts, 1(1).
5. Alshmemri, M., Shahwan-Akl, L., & Maude, P. (2017). Herzberg's two-factor theory. Life Science Journal, 14(5), 12-16.
6. Balzer, W. K. (2020). Lean higher education: Increasing the value and performance of university processes. Productivity Press.
7. Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2021). Teaching and researching motivation. Routledge.
8. Elfahmi, S., Chandrarin, G., & Manan, A. (2021). The influence of external environment, internal environment, and motivation on competitiveness through the product innovation of Lasem Batik Tulis SMEs in Indonesia. International Journal of Business Innovation and Research, 24(4), 514-534.
9. Ghazi, S. R., Shahzada, G., & Khan, M. S. (2013). Resurrecting Herzberg's two factor theory: An implication to the university teachers. Journal of Educational and Social Research, 3(2), 445.
10. Herzberg, F. (2015). Motivation-hygiene theory. Organizational behavior.
11. Ibrahim, I. W., Ghazali, I. M., Syed, S. A., Abdullah, N. H. R., Hamid, M. H. A., & Aisyah, S. H. (2023). Exploring motivation for learning using Hertzberg's two factor theory. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 13(3), 1065-1083.
12. Le, T. T., Phuong, H. Y., Pham, T. T., Nguyen, A. T., Huynh, T. A. T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2023). The integral roles of supporting staff in bolstering academic performance: A qualitative study in Vietnamese higher education institutions. Cogent Arts & Humanities, 10(1), 2264008.
13. Lohela-Karlsson, M., Jensen, I., & Björklund, C. (2022). Do attitudes towards work or work motivation affect productivity loss among academic employees?. International journal of environmental research and public health, 19(2), 934.
14. Lawler, E. J. (2001). An affect theory of social exchange. American journal of sociology, 107(2), 321-352.
15. Masinde, M., & Coetzee, J. (2023). Modelling research productivity of university researchers using research incentives to crowd-in motivation. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 72(5), 1509-1530.
16. Nwakamma, M. N., Ndinechi, M. C., & Agubor, C. K. (2024). Examining the Integration of a GPS-based Staff Performance Monitoring and Assessment System within Academic Settings.
17. Nwachukwu, G. O. (2024). Human capital development: A driver for educational improvement in Nigeria. British journal of education, 12(6), 30-39.
18. Odunukwe, I., Dioha, I., & Prince Okoli, P. (2025). Self-Motivation and Performance of Academic Staff of Federal Universities in South East, Nigeria. American Journal of Economics and Business Management, 8(3), 1126-1149.
19. Reza, M. M. H., & Neogy, T. K. (2024). Total Rewards as a Driver of Employee Performance: An HRM-Based Analytical Literature Review. Journal of Fareast International University, 7(1), 27-36.
20. Rietveld, J. R., Hiemstra, D., Brouwer, A. E., & Waalkens, J. (2021). Motivation and productivity of employees in higher education during the first lockdown. Administrative Sciences, 12(1), 1.
21. Slama, R. B., & Choukir, J. (2019). Faculty members' productivity and research funding: Intrinsic and/or extrinsic motivations. Advanced and applied sciences, 6(4), 130-142.
22. Tejada, J. J., & Punzalan, J. R. B. (2012). On the misuse of Slovin's formula. The philippine

statistician, 61(1), 129-136.
23. Theng, B. P. (2023). The Impact of Employee Motivation on Productivity. International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS), 5(1), 209-221.
24. Wambui, N. M. (2022). Employee Engagement and Performance of Non-Academic Staff in Selected Public Universities in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, Kenyatta University).
25. Wiechetek, Ł., & Pastuszak, Z. (2022). Academic social networks metrics: an effective indicator for university performance? Scientometrics, 127(3), 1381-1401.
26. Yener, C. (2021). Exploring the Drivers of Research Productivity: A Study of Motivation and Hygiene Factors Among Academics. Journal of Policy Options, 4(2), 30-36.