

ASSESSMENT OF ORGANISATIONS INCENTIVES IN ENHANCING EMPLOYEES' PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA: A STUDY OF OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE, OSUN STATE.

MICHAEL. A BALOGUN*

Department of Sociology & Anthropology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria.

OSAGIE JOSEPH EGHAREVBA

Department of Social Work, Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.
joseph.egharevba@uniben.edu
+234 803 234 3678

ABSTRACT

The paper assessed the impact of incentives in enhancing employee's performance in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. It examined the type of incentives (monetary and non-monetary) adopted in the institution; assessed the quality/quantity of incentives given to staff; determine employees' involvement in designing the incentives. In all, five hundred (500) sample respondents were drawn from both academic and non-academic staff of the University. Data were gathered and analyzed through simple percentage. The findings revealed that the quality/quantity of incentives given to the staff, the type of incentives, and the employees' involvement in designing the incentives, all have significant impact on employee's performance and motivate them to put in their best towards the achievement of University goals. Based on these findings, the paper recommended that the Management of Obafemi Awolowo University should continue to improve on employee's incentives regarding their benefits; the employees should continue to be part of incentive package development. It also recommended that incentives should be given according to the level of employee's performance to encourage competition/performance amongst employees

Keywords: Employees, organization, University, incentives, performance

ABSTRAIT

Le document a évalué l'impact des incitations sur l'amélioration des performances des employés de l'Université Obafemi Awolowo, Ile-Ife, Nigéria. Il a examiné le type d'incitations (monétaires et non monétaires) adoptées dans l'institution; évalué la qualité / quantité des incitations accordées au personnel; déterminer la participation des employés à la conception des incitations. Au total, cinq cent (500) répondants de l'échantillon provenaient du personnel universitaire et non universitaire de l'Université. Les données ont été recueillies et analysées par un pourcentage simple.

*Address of Corresponding Author: Michael. A BALOGUN, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria. E-Mail: snazzy700uk@yahoo.com, Phone: +234 8062406830

Les resultants ont révélé que la qualité / quantité des incitations accordées au personnel, le type d'incitations et l'implication des employés dans la conception des incitations, ont tous un impact significatif sur les performances des employés et les motivent à faire de leur mieux pour la réussite de l'Université. Sur la base de ces résultats, le document recommandait que la direction de l'Université Obafemi Awolowo continue d'améliorer les incitations offertes aux employés concernant leurs avantages sociaux; les employés devraient continuer à participer au développement de packages incitatifs. Il a également recommandé que des incitations soient accordées en fonction du niveau de performance des employés pour encourager la concurrence / la performance entre les employés.

Mots-clés: Employés, Organisation, Université, incitations, Performance

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Incentive refers to inducement given to the employees in both public and private organizations in order to motivate, encourage and maintain a desired behaviour towards the fulfillment of objectives (Allen & Kilmann, 2001). Incentives are mechanisms aimed at achieving a specific change in behaviour (Hicks & Adams, 2003), something that intends to ignite one and encourage greater effort to act in a given manner. While performance refers to how well an employee fulfils assigned task through effort and skill, incentive pay is a form of compensation given to employees upon attainment of some form of job performance (Armstrong, 2009). Organisations have resorted into the adoption of relevant and appropriate incentives in order to encourage employees to elicit their best skills while increasing their effort (Yap, Bove & Beverland, 2009). Various forms of incentive plans are offered to employees, such as commission and bonus awards. Similarly, Franco et al (2002) identified incentives as a means applied by the employer so as to influence the employees' willingness to exert and maintain effort towards attaining organization goals.

The success and the survival of any organization is determined by the way the workers have been encouraged (Hijazi & Mehboud, 2007). Motivating incentive determine the level of employees' commitment and their attitude to work. Poor incentives packages are seen as major factors affecting employees' commitment and productivity (Dixit & Bhati, 2012). However, for any organization to achieve its objective in any competitive society, employers of labour must have a thorough understanding of what drives the employees to perform effectively and efficiently and reward them accordingly (Mueller, 2011). Employees who are motivated through adequate incentives plans will be proactive and have right attitude to work, thereby promoting organizational goals (Armstrong, 2007). However, in a highly dynamic organization, incentives strategies are deployed by employers of labour to ensure that the best brains are retained in the best interest of the organization (Nelson, 2003).

For any organization to experience effective functioning and quality performance, it must have an in-depth understanding of its employee's needs. Hafiza et al (2011) argued that due to the fact that organizations have to perform optimally and compete effectively, they must maximize on the resources they have, one of which is the human asset and the most important asset any organization can possess. Thus, to achieve the required performance standards from the human resource, employee motivation is necessary, since employees peg their performance to the feeling that their efforts will be rewarded (Armstrong, 2007).

However, many incentives are usually designed by the top management based on their perceptions without consulting the employees, and such incentives may not be able to give needed satisfaction, and may at best be at the detriment of organizational fulfilment and objectives. Based

on such observation, the paper assessed the levels and impact of incentive in organization performance in Obafemi Awolowo University, Île-Ife, Osun State.

THE STUDY AREA

Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, is a first-generation comprehensive public institution established in 1961 as the university of Ife, by the then Western Region government of Nigeria. In August 1975, the federal government of Nigeria took over the university, and in 1987 renamed it Obafemi Awolowo University, after a frontline Nigerian statesman and one of the university's founding fathers. The university is situated on a vast expanse of land totaling 11,861 hectares' in Ile-Ife, Osun state, southwest of Nigeria (www.oauife.edu.ng).

The focus of the Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun is on the development of teaching and research that can be used to provide solutions to problems of national development. It aimed at creating an institution for developing a cadre of high-level manpower, qualified in various fields. The university being a renowned Centre of excellence over the years, is known as the most beautiful campus of learning in south sub-Saharan Africa (www.oauife.edu.ng). In tandem with her vision of establishing institution dedicated for the promotion of learning and culture, has produced among its staff, a Noble Laureate and five National merit award winners and is recognized for inventions of modern technologies capable for alleviating and tackling society challenges.

CONCEPTUAL EXPLANATION

Monetary incentives

Monetary incentive comprised cash (over time, bonus). It involves direct monetary benefits such as illness benefits, health/accident/life insurance, and assurance, clothing benefit, accommodation allowance, travel allowance, and child allowance. Other indirect monetary benefits like subsidized meals subsidized transport, child care subsidy, creche provision (Kepner, 2003) are also regarded as incentives. In these ways, employers of labours are able to retain their best brains and ensure excellence performance at work. According to (Nelson, 2003; Kepner, 2001), incentives can come in many forms: compensation, insurance, profit sharing, retirement plans, employee stock, overtime pay, attendance incentives, competition and contests, output-oriented merit increases, performance bonuses, piecework, safety incentives, suggestion awards, etc. In Pattanayak's (2005) explanation, monetary incentive is used to describe incentive-payment plans which ties incentives directly or indirectly to productivity standard. The role of money as an incentive is recognised as a powerful force in most cultures. It is also argued amongst certain researchers that pay satisfaction is not itself enough, but the perception of the person receiving the pay and the inclusion of pay administration variables (Nelson, 2003).

Non-monetary Incentives

Non-monetary incentives include holiday/vacation, flexible working hours, access to/support for training, education sabbatical, study leave, planned career breaks, occupational health counseling, and recreational facilities (Buchan, 2000). Non-monetary incentives come in form of more enabling authority, award, participating in the management, promotion, holidays, better working environment, written recognition, gifts, formal dinners, informal parties, plaques, etc. (Ellis & Pennington, 2004; Spector, 2003; Chaing&Birtch, 2008).

Non-monetary incentive is viewed as a non-cash award given in recognition of a high level of accomplishments or performance such as customer care or support to colleagues, which is not dependent on achievement of a pre-determined target (Armstrong, 2009). Non-monetary

incentives are regarded as cost effective ways to compensate employees, thereby attracting, motivating and retaining employees. The importance of non-monetary incentives and job satisfaction in improving job performance among employees cannot be underestimated. Non-monetary rewards play a significant role in the perception of the employee regarding the reward climate in the workplace (Lawler, 2003). When organizations pay attention to non-monetary tools such as opportunity of increasing holiday and family benefits, the employee may perceive the organization as a supporting and caring organization.

Techniques and classification of incentives in organization development.

Incentives have been severally classified. Some have classified them depending on their effect on employees, each while some based their classification on the way they are given out. Other researchers have classified incentive, based on the purpose and incentives based on the kind of the incentive itself (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

Firstly, incentives based on the purpose, can be classified into two types: the first one is the positive incentives which is the ways that incentive positively affect people's behaviour through satisfying their needs such as promising the employees of cash bonuses when they reach a stage of highly qualified performance. Such incentives are helpful for both the needs and sake of the employees and that of the institution; it increases the production, improves the quality of products, working according to high standards, coming up with inventories along with high responsibilities, are all positive consequences for the institution, which in return rewards its employees with concrete, moral or social incentives (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

Second, classification of incentives based on purpose is the negative incentives which are the ways of affecting people's behaviours threatening employees or depriving them of some privileges such as truncating part of their salary if they violated any of the work's principles. These are methods used by the administration to reduce negative behaviours and unacceptable manners among employees. This kind of methods includes cautions and warning, preventing the employee of some privileges for a specific time, delaying promotion or even lowering the job position and transfer to other departments. These methods are used according to the degree of violation; such negative incentives are called "deterrent incentives". However, the use of negative incentives is sometimes necessary for increasing efficiency in production especially when dealing with lazy employees (Condly et al, 2003).

Incentives can also be classified into the following:

Payment by Result, which is historically the most widely used incentive scheme. It rewards employees according to the number of items or units they produce or the time they take to produce them. This scheme has been criticized due to its tendency to reward quantity output rather than quality which can lead to reduced quality of the product or service. There is a great need to modify and evaluate the effectiveness of this scheme if it is to retain the impact of productivity (Franco et al, 2002). *Skills-based pay*: is an input-based payment system in which employees receive pay for the skills or competencies which they acquire. This system gives the employees an opportunity to influence their pay by acquiring more skills that lead to pay increases. Skills-based pay encourages multitasking and flexibility, which in turn enables the organization to respond faster and more effectively to the needs of customers (Derek et al, 2009).

Profit sharing is an incentive-based compensation program where employees are rewarded with company shares or a percentage of the company's profit. This scheme is claimed to increase

employee's commitment to his or her company by linking pay to profit, and hence deepening the level of mutual interest. Profit sharing also encourages the thought of everyone being on the same team; the employees have the same goals and are rewarded equivalently. The disadvantage of profit sharing in the employee's point of view is the fact that pay levels may decline if the company do not meet its profit expectations. Another weakness of profit sharing is that the employees cannot see and know the impact of their work performance on the profitability of the company. Due to the fact that the employees receive the profit-sharing money regardless of their own performance, the reward might become more of an entitlement than a motivating factor (Derek et al, 2009).

Performance-related pay: works on the assumption that if an employee is offered monetary bonuses for a job well done, they will perform better. There are two distinct varieties of this scheme, the merit-based system, and the goal-based system. The merit-based system is based on the assessment of an employee's performance against previously set objectives. In the goal-based system the employer and the employee arrange a meeting and agree on a list of objectives which are set to be met during the coming months. In order for performance related pay to work, it should be based on clear and measurable targets that are agreed by both the employer and employee (Derek et al, 2009)

The Role of Incentives in organizational Success

The importance of incentives originates from the need for the employees to be recognized and appreciated for their efforts in the success of organizational goals. Appreciating people for their efforts via incentives is a very significant factor in satisfying their internal desires. The individuals' own skills are not enough to let them work with high productivity until there is an incentive system that encourages their internal motives and then leads very hardworking efforts (Locke & Braver, 2008). Scholars have worked hard to come up with a comprehensive description of how to enhance the professionalism of employees and how employers can choose active employees and connect their objectives with the institutions' goals, which will improve their performance. Thus, successful organizations set an active incentive system to motivate the employees' performance in a way that pushes them into working harder and maintaining the goals of the institution. It is noticed that motivating employees may help overcome lot of obstacles at work (Condly et al, 2003). There are two types of incentives: monetary and non-monetary

In his attempted to investigate the relationship between incentive's methods and organizational performance in four public institutions, Al-Fares (2011) found a strong relation between the incentives and loyalty towards the organization, which affected the performance at work. The study recommended that there should be more attention devoted to developing the incentives given to the employees as to enlist the employees to become activists in the institution.

Thus, Abbas and Hammadi (2009) in their study found low level of participation by the employees in decision making. Thus, the majority of employees complained about lack of concrete incentives, such as bonus and rate. Al-Aydi (2000) investigated the effect of incentives on the level of performance in the textile industry in Iraq. He found a weak relationship between the incentives system and the level of performance and between the wages system and the level of performance. There was a strong correlation between rewards and the level of financial performance, appropriate promotion system and level of performance.

Alwabel (2005) investigated the role of financial and moral incentives in raising the performance level of employees from the viewpoint of public security officers participating in the Hajj season. The results showed that no incentives standards provided to the officers though the degree of their satisfaction and incentives play a major role in raising the level of performance. A study conducted by Ong and Teh (2012) on incentive and performance within Malaysian

commercial banks found that most of the commercial banks provide both monetary and non-monetary incentives; adoption of incentive was not influenced by age and size of the organization. The study however, found a negative relationship between extrinsic incentives and financial performance of organizations and intrinsic incentives positively relating to financial performance of organizations.

Thus, Kaneez & Safia (2016) in the effect of motivational incentives on employee's job satisfaction, level of performance, efficiency, organizational productivity, employee's loyalty and professionalism in fifteen different banks of Karachi in Pakistan with the sample size of one hundred and fifty-four (154). The study recognized the various ways employees were motivated both monetary and non-monetary based incentives, the result indicated that motivational incentives had impacted on employee's performance but they were still not loyal to their organization and willing to switch their job if better opportunities came because only monetary incentives were not enough. The study recommended that amongst others incentives, capacity building programs should be welcome to make the work challenging and help in increase commitment towards organization

In related view, Balogun and Iduemre (2020) in their study in Ondo State, Nigeria with sample size of two hundred and seven (207), the respondents' claimed they have not observed any incentive despite their effort to improve the industries. Thus, incentives given is one sure way to increase employee's performance and organization productivity. In Falola et al (2014) while examine the effect of incentives packages on employees' attitudes towards work in four (4) selected government parastatals in Ogun State, South-West Nigeria, using one hundred twenty (120) sample size. The study found that strong relationship exists between incentives packages and employees' attitude to work, and the workers were not satisfied with the present incentives packages after subjected the collected data to the empirical analysis through the use of standard deviation. Therefore, to enjoy employee's commitment and satisfaction is to review incentives packages at all levels to motivates and increase workers performance.

However, according to Olayinka et al (2017) in real estate firm in Nigeria among one hundred and seventeen (117) estate firms in Victoria Island, Ikeja and Lekki Area of Lagos. While examine the incentives packages, employees and organization productivity in these real estate firms with the sample size of three hundred and fifty-one (351) respondents, the result found amongst other that there is strong positive correlation between incentives and employees' productivity, and employees were largely dissatisfied with the incentives offered by majority of the estate firms. This underscore the fact that most of the employers are ignorance of determinants of performance especially in real estate firms to boost the morale of the employees for better performance. That is, crucial to the success of organization hinged on the employee's capacity and motivation received to perform the various task assigned to them.

A study of individual incentives versus team performance conducted by Shawn, Patricia and Marlon (2007), described a modified game of Charades that was developed to facilitate a discussion on the basic principles of effective reward system design. Students were organized into small groups. Incentive schemes are then manipulated so that one player within the group strives for an individual incentive, while the rest of the team play for a group reward. Through this simple and "fun" activity, students learn firsthand what happens when individual and team interests and incentives are not aligned. This experiential learning activity also offers excellent opportunities to discuss group dynamics, communication and coordination, and the importance of maintaining a systemic view of organizational performance

Thus, Abang et al, (2009) found that firm performance has important implications for employees and organizations by examining human resource practices and the impact of incentives on manufacturing companies in the Malaysia context. The results have indicated that the two components of human resource practices namely, training and information technology have direct impact on organizational performance. It was found that incentive was positively related to organizational performance but did not moderate the relationship between both HR practices and organizational performance. Koonmee (2010) discussed the development of organizational justice in incentive allocation of the Thai public sector by comparing the roles of distributive and procedural justice on national personnel's attitudinal outcomes (incentive satisfaction and job performance). He found that distributive justice and procedural justice played more important roles in predicting incentive satisfaction and job performance in 2008 than in 2006.

In all, the importance of formal or informal incentives in organizations and their used in some companies/institutions, as a way of stimulating an increase in the performance of employees have been enlisted.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The paper adopted expectancy theory as the theoretical framework. Expectancy theory was proposed by Victor Vroom in 1964; it possesses a direct relationship between incentives and performance. He states that an employee is motivated to work hard when he/she believes that the performance when recognized, will lead to having rewards that has value (Vroom, 1964). Vroom developed a multiplicative model between the three variables: *Valence*, *Instrumentality* and *Expectancy*. According to him, what motivates a person to make a decision is a product of these three variables, how much a person desires a reward (*valence*); his/her estimate of the probability that effort will result in successful performance (*expectancy*); and his/her estimate that performance will be a means to get the reward (*instrumentality*).

Thus, people will reduce their efforts if they believe that they will not achieve the required performance, if they believe that it is impossible to achieve the rewards or if the reward is undesirable. According to Vroom, achieving rewards to which a large value is assigned leads a person to making more intensive efforts. However, among his critic was Edward Lawler who observed that the simplicity of expectancy theory was deceptive because it assumes that if an employer makes a reward (as financial bonus or promotion) enticing enough, employees will increase their productivity to obtain the reward, that this only works if the employees believe the reward is beneficial to their immediate needs (Lawler, 1971). This is where the important of employees' involvement in designing incentives and decision are crucial to the success of the organization, where opportunity will be given for vital expression/contributions.

METHODOLOGY

The survey method was adopted, with the used of questionnaires in collecting data from the respondents. The questionnaires were distributed to both academic and non-academic staff (Senior and junior staff). The staff strength/profile of Obafemi Awolowo University as the time of the study was 4,767 comprising 1,399 academic and 3,368 non-teaching staff (www.oauife.edu.ng) The paper adopted the non-probabilistic sampling technique relying specifically on the purposive or judgmental sampling method in selecting 500 respondents from the total population of the study; 209 drawn from the Academic staff, and 291 taken from the non-academic staff. The data relied on two sources: the primary and secondary source. The primary data were collected through questionnaire, while the secondary data were collected from research publications, journals and text books. Data collected from the administered and retrieved questionnaire were analyzed using simple percentage (%)

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The five hundred (500) questionnaires were distributed using judgmental sampling method to elicit the opinions of Obafemi Awolowo University staff but four hundred and seventy-two (472) representing 94.4% of the distributed questionnaire were retrieved. The questionnaires were analyzed with simple percentage.

Table 1: Socio-Demographics Background of respondents

| Socio-demographic variables | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 279 | 59.1 |
| Female | 193 | 40.9 |
| Age group | | |
| 18-35 | 193 | 40.9 |
| 36-53 | 214 | 45.7 |
| 54 and above | 64 | 13.8 |
| Marital status | | |
| Single/Never married | 187 | 39.6 |
| Married | 245 | 51.9 |
| Divorced | 27 | 5.7 |
| Widow/Widower | 13 | 2.8 |
| Religion | | |
| Christianity | 321 | 68.0 |
| Islam | 102 | 21.6 |
| Traditional | 30 | 6.4 |
| Others | 19 | 4.0 |
| Educational Qualification | | |
| Primary | 26 | 5.5 |
| SSCE | 42 | 8.9 |
| Diploma | 64 | 13.6 |
| B.Sc | 175 | 37.0 |
| MSc | 101 | 21.4 |
| Ph.D. | 64 | 13.6 |

Staff distribution

| | | |
|--------------------|-----|------|
| Academic staff | 194 | 41.1 |
| Non-academic staff | 278 | 58.9 |

Staff status

| | | |
|--------------|-----|------|
| Senior staff | 98 | 20.8 |
| Junior staff | 374 | 79.2 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

Table 1 above shows that 279 (59.1%) of the respondents were male and 193 (40.9%) of them were female. This means that, more male participated in the study than female. In age distribution of the respondents, it shows that 193 (40.9%) of them were between 18 -35 years age group, 214 (45.3%) were within the age bracket of 36 -53 years, and 65(13.8%) were 54 and above. It shows that respondents between the ages 36-53 (214 or 45.3%) were very active in this study followed by the participants in the bracket age 18 -35, and lastly, respondents in the age brackets 54 and above.

In marital status according to same table 1, shows that 187(39.6%) of the respondents were single, that is, they have never been married. More than 51.9 per cent (245) of the respondents were married, while 27 (5.7%) were divorced. Another 13(2.8%) were widow/widower. This indicates that more married respondents took part in the study. The religion affiliation of the respondents, indicates that 321 (68.0%) of the respondents were Christians, 102 (21.6%) were Muslim, 30 (6.4%) belonged to Africa traditional religion and 19 (4.0%) pitched their tents with other religious bodies.

The education qualifications show that 26(5.5%) of the respondents had primary school leaving certificate, 42(8.9%) of the respondents were SSC holders, while 64 (13.6%) of the respondents were Diploma holders. The rest: 175 (37.0%) of the respondents had B.Sc degree, 101 (21.4%) of the respondents had M.Sc. degrees and 64 (36.6%) of the respondents had Ph.D degrees. According to staff distribution in above table 1, it reveals that the academic staff were 194(41.1%), while the non-academic staff were 278 (58.9%). The analysis shows that more non-academic staff participated in the study than the academic staff. Also, the staff status in table1, shows that 98(20.8%) of the respondents were senior staff, and 374 (79.2%) of the respondents were junior staff. This indicates that majority of the participants were junior staff.

The following responses were analyzed according to the objectives:

Table 2: Are there incentives for the employees of the Obafemi Awolowo University?

| Responses | Academic staff | Non- academic staff | Total |
|-----------|----------------|---------------------|------------|
| Yes | 126 | 121 | 247 |
| No | 68 | 157 | 225 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

It can be seen from table 2 that 126(26.7%) of academic staff respondents agreed that there are incentives for the employees of the University, while 121(25.6%) of non- academic staff respondents equally agreed making a total of 52.3%. On the contrary, 68(14.4) of the academic staff and 157(33.3%) of the non- academic staff respondents disagreed. This shows a percentage distribution of 52.3% (agreed) and 47.7% (disagreed).

Table 3: Are you satisfied with quality of incentives given to the staff?

| Responses | Academic staff | Non- academic staff | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 65 | 65 | 130 |
| No | 129 | 213 | 342 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

From table 3 above, 65(13.8%) of academic staff respondents and 65(13.8%) of non-academic staff respondents were satisfied with the quality of incentives given to the staff. On the other hand, 129(27.3) academic staff and 213(45.1) non-academic staff representing 72.4% were not satisfied.

Table 4: Have you ever involved in designing of incentives given to you as a staff?

| Responses | Academic staff | Non- academic staff | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 68 | 78 | 146 |
| No | 126 | 200 | 326 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

It can be seen from table 4 that 68(14.4%) of academic staff respondents agreed that they are involved in designing incentives given to the employees of Obafemi Awolowo University, while 78(16.5%) of the non-academic staff equally agreed, thus making a total of 30.9% agreement. On the contrary, 126(26.7) of academic staff respondents disagreed, and 200(42.4) of non-academic respondents disagreed. That brings the total percentage of the disagreement to 69.1% of the total respondents.

Table 5: Would you want to be involved in designing incentives given to the employees in your university?

| Responses | Academic staff | Non- academic staff | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 123 | 201 | 324 |
| No | 71 | 77 | 148 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

With reference to table 5 above, 123(26.1%) of the academic staff want to be involved in designing incentives given to them, and 201(42.6%) of non-academic staff equally want to be involved. On the other hand, 71(15.0) of the academic staff do not want to be involved and 77(16.3) of the non-academic staff do not also want to be involved. This implies that majority (68.7%) of the staff want to be involved.

Table 6: Do you prefer Monetary incentives (such as overtime pay, Bonus, travel allowance etc.) to others incentives?

| Responses | Academic staff | Non-academic staff | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 127 | 206 | 333 |
| No | 67 | 72 | 139 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

Table 6 shows that 127(26.9%) of academic staff of the respondents agreed that they preferred monetary incentives, while 206(43.6%) of non-academic staff of the respondents equally agreed, making a total of 70.5% agreement. On the other hand, 67(14.2%) of academic staff of the total sampled respondents disagreed, while 72(15.3%) of non-academic staff of the respondents disagreed thus bringing the total percentage of disagreement to 29.5% of the total respondents

Table 7: Do you prefer non-monetary (such as free health care, sabbatical, study leave, training etc.)

| Responses | Academic staff | Non- academic staff | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 67 | 77 | 144 |
| No | 127 | 201 | 328 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

With regards to table 7 above, 67(14.2%) of academic staff and 77(16.3%) of non- academic staff respondents agreed that they preferred non- monetary incentives. In a contrary opinion 127(26.9%) academic staff and 201(42.6%) of non-academic staff disagree, bringing the total percentage of disagreement to 69.5%.

Table 8: Do you prefer moral incentives (such as praise, recognition and promotion etc.)

| Responses | Academic staff | Non- academic staff | Total |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 92 | 81 | 173 |
| No | 102 | 197 | 299 |
| Total | 194 | 278 | 472 |

Source: Researchers survey, 2018

In view of table 8 above, it can be seen that 92(19.5%) of academic staff and 81(17.2%) of non-academic staff agreed to moral incentives, thereby bringing the total number of agreements to 36.7%. However, 102(21.6%) of academic staff respondents disagreed, while 197(41.7%) of non-academic staff equally disagreed, bringing the total number of disagreed respondents to 63.3%

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

From above findings, it was discovered that the quality of incentives given to employees has a significant effect on employees' performance and can hindered the achievement of the University's Objectives if it was not care for. This was seen with the massive dissatisfaction on both academic and non-academic staff respondents representing 27.3% and 45.1% respectively, bringing the total percentage to 72.4%. This showed that there is relationship between the quality of incentives given to staff and the achievement of the institution objectives.

It was discovered that, the type of incentives given to employees can motivate them to put in their best towards the achievement of the University goals. This was seen with the massive agreement of both academic staff and non-academic staff in table 12. It was also noticed that, employees' involvement in designing incentives given to them will increase their performance thereby contributing towards the achievement of the objectives of Obafemi Awolowo University. From table 4.11, it was found that, there is an agreement of opinion between sampled academic and non-academic staff, 123(26.1%) of academic staff want to be involved in designing incentives

given to them, while 201(42.6%) of non-academic staff equally want to be involved, bringing the percent to 68.7%.

CONCLUSION

One of the findings of this study is that employees/staff of the Obafemi Awolowo university were not satisfied with the quality/quantity of incentives given to them. Based on this finding, the management should improve by setting up committee to look into it. Secondly, in the type of incentives given to the employee', some of the respondents preferred monetary incentives such as overtime pay, bonus, travel allowance, accommodation allowance, etc., while others preferred non-monetary incentives such as free health care, sabbatical, study leave, training, flexible working hours, and free meal etc. This imply that, if adequate interventions could apply staff will be willing to contribute more to the achievement of the objectives of the University. Thirdly, involvement of employees in designing incentives given to the employees' will increase their performance thereby contributing towards the achievement of the organization (Obafemi Awolowo university), this was seen when almost all the respondents wanted to be involved in designing incentives given to them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident that Management of Obafemi Awolowo University needs to do more about the needs and wants of the employees. The paper suggests that University should include the same numbers of employees both academic and non-academic in incentives process and decision-making processes. This could be done by giving the employees an opportunity to frequently giving feedback on the incentive's plans together with the development discussions that take place between the management and the employee and others. It is also worth recommending that the institution should strive to improve on monetary incentives package giving to the employees in order to get the best out of them. Efforts must be intensified to ensure that employees are giving what is due to them without any delay.

It is evident from this paper that work attitude is significantly influenced by incentives structure. The Implication is that, the more preferred the incentive structure, the more positive employee work attitude will be. It is then recommended that in order to retain competent staff in the establishment, the Management should be able to provide them with the optimal level of incentives that they require for the sustainability of themselves based on the prevailing economic and social realities of the time. Giving incentives should be linked practically with the level of performance as to distinguish the excellent employees according to their performance; this will enhance them to do the best in order to improve the performance, therefore incentives linked to improving the performance and vice versa without no vested interests.

REFERENCES

- Al-Aydi, K. (2000). *Impact of incentives on performance in public firms of Cotton Industry in Iraq: A field Study*. Master Thesis. Al al-Bayt University, Mafrq, Jordan.
- Allen, R. and Kilmann, R. (2001). The role of reward system for a total quality management based strategy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 14(2): 110-131.

- Alwabel. A., (2005). *The role of financial and moral incentives on raising the performance level of employees from the viewpoint of the Security Officers involved in the Pilgrimage Season*. Master Thesis. Naif Arab University for Security Sciences. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
- Armstrong, M. (2007). *Employee rewards management and practice*. London & Philadelphia: Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. 10th Ed. London: Kogan Page.
- Balogun, M.A & Idumre, O (2020). Harnessing indigenous technologies in its value chain for economy expansion in Nigeria: analysis from Ondo State. *Verstehen Journal of Social Research: Department of Sociology, Bokkos, Nigeria*, 1(2)
- Chiang, F. F., & Birtch, T. (2008). Achieving task and extra-task-related behaviors: A case of gender and position differences in the perceived role of rewards in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(4), 491-503.
- Condly, S.J, Richard E. Clark & Harold D. Stolovitch, (2003). The effects of incentives on workplace performance: A meta-analytic review of research studies. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 16(3), 46-63
- Derek, T., Laura, H. & Steven, T. (2009). Fundamentals of human resources management: management people at work. *Financial Times Press*. United States
- Dixit, V. & Bhati, (2012). A study about employee commitment and its impact on sustained productivity in India Auto-Component Industry". *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*. 1(6), Pp 44
- Ellis, L., & Pennington S, (2004). Should leaders have tusks or fangs? *Management Today*, 20(9), 32-33.
- Falola, H.O, Ibidunni, A. & Olokundun, S. (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 Business and Social Science*, 3(1), 63-74.
- Franco, L., Bennett, S. & Kanfer, R. (2002). Health sector reform and public sector health worker motivation: A conceptual framework. *Social Science and Medicine*. 54: 1255-1266
- Hafiza, N., Shah, S., Jamseheed, H. & Zamam, K. (2011). Relationship between rewards and employee motivation in the non-profit organization of Pakistan. *Business Intelligence Journal*, 4(2), 327-334
- Hicks, V. & Adams, O. (2003). *Pay and non-pay incentives, performance and motivation*. Anwerp: ITG Press.
- Hijazi, S., Anwar, A. & Mehbood, S. (2007). Impact of non-financial rewards on employee motivation. *The Business Review*, 7 (2), pp 272-277.
- Kaneez, F.M. & Safia, M (2016). Effect of motivational incentives on employees' performance: A case study of Banks of Karachi, Pakistan. *South East Journal of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law*, 9(2), 32-39.
- Kaplan, S. & Henderson, R., (2005) *Inertia and incentives: Bridging organizational economic and organizational theory*. 510. *Organization Science* 16(5)
- Kepner, K, (2003) The role of monetary and non - monetary incentives in the workplace as influence by career stage: Institute of food and agriculture sciences. University of Florida. Gainesvills.
- Koonmee, K. (2010). Development of organizational justice in incentive. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, (66), 861-867.

- Lawler, E.E. (1971). Pay and organisational effectiveness: A psychological view. New York: McGraw-Hall
- Locke, H. S. & T. S. Braver, (2008). Motivational influences on cognitive control: Behavior, brain activation, and individual differences. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci*, 8(99),
- Mueller, D. R (2011). Financial incentives to increase employees' motivation; www.ehow.com
- Nelson, B. (2003), Money is not the root of all motivation. *Health Care Registration* 12(10) 7-9
- Olayinka, C.O, Abiodun, S.O, Daniel, O.B & Raphael, A.O (2017). Incentives packages, employees' productivity and performance of real estate firms in Nigeria. *European scientific journal*, 13(11), 246-260
- Ong, S. & Teh, H., (2012) *Reward system and performance within Malaysian manufacturing companies*, IDOSI Publications. Faculty of Economics and Management, University Putra Malaysia, Malaysia
- Pattanayak, B. (2005). Human resources management: Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd
- Schmidt, R. (2010). Are incentives the bricks or the building? *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 22 (1), 129–136. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6622.2010.00268.x>
- Shawn, E. P., Patricia, D. L., & Marlon, F. S. (2007). Individual incentives versus team performance: lessons from a game of charades. *Organization Management Journal*, (4), 54–68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/omj.2007.7>
- Spector, P.E, (2003). *Industrial and organisational psychology, research and practice* (3rd Ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Oxford, England: Wiley
- Yap, J., Bove, L. & Beverland, M. (2009). Exploring the effects of different reward programs on in-role and extra-role performance of retail sales associates. *Qualitative Market Research*, 12(3):279-294.