

## **The Effects of Motivation on Staff Productivity/Performance at the Francis Sulemanuu Idachaba Library, University Of Agriculture, Makurdi-Nigeria**

Upev, Micheal Terver (Cln)<sup>1</sup>, Chorun, Matthew Terfa(Cln)<sup>2</sup>,  
Idachaba, Joy Asibi<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Francis Sulemanuu Idachaba Library, Federal university of agriculture, Makurdi.

---

**Abstract:** *The paper examines the impact of motivation on staff performance and productivity in the university library, using structured questionnaire and interview tools administered on 72 para-professional staff. The study sought to know what their possible motivating factors are and to what extent they can be influenced for higher performance and productivity. The result revealed both the factors and the degree of influence in the following descending order, participation in decision making, job security, challenging work assignment, monetary reward and job incentives. It was evident that their productivity was at its lowest ebb as further inquiry revealed that apart from the mass retrenchment of staff in 2004, only three (4.2%) of the staff were sponsored for training between 2004-2011. Recommendations were made for regular management and staff dialogue in addition to training of staff on new information technologies as their level of backwardness was appalling.*

**Keywords:** *Motivation; Performance, Productivity, Personnel.*

---

### **I. Introduction**

University institution like every other organization is a complex system comprising many subsystems which must work together in harmony and synchronization. A number of variables affect subsystems and the subsystem themselves make interaction with each other more complicated.

The complications of the dynamic nature of the environment in which university institution exist and the rapidly changing values of the variables affecting the system becomes obvious that university management must be prepared to achieve a degree of organizational environment to accommodate the change in the conditions which must be pre-planned and not haphazard.

Human element is the most important in the success of any institution hence, it's advocating in organizational development. Beckhard(1969) describe organizational development as an effort (a) planned (b) organization wide (c) manage from top, in order to (d) increase organization effectiveness and health through (e) planed intervention in the organization's processes using behavioral science knowledge. Deduced from the above effectiveness refers to establishing and attaining realistic institutional goals while health refers to motivation, integration and utilization of combined human resources within an institution.

Motivation is a prime factor in all human activities thus, Deceeco and Tutoo (1988) categorize it as those factors which tend to increase or decrees, encourage or discourage the virus in an individual with the aim of determining his level of activity. Productivity on the other hand is the measure of output from input resulting from enhanced welfare packages. It results with the interaction of three types of resources, which are physical, financial, and human it is a measure of how well resources are combined and utilized to accomplish specific desirable result (Alamieyeseisha (2004). Productivity can be both quantitative and qualitative output and the process itself (Alaimieyessiah 2004), ( proko penko (1987). In that wise Akide, (2012) opined that rising productivity should go hand in hand with improving the quality of working life.

At times performance problems are not often caused by poor or low levels of motivation. Factors such as shortage of working materials or lack of skills and lack of good organizational structure may cause low productivity in an organization

### **Statement Of The Prproblem**

One dominant issue in the 2007 Federal Government of Nigeria and Academic Staff Union of Universities (FGN/ASUU) agreement was aimed at curbing the "brain drain" using staff welfare as one of the yard stick. One among several other factors principally listed was lack of adequate motivation of staff. It was agreed that motivation stimulates a person to be proactive therefore input efforts for a better output. However several opinions have been advanced as to what should constitute motivation, how employees should be motivated, whether or not they should be motivated, how extreme motivation can be catastrophic and whether

motivation can influence productivity. The study intends to explore the effect of motivation on staff/personnel productivity at the Francis Sulemanu Idachaba library, university of Agriculture Makurdi.

## **II. Literature Review**

Human motivation is multifaceted. It cut across various drives, desires, needs, wishes and other forces; motivation is a dynamic force setting a person into motion or action. Vitalis (1953) define motivation as unsatisfied need which creates a state of tension or disequilibrium, causing an individual to move in a goal directed pattern towards restoring a state of equilibrium by satisfying the need. Similarly, yadav(2010) defines it as a set of reasons that determines one to engage in a particular behaviour while chandan (1987) views as combination of many factors which affect behaviour modification and is tied to human behaviour. According to Yadav(2010) motivation may be rooted in the basic need to minimize physical pain and maximize gain

The word motivation is derived from motive which is an active form of desire, craving or need, which must be satisfied. According to Macmillan English dictionary, new edition (2007), motivation is a feeling of enthusiasm or interest that makes you determined to do something. Understanding peoples motivation is a complex business in which several inter related factors are at work. What may be a motivator for a person may certainly not be for the other. Some staff are motivated by challenges, others by financial incentives while others could be by work environment.

Workers needs are both diverse and multidimensional. According to prokopenko(1987) olugbemi(2002) quoted by Akid (2012), they could be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation comes from within an individual staff while extrinsic motivation comes from outside of the performer. Intrinsic motivation originates from reward inherent in the performance of assignment or duty. In the work environment, this category of staff, referred to by Owuamaman and Owuamaman (2004) McClelland (1961) Herzberg (1959) and Douglas and Schein (1989) as self-actualization model depend on the nature of the tasks. Successful completion gives the staff, personal satisfaction, and feeling of success, achievement or accomplishment.

Extrinsic motivation on the other hand comes from outside of the performer. It results from the reward that is not derived from the Job or task. Money and other extrinsic rewards are the obvious example which encourages the spirit of completion of task and to beat others, rather than the intrinsic reward of the activity.

In library services, staff are motivated on the basis of both intrinsic and extrinsic conditions such as promotion, grades approval; prizes and commendation, good working environment, and friendly labour management relationship. Motivation and productivity are tied to human behaviour. It is against this backdrop that Likert (1967) describes human resources as most important task upon which all results depend and on how well it is done

However motivation and productivity have become a subject of unending debate by motivation theorist. Where as others argue that motivation can be designed to affect performance and productivity, for others it is a function of ability. In one school of thought, the needs theorist promoted by behavioural scientist as well as industrial psychologist view motivation as a combination of many factors which affect behaviour modification. The factors according to Dececco and Tutoo(1988), quoted by Ityav (2009) are those which tend to increase or decrease, encourage or discourage the views in an individual with the aim of determining his level of activity. Chandan (1987) identified two factors that could affect behaviour modification to include urges, need and desires of the people which can be stimulated and a sense of communication and methodology that would provide such stimulus to these urges. He argues further that where ever there is a strong motivation, the employee output increases. No wonder while evaluating the nature of goals in organization Richards (1978) reported that managers attend to goals particularly if they are paid and promoted to do so. To this end, achieving high productivity require the recognition of human resource as most important and active agents for harnessing and combining other resources. Based on the forgoing the behavioural and industrial psychologists emphasize what motivate people rather than how people are motivated. They identified workers needs as financial incentives cordial working environment, challenging work and responsibility, personal accomplishment, recognition for such accomplishment and an opportunity for growth and advancement.

Another school of thought tagged 'Rational- economic-model' Schein (1988) in concomitant with McGregor's theory x, and rooted in the economic theories of Adam Smith in the 1970s. This theory regards employees as inherently lazy, requiring coercion and control, avoiding responsibility and only seeking security. It identify the pursuit of self interest and the maximization of gain as the prime motivation.

Rational- economic model categorizes human beings into two main groups (a) the untrustworthy money motivated calculative masses (b) the trust worthy, more broadly motivated moral elite whose task it is to organize and control the masses. This view give credence to the argument by Chandan (1987), that the level of performance of an employee is a function of his ability and his motivation as ability determines what he can do while motivation determines what he will do. He further stress that lazy and irresponsible people seldom get motivated.

Similarly, Bratton and Gold (1999) quoting Vroom's expectancy theory of rewards reported that British and North American companies attempted to relate pay to performance which represent payment-by-results (PBR). This seeks to relate rewards to the pace of work or effort. With the proportional scheme, pay increases in direct proportion to the increase in output. In Britain, the system was tagged "merit pay" that is, paying dependent on subjective judgment of a superior (Bratton, 1999). Rational economic model is predicated on productivity in relationship between result (output) and the means employed, (input) efficiency and effectiveness, and elimination of waste in all aspects. However while not opposed to the rational economic theory, it should be noted that services provided by Academic library staff varies in different settings, each has its uniqueness and offered to different types or groups of users. Therefore to measure the input and output of library services will result from improvement of staff/user relationship while the critical judge of that impact is the user himself since he is the only one who determine the level of satisfaction derives from interacting with the library (Mendelsohn, 1995), quoted by Eneh and OsayUwa- odigie,(2013).

The third school of thought is complex model which according to Schein (1988) presupposes that understanding peoples motivation is a complex business in which several inter related factors are at work undoubtedly, what may be a motivator for a staff may certainly not be for the other. Some staff are motivated by challenges, others by financial incentives while others could be by work environment. Generally motivational force is basic determinants of behaviour and lack of it manifest in individual indifference to his work or lack of interest and weak drive towards goal attainment. Looking at the argument, Ukeje, Akabogu and Ndu,(1992) also concluded that motivation to do something is internally determined while external influence is only with the manipulation of rewards and the behaviour in such a way as to show that the path to achieving his goal is through performing to task. They equipped further that looking at a glance, one might think that the more motivated a worker is to perform well, the more effective his performance. This however is not necessary so because, there is considerate research evidence from both human subjects and sub-human which show that extreme level of motivation are detrimental to performance. Another study has it that very low motivation is associated with sluggishness, inertia and no goal directed acts, while very high motivation is associated with anxiety disruption and less efficiency. It is further argued that high performance and productivity can not be achieved by mere adequate motivation; rather the major variables are abilities and role perception.

With many arguments over motivation notwithstanding, it remains a key pointer to staff productivity. Staff productivity is the measure of output resulting from a given resource input at a given time, getting more out of less as a way of optimizing resource to the benefit of the organization and society. In the words of Akid,(2012) Employee productivity is striking a balance between all factors of production that will give the greatest result for the smallest effort, the relationship between result(output) and the means employed (input), efficiency and effectiveness, and elimination of waste in all aspects. On a higher note Prokopenko (1987) describe higher productivity as accomplishment of more with the same amount of resources i.e. High volume and quality for the same input.

These definitions are seemingly more in tune with the production sector as in the service sector like Libraries where employee productivity could be described as a measure of effective and most efficient use and application of the various resources available at his disposal at meeting the specific needs of the users, the result of which can only be through a feedback mechanics. Achieving high productivity is a matter of utmost concern to all administration and dependent on certain variables among what Lawlor(1985) categorize as;

Objectives: The degree to which they are achieved. Efficiency, how effectively resources are used to generate Useful output. Effectiveness: what is achieved compared with what is possible. Comparability how productivity performance is recorded over time.

But for Bisi (1996) high productivity can be achieved through the following variables.

- Labour must participate in management.
- There must be mutual trust and cooperation would not replace them
- Proper incentive schemes should be put in place.
- Availability of raw materials
- Proper training and development of worker.
- Proper equipment and plant maintenance.
- Good working condition and adequate safety measures.

But while some schools are opposed to monetary compensation of staff, Ejimudo (2003) opine that if being equal their productivity will increase similarly, Vrooms (1964) expectancy theory to individuals perception or belief reach a goal if they perceive that a particular act will produce a particular outcome. This is further supported by Briggs (1970) and Adeleke (2001) who advocated constant employee training and development as additional means in achieving organizational goals and objectives.

### III. Methodology

The study was carried out at the FSI library, University of Agriculture Makurdi in July 2014. The study adopted questionnaire methods in addition to one-on-one interaction and personal experience. At the time the questionnaires were administered and retrieved, the University library had staff strength of thirty one Academic librarians and eighty six para-professionals. The target here was only para-professionals. Items on the questionnaires bothered on Gender, Age Academic qualifications, length of service, job performance and productivity, assessing staff productivity, career motivators. Career motivators and job enhancement, staff performance appraisal and training. In all seventy two copies of the questionnaire were duly completed and returned, thus representing 83.73%.

### IV. Data Analyses And Discussion

Table 1 provides the demographic representation on gender/ age, table 2 data on academic qualifications/ work experience. Demographic distribution of respondents.

**Table 1: Gender and Age of respondents**

Gender	Frequency	%	Age	Frequency	%
Male	40	55.6	18 – 25	4	5.6
Female	32	44.4	26 – 30	15	20.8
			31 – 39	33	45.8
			40 – above	20	27.8
Total	72	100	Total	72	100

Source: Field survey 2014

Of the total population of 72 para-professional staff of the library sampled, 40 of them representing 55.6% are male and 32 representing 44.4% are female out of which 45.8% of the staff is within the age bracket of 31 – 39 years with just 27.8% within the age of 40 above.

**Table 2: Academic qualification and work experience**

Qualification	Frequency	%	Years of service	Frequency	%
MSc	2	2.8	1-5	9	12.5
Bls,BSc,B.Ed	6	8.3	6-10	14	19.4
Diploma DIs	45	62.5	11-15	28	38.9
SSCE,GCE, O/L	19	26.4	16-20	12	16.9
			21 above	9	21.5
Total	72	100	Total	72	100

Source: Field survey 2014

Table 2 reviews that out of a total staff strength of 72 para-professionals, 45(62.5%) have obtained diploma certificate with only 11.1% of them with higher qualification. There is opportunity for growth as an average of 51 representing 70.8% of staff have put in between 1 – 15 years.

Job performance and motivation

**Table 3: Job performance and higher productivity as a product of motivation.**

Variables	Frequency	%
Strongly agreed	39	54.2
Agreed	21	29.2
Disagreed	8	11.1
Strongly Disagreed	2	2.8
Undecided	2	2.8
Total	72	100

Source: Field survey 2014

Table 3: shows that overwhelming majority of 83.4% of staff is of the opinion that their job performance and higher output can be induced by motivational factors. However a total of 10 respondents (minority) 13.9% never consented while 2(2.8) gave no response.

**Table 4: Assessing staff productivity using performance appraisal**

Variables	Frequency	%
Strongly agreed	44	61.1
Agreed	17	23.6
Disagreed	5	6.9
Strongly Disagreed	6	8.3
Undecided	0	0
Total	72	100

Source: Field survey 2014

Table 4 visibly reveals a simple majority 84.7% consenting that productivity will be enhanced through performance appraisal. Though 15.2% of the staff representing minority interest rejected the appraisal method. Further enquiry confirmed that it is subject to abuse as objectivity is often ignored. The minority interest decried the attitude of favoritism that was witnessed in the promotion of few at the expense of many hard working staff in the past. when reminded of the prevailing change, their fear still remain that the change may only last with the tenure of the actors of the change.

**Table 5: Career Motivators.**

Variables	Strongly Agreed	Agreed	Disagreed	Strongly Disagreed	Undecided
Merit Award	43(59.7%)	17(23.6%)	5(6.9%)	4(5.6%)	2(2.8%)
Monetary reward	54(75%)	9(12.5%)	9(12.6%)	(0%)	(0%)
Recognition	44(61.1%)	12(16.7%)	2(2.8%)	10(13.9%)	4(5.6%)
Challenging Assignments	58(80.5%)	7(9.7%)	4(5.6%)	3(4.2%)	(0%)
Job Security	57(79.1%)	12(16.7%)	(0%)	1(1.4%)	2(2.8%)
Participation in Decision Making	52(72.2%)	20(27.8%)	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)
Social Status	31(43.1%)	6(8.3%)	11(15.3%)	13(18.1%)	11(15.3%)
Provision of incentives	39(54.2%)	26(36.1%)	3(4.2%)	1(1.4%)	3(4.2%)

Source: Field survey 2014

Table 5 seeks to know what could be the possible motivating factor upon which a staff performance can be enhanced. As can be deduced from the table, job security has the second highest aggregate score of 69 respondents (95.8%). The reason is predicated on the rationalization which led to mass retrenchment of library staff in 2004.

Job security and safety are provisions against deprivation in the future and involves protection against danger and threats (Chandan 1987). Similarly, Maslow (1954) reaffirms that people want to be free of physical danger and of the fear of losing a job, property, food or shelter.

Participation in decision making tops the table with aggregate score of 72 (100%) with no discerning voice. This unanimous action is an indication that they want dialogue. They want to be consulted and engaged in matters affecting them and the organization where they can freely make input on such issues. Staff participation according to Wehrich, Cannice and Koontz (2008) is a means to recognition, and give people a sense of accomplishment.

Recognition also featured prominently among motivating factor. With a response rate of 66(91.7) %, the staff want management to recognize employees contribution as morale-boosting. It gives the worker a feeling of worth and self esteem thus encourages higher productivity. Herzberg relates recognition to real motivators attached to job content which also has the potential of yielding a sense of satisfaction.

Two motivators share the same percentage of acceptance. They are challenging work assignment and provision of incentives. They each have aggregate response rate of 65(90.3%).

For challenging work assignment, 80.5% strongly agreed while 9.7% agreed. Seven respondents (9.8%) thought otherwise. Challenging work assignment is synonymous with self actualization. It is soul searching and inner oriented. A self actualized person is creative, independent, content, spontaneous and has a good percentage of reality and the person is constantly striving to realize his full potential (Chandan 1987).

Provision of job incentives is linked to both physical and social factors which can influence people positively or otherwise. These include ventilation, accessibility of work tools, noise level, light, heat, office furnishing, nature of job, fringe benefits etc. This explains why 65 respondents (90. %) with a close margin of 19.1% strongly agreed and that provision of working tools, equipment and right environment can influence their skills. people have changed jobs because the environment in the job situation was not conducive to their enhancement. On the other hand, Chandan (1987) asserts that less skilled people have learned skills and forged ahead because of the right environment.

Monetary reward is another strong motivator among the library staff. The result shows that 54(75%) of the para-professional staff strongly endorse of monetary compensation while another 9(12.15%) also supported with less magnitude. However 9 other respondents (12.5%) were totally opposed to monetary incentives.

While monetary reward was strongly advocated by Vroom (1964), Dutoit, Van stadem and Steyn (2011), had argued that it could cause other career motivators such as autonomy and personal growth which have an impact on innovation to be considered less important.

Other career motivators such as merit award and social status also received favourable responses while the former had a cumulative average of 83.3% response in favour, another 12.5% minority interest went against with 2.8% undecided.

The result of merit award corroborate Akid's (2012) study that people feel demotivated and demoralized when there is no distinction between hard work and mediocrity.

With great percentage for merit award system, the support of staff for social status nose-dived with only 37(51.4%) respondents giving their consent. Interestingly, 24 respondents (33.4%) and another 11(15.3%) either rejected the social status or chose to be indifferent. The result is relating to Dutoit, Van staden and Steyn (2011) study which considered social status the least important career motivator.

**Table 6: measuring performance output with training. No correlation between staff training and performance output**

Variable	Frequency	%
Strongly Agree	48	66.7
Agree	17	23.7
Disagree	5	6.9
Strongly Disagree	-	0
Undecided	2	2.8
Total	72	100%

Source: Field survey 2014

The goals and objectives of the university can be defined in measurable terms where possible. The relationship between staff training and performance in relation to output can be expressed both quantitatively and qualitatively. This presupposes the result of table 6.

The cumulative frequency of 65(90.3%) of respondents agreed that training and performance leads to increase in output. However, 5(6.9%) respondents objected while another 2(2.8%) respondents were indifferent. Further interaction with the staff revealed that only 3(4.2%) staff out of a total of 72 were sponsored in the past eight years (2004-2011). This action negate the principle of productivity where new skills cannot be learned, old methods continue to recycle in perpetuity while the cost of service delivery remains high with low productivity. On the other hand, while the result of sponsorship look so dismal, it was discovered that majority have been released on self sponsorship for part time diploma and degree programmes.

**Table 7: Extent of career motivators on job enhancement**

Variables	Very Large Extent	Large Extent	Little Extent	Very Little Extent	Neutral
Merit Award	43(59.7%)	17(23.6)	5(6.9%)	6(8.4%)	—
Monetary Reward	58(80.6%)	5(6.9%)	9(12.5%)	—	—
Recognition	48(66.7%)	8(11.1%)	2(2.8%)	12(16.7%)	2(2.8%)
Challenging Work Assignments	58(80.5%)	7(9.7%)	4(5.6%)	3(4.2%)	—
Job Security	58(80.5%)	11(15.3%)	—	1(1.4%)	2(2.8%)
Participation in Decision Making	59(81.9%)	13(18.1%)	—	—	—
Social Status	31(43.1%)	6(8.4%)	11(15.3%)	13(18.1%)	11(15.3%)
Provision of Incentives	43(59.7%)	22(30.6%)	3(4.2%)	1(1.4%)	3(4.2%)

Source: Field survey 2014

Table 7 compares the extent of career motivator on staff job enhancement in the University library. Results revealed that staff participation in decision making top the chart with 81.9% voting for very large extent and another 18.1% voting for large extent. Followed closely are three other motivators, monetary reward, challenging work assignment and job security with same percentage of 80.5 who can be influenced by them to a very large extent. Also provision of incentives is considered a great motivator with 59.7% voting for very large extent while 30.6% voted for large extent.

## V. Findings

1. The University library has 31 academic staff and 86 para-professional staff.
2. Higher output can be influenced by motivational factors as job security, challenging work assignment, participation in decision making, provision of incentives and monetary reward. And as to extent which any of these could be, the result was to a very large extent.
3. The real motivators and their degree of enhancement of job output, the degree of which is in the following; participation in decision making, job security, challenging work assignment, monetary reward and least being social status.
4. The staff affirmed their support for performance appraisal as a means of enhancing productivity.
5. It was established that a correlation between training and performance would lead to staff output increase.
6. It was discovered that only three (4.2%) of the total staff benefited from training sponsorship within eight years (2004-2011).

## VI. Conclusion

This study was designed to establish the impact of motivation on productivity of staff of FSI Library, University of Agriculture Makurdi. It is a well known fact that user expectations and satisfaction have taken the centre stage in library and information service delivery. To an extent several research methods and innovations have been developed. All aimed at meeting users' satisfaction. Beyond that lay the tool (human capacity) to fulfill such obligation. This is where motivation and productivity becomes the arrow head to that realization. Motivation has very strong influence on staff output this presupposes why Ityav(2009) suggested that it should not be limited to staff being paid regularly and promptly but in proportion to the volume of services rendered. Indeed, employee need good working environment, housing, medical allowance, transportation regular promotion and training opportunities thus we advocate constant employee training and development. Similarly, Ukeje Akabogu and Ndu (1992) observe that job brings satisfaction when it offers adequate mental challenge by offering opportunity to use skills, creativity, variety and some measure of autonomy in task performance. They affirmed that productivity will lead to job satisfaction when productivity is perceived as being instrumental to the attainment of the individual's important job values like achievement, higher status and increased earnings.

## VII. Recommendation

- ❖ Staff and management consultation on regular basis would reduce suspicion and rumor peddling.
- ❖ Sufficient working tools should be provided to enable the staff discharge their services with courage and satisfaction.
- ❖ The staff are far backward on the use of ICT tools. Training and retraining of staff on new technologies should be given top priority.
- ❖ All categories of library staff should be sponsored for higher training as a means of making them more relevant and productive.
- ❖ The library should institute award system to serve as recognition for dedication and hard work and as a guarantee that attractive rewards are potentially available for effective performance.
- ❖ Regular seminars and workshops should be organized to acquaint the staff with recent innovations and developments in the field of librarianship.

## References

- [1]. Adams, J.S. and Jacobsen, P.R (1964) in Cole, G.A (2004), management, theory and practice: 6; London: book power
- [2]. Alamiyesigha, D (2004) this day newspapers, Wednesday, April 7, 2004, PP.29-36
- [3]. Akid, J.O (2012) Enhancing productivity in the public services a case study of National library of Nigeria Abuja Infolib journal of library and information science pp137-148
- [4]. Beckhard,R(1969) Organizational Development:Strategies and models.Addison-Wesley.
- [5]. Bratton, J and Gold, J.(1999). Human Resources management: theory and practice. 2; Houndhills (UK): macmillian.
- [6]. Cole, G.A (2004). Management theory and practices. 6th ed; London: Book power
- [7]. Dececco and Tutoo (1988) in Ityav ADK(2009). Theory and practice of pre-primary education in Nigeria, Makurdi: Destiny ventures.
- [8]. Dessler G. (2009) Human resource management. 11th ed New Delhi: PHI learning.
- [9]. Dutoit, ASA, Vanstaden,R j and Steyn, PD (2011) South Africa future knowledge workers; A peep into their goals and motivation for innovations. African journal of library, Archive and information science. Vol 21 no2 pp87-97.
- [10]. Ejimudo, cu (2003) in Akid, J.O (2012), Enhancing productivity in the public service a case study of National Library of Nigeria, Abuja. infolib journal of library and information science Vol.6 No 1.12 pp.137-148
- [11]. Eneh, Ac and Osayuwa-odigie HT(2013), User' satisfaction with the services of John Harris library University of Benin African library centinel: journal of library and information science Vol.2 no.2 pp 124-135
- [12]. Federal ministry of education report (1990) main report on national conference of discipline and motivation in school Held at Durbar Hotel, Lagos 25-30 November.
- [13]. Herzberg, F Maouser, Band Synderman, B(1959)in Bratton, J and Gold J (1999) Human resources management: theory and practice.2<sup>nd</sup>, UK Macmillian.
- [14]. Ityav ADK (2009) theory and practice of per-primary education in Nigeria, makurdi Destiny ventures.
- [15]. Lawlor A (1985) in Akid, J.O (2012) Enhancing productivity in the public services: a case study of National library,Abuja infolib: journal of library and information science pp. 137-148
- [16]. Likert, R (1967) in Cole G.A (2004) management theory: and practice. 6th ed; London: book power
- [17]. Maclelland, DC (1961), the Achieving society, Princeton: N.J: Van Nestran.
- [18]. Macmillan English, Dictionary of Advanced learners (2001) New e.d, Malaysia, macmillan education.
- [19]. McGregors, D (1957) in Cole, GA(2004) Management theory and practice 6<sup>th</sup> ed, London Book power
- [20]. Maslow A (1954) motivation and personality, New York Haerper and Row
- [21]. Okubanjo AO (2009) Job satisfaction, job motivation and organizational climate as determinants of teachers' turnover intention; Implication for mental health. The Nigerian educational psychologist journal 7; 130-143
- [22]. Owuamanan DO and Owuamanan T.O(2002) Fundamentals of educational psychology. Lagos Bolobay publication.
- [23]. Prokopenko J (1987),in Akid, J. O (2012) Enhancing productivity in the public service; a case study of National Library of Nigeria. Abuja Infolib: journal of library and information science pp137-148
- [24]. Richards M.D (1978), organizational good structures Minnesota. West publishing.
- [25]. Schein E(1988) organizational psychology 3<sup>rd</sup> ed pertice Hall
- [26]. Ukeje, BO. Ukabogu GC and Ndu A(1992) educational administration, Enugu fourth Dimension publishing.
- [27]. University of agriculture Makurdi-Nigeria (2014) Office of the university librarian, Staff disposition list.
- [28]. Vitelis MS(1953) in Chandan,JS(1987) Management Theory and practice, New Delhi vikas publishing house.
- [29]. Vroom VH and Deci, EL (1970) Management and motivation. London, penguin books.
- [30]. Weirich, H, Cannice, M. C and Koontz,L (2008) management a global entrepreneurial perspective 12<sup>th</sup> ed New Delhi Tata Mcgrow Hill
- [31]. Yadav, RS (2010) General psychologt. New Delhi; Saurah publishing.