

Influence of Motivational Factors on Research Productivity of Academic Staff in Private Universities in Oyo State Nigeria

Sophia Vivian Adeyeye¹, Tosin Abimbola Ayodele²

¹Department of Information Management, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria.

²College Library, Federal College of Education (Special), Oyo, Nigeria.

Correspondence Email: tosinayoola1960@gmail.com²

Article Info

Article history:

Received January/28, 2025

Revised December/24, 2025

Accepted February/28, 2026

Keywords:

Motivational factors;
Research Productivity;
Academic Staff

Kata Kunci:

Motivasi;
Produktifasi Riset;
Staff Akademik.

ABSTRACT

Academic staff members play a fundamental role in the intellectual development of institutions. This role is also felt in the productivity level of academic staff. When academic staff are productive, it goes a long way in bringing about much positivity to the sustenance of that organization and when this is not the case, there is every tendency that, that organization might collapse. It is in this regard that this study therefore deems it fit to investigate motivational factors on research productivity of Academic Staff in Private Universities in Oyo State. Descriptive research design of a correctional type was adopted. The population consists of 717 academic staff in private universities in Oyo state, Nigeria. Sample size of 255 academic staff was determined using Yamane table of sampling size, while validated questionnaire was used to collect data from the respondents. Data collected was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings revealed that motivational factors has no significant to research productivity (Adj.R2 = 0.010; p = 0.057). while prevalent factors that bring about motivation was found not to statistically significantly influence Research Productivity ($\beta = -.165$, $t = 1.790$; $p > 0.05$). The study concluded that prevalent factors that bring about motivation is not strongly influenced Research Productivity. The study recommended that private universities should increase their support by facilitating access to grant for research activities of their academic staff and academic staff should work more on their research skill.

ABSTRAK

Staf akademik memainkan peran yang sangat mendasar dalam pengembangan intelektual institusi. Peran ini juga tercermin dalam tingkat produktivitas staf akademik. Ketika staf akademik produktif, hal tersebut sangat berkontribusi terhadap keberlanjutan organisasi dengan membawa banyak dampak positif. Sebaliknya, jika hal ini tidak terjadi, terdapat kecenderungan bahwa organisasi tersebut dapat mengalami kemunduran bahkan runtuh. Sehubungan dengan hal tersebut, penelitian ini memandang perlu untuk mengkaji faktor-faktor motivasi terhadap produktivitas penelitian staf akademik di perguruan tinggi swasta di Negara Bagian Oyo. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian deskriptif dengan jenis korelasional. Populasi penelitian terdiri atas 717 staf akademik di perguruan tinggi swasta di Negara Bagian Oyo, Nigeria. Ukuran sampel sebanyak 255 staf akademik ditentukan menggunakan tabel penentuan ukuran sampel Yamane, sementara kuesioner yang telah divalidasi digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data dari para responden. Data yang terkumpul dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif dan inferensial. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa faktor motivasi tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap produktivitas penelitian (Adj. R² = 0,010; p = 0,057), sementara faktor-faktor dominan yang menimbulkan motivasi juga ditemukan tidak berpengaruh signifikan secara statistik terhadap produktivitas penelitian ($\beta = 0,165$; $t = 1,790$; $p > 0,05$). Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa faktor-faktor dominan yang menimbulkan motivasi tidak secara kuat memengaruhi produktivitas penelitian. Penelitian ini merekomendasikan agar perguruan tinggi swasta meningkatkan dukungan dengan memfasilitasi akses hibah untuk kegiatan penelitian bagi staf akademiknya, serta agar staf akademik lebih meningkatkan keterampilan penelitian mereka.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



1. INTRODUCTION

Addressing social needs and advancing national development are the goals of research. In this regard, one could argue that the level and caliber of a nation's research productivity reflect its current state. Stated differently, no culture can truly advance past the depth and breadth of its research. As a result, one could argue that research makes a distinction between the world's developed and developing nations. This explains the enhanced and heightened emphasis being paid to research productivity and the numerous stakeholders involved in the process (Adekunle & Madukoma 2022). Research's critical role in the establishment of institutions is widely recognized, and its significance for the academic setting cannot be overestimated.

Research productivity is the overall quantity of research completed within a specific time frame. This includes giving speeches at seminars, publishing books or chapters in books, and publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals (Gabbay & Shoham 2019). Research productivity can be shown by the filing of patent applications, the publication of articles in respectable scholarly journals with a global readership, or the documenting of theoretical and practical studies (Ifijeh, Ogbomo, & Ifijeh 2018). Intangible research productivity such as obtaining research grants, editing duties, engaging in public debates and opinions on matters of public interest, supervising students' class projects and dissertations, teaching, and volunteer work are also included in the definition of research productivity (Smith, Kat, Philip, & Carter 2018).

On the other hand, university research can assist academic staff members in decision-making and help them appear on global rankings lists. Research productivity is generally seen as a key factor in success, which can lead to advancement, recognition, and a decent pay. University faculty members are keenly interested in the ways that research contributes to both the global economy and significant intellectual breakthroughs. This kind of impact is quite fascinating, especially when it is backed up by evidence and can be shown (Jalal 2020). Although research productivity is a complex concept, it may be measured with hard measures such as three themes that are based on academic, institutional, and individual leadership characteristics.

However, effective motivation of staff members is a key element in determining the overall productivity of the staff in any organization. It promotes the organization's healthy growth and development. In other words, motivation is a crucial element that improves the research output of university faculty. The word "motivation" is derived from the word "motive," which refers to a person's inner needs, desires, or impulses (Devancy, & Arquisola 2020). It entails encouraging others to act in order to accomplish their aims. A person's motivation is what steers their conduct, what makes them repeat a particular action, and vice versa. Thus, if these definitions are different, some similar characteristics like "direction"

and "goal" can still be mentioned (Bigirimana, & Sibanda 2016). The psychological aspects influencing staff behavior in the context of work goals include achievement, work environment, need for money, job satisfaction, respect, and achievement. Since motivation is an emotional phenomenon, creating an incentive program must take into account the needs and desires of the workers. As a result, staff motivation boosts productivity in any organization, but particularly in a university where staff who are generally contented and motivated tend to be content and successful.

A demotivated worker is likely to become a hindrance to the organization or resign from his or her position, which will encourage inefficiency, low productivity, or dedication in attaining the organization's goals and objectives. In order to increase their research productivity and the retention of the skilled workforce in their organization, it is therefore advisable for every university to take the initiative to identify the characteristics that enhance job happiness among academic staff (Yaya 2018). When handled effectively, incentive can be crucial to getting the most out of the academic staff while also boosting research productivity. Motivational elements raise job satisfaction, while hygienic factors lower it. Employees' thoughts are significantly impacted by motivational variables as they become more aware of their place in the company. They strive to infuse innovation into various working processes while maintaining a positive attitude. Employees that are both internally and externally driven consistently improve their professional competencies and coordinate their own objectives with those of the company to operate as efficiently as possible. To secure the best output and job results, companies should carefully evaluate the needs, psychological characteristics, and expectations of their employees. Employee motivation and job happiness typically affect how well they perform. Because it gives workers the freedom to function independently and effectively, empowerment is a terrific motivator. Employee motivation for their jobs is directly impacted by their working environment, as is a strong sense of cooperation. When the staff are well motivated, the level of their commitment will increased (Shahzad, Khan, Iqbal & Shabbir 2023). In the conventional Herzberg model, job satisfaction and unhappiness were depicted as two opposed ends of the same continuum. Later, contentment and discontent were divided into other categories, each of which was associated by a unique collection of characteristics. While motivators raised happiness, hygiene factors decreased dissatisfaction. The modified two-factor theory, which asserted that happiness and discontent were influenced by various sets of components, was therefore supported (Luzipho, Jourbert & Dhurup 2023). In the conventional Herzberg model, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were depicted as two opposed ends of the same continuum. Later, contentment and discontent were divided into other categories, each with its own set of contributing elements. While the motivators boosted satisfaction, hygiene factors decreased dissatisfaction. The modified two-factor theory, which asserted that happiness and discontent were influenced by various sets of components, was therefore supported (Yousaf 2020). Thus, hygiene factors, fulfilled the need to avoid unattractiveness situation while the motivation factors met the need of the individual for self-growth and self-

actualization (Alshmemri, Maude, & Phillip 2017). However, motivational factors will affect academic staff research productivity directly or indirectly. It is based on this premise that this study seeks to analyze motivational factors on research productivity of Academic staff in private universities in Oyo State.

2. METHOD

The study utilized a cross-sectional descriptive survey research approach, because it allowed the researcher to collect data at a given point in time across a sample population. The population of the study consists of all academic staff in private universities. The sample size of this study is Two hundred and fifty five (255). Sampling is a process that allows a researcher to scientifically choose who or what is included in an investigation. Specifically, the sample size was drawn from the total number of lecturers in two private universities that were purposively selected in Oyo State i.e. Lead City University, Ibadan and Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo. Taro Yamane (1967) published table was used to select the sample size for the study. The table at confidence level 95% with margin error of +5.0 was used to select sample size of 255 out of the total population of 717 academic staff identified for this study.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study in table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Gender wise, there are more females than male respondents. There are 152 female respondents which constituted 59.6% of the total respondents while there are 103 male respondents which means they constituted 40.4%. In term of institutional affiliation, majority of the respondents 161(%) were from Lead city University Ajayi Crowther University, while the rest, 94(%) are from Ajayi Crowther University, due to Lead City University has more academic staff than Ajayi Crowther University.

From academic attainment information reveals in table 1 again, there were 101 (39.6%) Ph.D. holders, followed by 154(60.4) MPhil/ Masters and others 0(0%). This data shows a diverse blend of qualification and educational backgrounds. This diversity was also shown in the positions held by the respondents. Those in the Assistant Lecturer status which is 61 which means they constituted about (23.9%). Majority of the respondents 76 are Lecturer II which is (29.8%) of the total respondents, while those in the Lecturer I status 58 constitutes (22.7%) of the total respondents. There are 60 Senior Lecturers which represents (23.5%) and 0 respondents for professor status. The demographic distribution is very important because some of the factors that determine self-efficacy include gender, role played and experience (Lase, & Hartijasti 2020).

Experience also has a role to play in the pressure or motivation of academic staff to conduct research. Among the study respondents, it can be seen that 77 (30.2%) has between <1-5 years' experience; 88 (34.5%) of them has between 6-10 years while 43(16.9%) have been lecturing for 11-15 years. Also, 35 (13.7%) of the respondents has experience between 16-20 years while few who has experience between 21-25 years 5 (2.0%), 26-30 years 0(0%) and 31and above years has 7 (2.7%). The combination of academic attainment, work

experience and gender are important in investigating the research self-efficacy of academic staff. In addition, the rank of academic staff may determine whether they would conduct more or less research (Emami, Rezaei, Sangani, & Goh 2019).

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to Demographics characteristics

	Items	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	103	40.4
	Female	152	59.6
	Total	255	100.0
Institutions	Lead City University	161	
	Ajayi Crowther University	94	
	Total	255	
Status	Professors	0	0
	Senior Lecturer	60	23.5
	Lecturer I	58	22.7
	Lecturer II	76	29.8
	Ass. Lecturer	61	23.9
	Others	0	0
	Total	255	100
Academic Qualification	Ph.D	101	39.6
	M.Phil/Masters	154	60.4
	Others		
	Total	255	100
Work Experience	<1-5	77	30.2
	6-10	88	34.5
	11-15	43	16.9
	16-20	35	13.7
	21-25	5	2.0
	26-30	0	0
	31&above	7	2.7
	Total	255	100

Source: Field survey 2023

Table 2 presents data on the factors that bring about motivation of the respondents. The two factors are intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors. The data presented shows that the highest prominent intrinsic factors of motivation by the respondents is received positive feedback from students research (Mean = 3.23). This shows that the academic staff received positive feedback from their student research. Followed by the respondents work because of the satisfaction they experience at work (Mean = 3.01), their job in this university gives me much pleasure (Mean = 2.98) and the least among is they have received appreciation from

my employer (Mean = 2.34). The average mean score 2.89 is high under decision rule and this shows that the intrinsic factors have influence on staff performance.

Furthermore, the most preferred extrinsic factors among academic staff is their job in this university gives them career satisfaction (Mean = 2.97). In addition, their job in their university provides them with security (Mean = 2.91), the respondents love their job in their university because the salary structure of employees is encouraging (Mean = 2.85) and the least is their contributions have been acknowledged with certificates (Mean = 2.19). This is low under decision rule, and this result shows that the respondents' contributions in their universities have not been acknowledged with certificate.

However, the intrinsic factors have the highest average mean 2.89, follow by extrinsic factors 2.73. The result is high and acceptable by the decision rule and the grand mean is (2.81).

Table 2: Analysis of the most prevalent factors that bring about motivation of Academic Staff in private Universities in Oyo State

Statement	TVHE	THE	TLE	TVLE	Mean	Std.Diation
Intrinsic Motivation Items						
I work because of the satisfaction I Experience at work	12 (4.7%)	235 (92.2%)	8 (3.1%)	-	3.01	.280
My job in this university gives me much pleasure	12 (4.7%)	227 (89.0%)	16 (6.3%)	-	2.98	.31
I have received positive feedback from students	61 (23.9%)	194 (76.1%)	-	-	3.23	.427
I have received appreciation from my employer	-	109 (42.7%)	126 (49.4%)	20 (7.8%)	2.34	.620
Average Mear	2.89					
Extrinsic motivation items						
My contributions have been acknowledged with certificates	6 (2.4%)	84 (32.9%)	119 (46.7%)	46 (18.0%)	2.19	.753
I love my job in this university because the salary structure of employes is encouraging	7 (2.7%)	214 (83.9%)	23 (9.0%)	11 (4.3%)	2.85	.518
My job in this university provides me with security	4 (1.6%)	229 (89.8%)	19 (7.5%)	3 (1.2%)	2.91	.361
My job in this university gives me career satisfaction	7 (2.7%)	235 (92.2%)	13 (5.1%)	-	2.97	.279
Average Mean	2.73					
Grand Mean	2.81					

Decision rule: 1.00 -1.49 = very low, 1.50 -2.49 =Low, 2.50 – 3.49 = High, 3.50 – 4.00 = Very high

Source: Fieldwork, 2023

Table 3 shows how the research productivity is measured under various dimensions such as individual characteristics, institutional characteristics and leadership characteristics.

The analysis shows that the dimension with highest means score of individual characteristics in academic staff research productivity is that the respondents find research activities stimulating (Mean = 3.30). This means that the academic staff find research activities stimulating is high. This dimension is followed by the respondents always ready to participate in research groups (Mean = 3.20) which means that most of the academic staff always ready to participate in research groups. However, the analysis also shows that while the editors/reviewers comments does not discourage the academic staff (Mean = 3.03), and academic staff rarely miss deadline for paper submission (Mean = 3.02). The average mean score (3.14) shows that the respondents individual characteristics is high which it has really contribute to their research productivity.

However, the analysis also shows that, the highest mean score of institutional characteristics is there are research groups in my institution the respondents can join (Mean = 3.11) followed by their institution promotes a culture of research and innovation (Mean = 3.10). Additionally, the respondents institutions ensures they have a enough time for research (Mean = 2.99) and also, their institution facilitates access to grant for research activities (Mean = 2.58). Thus, the average means score 2.95 shows that the institutional characteristics of the respondents is also high under decision rule and this has help their research productivity. Furthermore, the highest (Mean = 3.12) of leadership characteristics is there are many proficient researchers around me. This revealed that the respondents have many proficient researchers around them which as really improve their research productivity. In addition, the respondents supervisor/HOD encourages them to conduct research (Mean = 2.98) and also, they have access to mentoring that encourages research (Mean = 2.96). The supervisor/HOD encourages the respondents to see problems and challenges as opportunities to perform better (Mean = 2.85). However, the average mean score 2.97 which is also high under decision rule, reveal that the leadership characteristics have impact in research productivity of academic staff.

Individual characteristics have the highest average mean score 3.14 follows by leadership characteristics 2.97 while institutional characteristics is 2.95. These three measures falls under high under division of rule which is acceptable, this means that these three measures have great impact on academic staff research productivity.

Table 3: Distributions of response according to research productivity of academic staff in private universities in Oyo State.

Statement	SA	A	DA	SDA	Mean	Std. Deviation
Research Productivity						
Individual Characteristics						
I find research activities stimulating	78 (30.6%)	177 (69.4%)	-	-	3.30	.461

Influence of Motivational Factors on Research Productivity of Academic Staff in Private Universities in Oyo State, Nigeria

I am always ready to participate in research groups	53 (20.8%)	202 (79.2%)	- -	- -	3.20	.406
Editors/ Reviewers comments does not discourage me	46 (18.0%)	172 (67.5%)	37 (14.5%)	- -	3.03	.570
I rarely miss deadline for paper submission	38 (14.9%)	185 (72.5%)	32 (12.5%)	- -	3.02	.524
Average Mean Score					3.14	
Institutional Characteristics						
My institution facilitates access to grant for research activities	3 (1.2%)	145 (56.9%)	105 (41.2%)	2 (.8%)	2.58	.532
My institution ensures I have a enough time for research	3 (1.2%)	250 (98.0)	- -	2 (.8%)	2.99	.208
My institution promotes a culture of research and innovation	32 (12.5%)	221 (86.7%)	- -	2 (.8%)	3.10	.381
There are research groups in my institution I can join	38 (14.9%)	211 (82.7%)	4 (1.6%)	2 (.8%)	3.11	.427
Average Mean Score					2.95	
Leadership Characteristics						
I have access to mentoring that encourages research	17 (6.7%)	225 (88.2%)	- -	13 (5.1%)	2.96	.520
My supervisor/ HOD encourages me to conduct research	27 (10.6%)	197 (77.3%)	31 (12.2%)	- -	2.98	.477
There are many proficient researchers around me	39 (15.3%)	209 (82.0%)	7 (2.7%)	- -	3.12	.406
My supervisor/ HOD encourages me to see problems and challenges as opportunities to perform better	22 (8.6%)	175 (68.6%)	56 (22.0%)	2 (.8%)	2.85	.562
Average Mean Score					2.97	
Grand Mean					2.81	

Decision rule: 1.00 -1.49 = very low, 1.50 -2.49 =Low, 2.50 – 3.49 = High, 3.50 – 4.00 = Very high

Table 4a presents the results of linear regression analysis on the influence of Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff on research productivity of academic staff in private university, Oyo state. From the data presented in the table 4.6a , it can be seen that Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff has no significant value which indicates that it has no influence on research productivity among respondents. In addition to this, the research model also shows an R^2 value 0.014 and adjusted R^2 value of 0.010. This means that prevalence factors that bring motivation of academic staff can lead to a 1.00% variation in the research productivity among the academic staff in the selected university.

Table 4b presents the results of ANOVA (overall model significance) of the regression test which revealed that Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff

has no significant influence on research productivity of academic staff in private university in Oyo state, Nigeria. This can be explained by the F-value (3.651) and high p-value (0.057) which is not statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. Hence the result posited that prevalence factors that bring about motivation of academic staff has no significant influence on research productivity of academic staff in private university in Oyo state, Nigeria.

In addition, the results of regression coefficient in table 4c, revealed that Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff has no significant influence on research productivity of academic staff in private universities in Oyo start, Nigeria. Specifically, the analysis showed that at 95% confidence level, a unit change in Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff will lead to 0.186 increase in research productivity of academic staff in private universities in Oyo state, Nigeria. Therefore the null, hypothesis which states that there is no significant influence of Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff on research productivity of academic staff in private universities, Oyo state, is therefore accepted.

Table 4 : Summary of result of influence of motivational factors on research productivity of academic staff in private university

Model Summary ^a				
Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.119 ^a	.014	.010	3.03119

a. Predictors: (Constant), Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.543	1	33.543	3.651	.057 ^a
	Residual	2324.599	253	9.188		
	Total	2358.141	254			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff

b. Dependent Variable: Level of research productivity of academic staff

Coefficients ^c						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	
1	(Constant)	32.124	2.197		14.622	.000
	Prevalence factor that bring motivation of academic staff	.186	.097	.119	1.911	.057

a. Dependent Variable: Level of research productivity of academic staff

Source: Fieldwork 2023

4. CONCLUSION

The outcomes of several literatures pointed out that motivational factors are indispensable factors necessary for effective research productivity. Conversely, the study found that prevalence factors that bring about motivation of academic staff did not have

significant influence on research productivity of academic staff of selected private universities for this study. This could result from low or lack of motivation in terms of research grant disbursement, remunerations, academic research sponsorship and too much workload that reduces the time to attend to academic research activities of academic staff of selected private universities by their employers. This could dampen the motivation of academic staff of selected private universities towards research as compared to their counterparts employed in federal and state universities who received better motivations for academic research. Although, prevalence factors that bring about motivation of academic staff were found to be in the direction of positive relationship which show that, if motivational factors such as access to research grant, good working conditions, salary and mentoring were improved upon by employers in the study area as it is obtainable among academic staff of both federal and state universities; it should bring about a fundamental relationship and influence between motivation predictors of academic staff of selected private universities and their research productivity.

Based on the outcome of these findings the following recommendations were made;

1. It is important for private universities in Oyo State to increase their support by facilitating access to grant for research activities of their academic staff.
2. It is also important for private universities to ensure that their academic staff have lesser workload in order for them to have enough time for their research work.
3. Private Universities should motivate their academic staff by appreciating them in terms of giving them recommendation letters, acknowledgement with certificates, good salary structure and many more. This will give them job security and career satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Adekunle, A. P., & Madukoma, E. (2022). *Research self-efficacy and research productivity of doctoral students in universities in Ogun State. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 7097.
- Adekunle, P. A., & Madukoma, E. (2022). *Information literacy, critical thinking and research productivity of doctoral students in universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 7050. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/7050>
- Aithal, P. S., & Kumar, P. M. (2020). *Global ranking and its implications in higher education. SCHOLEGE International Journal of Business Policy & Governance*, 7(3), 25–47.
- Alemu, K. (2023). *Factors determining research productivity in Ethiopian universities: The case of Madda Walabu University. Social Science & Humanities Open*, 8, 100562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100562>.
- Alshmemri, M., Maude, L. S. A., & Phillip. (2017). *Herzberg's two-factor theory. Life Science Journal*, 14(5), 12–16.
- Bigirimana, S., & Sibanda, E. N. (2016). *The effects of working conditions on academic staff motivation at Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe. International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 4(1), 76–86. <http://www.eajournals.org>

- Devancy, L., & Arquisola, M. J. (2020). *Expectancy and sales personnel motivation to continue work performance during the COVID-19 pandemic*. <http://repository.president.ac.id/handle/123456789/7078>
- Jalal, A. (2020). *Research productivity in higher education environment*. *Journal of Higher Education Service Science and Management*, 3(1). <https://www.joherd.co/journals/index.php>
- Luzipho, N., Joubert, P. A., & Dhurup, M. (2023). *Job stressors, work tension and job satisfaction of academics at a university in South Africa*. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(1). <https://journal.co.za/doi/epdf/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.2015>
- Shahzad, K., Khan, S. A., Iqbal, A., & Shabbir, O. (2023). *Effects of motivational and behavioural factors on job productivity: An empirical investigation from academic librarians in Pakistan*. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 13(1). <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-328X/13/1/41>
- Yaya, J. A. (2018). *The essentiality of motivation on librarians' productivity in Nigerian public universities*. *Asian Journal of Contemporary Education*, 2(1), 19–35.
- Yousaf, S. (2020). *Dissection of Herzberg's two-factor theory to predict job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from the telecommunication industry of Pakistan*. *The Lahore Journal of Business*, 8(2), 85–128.