

THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE IN MODERATING ¹THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATION AND ACADEMIC STAFF PERFORMANCE OF A SELECTED NIGERIAN UNIVERSITY

Michael A. Afolayan^{1*}, Alli T. Sulaiman², Lawal T. Owolabi², Ajayi Olukayode²,

¹*Dept. of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Science, Anchor University, Lagos, Nigeria*

²*Dept. of Business Administration, Yaba College of Technology, Lagos Nigeria*

Abstract

Career in academics can be a daunting task, given the challenges that surround the performance of academic staffs in Universities of higher learning. These challenges most come with psychological issues which the researcher must overcome, if he or she is to make any impact within the university systems. In this study, we examine the effects of organization structure of Universities on how the employees stay motivated to carry out their roles effectively. It was observed that an organizational culture such as the corporate university culture that does not foster academic freedom regardless of the motivation policies put in place, hampers academic staff performance.

1. Introduction

A career in academics is an arduous and challenging profession. Academics are threatened by challenging circumstances affecting their motivation, causing adverse psychological conditions, and precipitating turnover (Viseu, De Jesus, Rus, Canavarrro, & Pereira, 2016). Academics are required to achieve a stipulated level of work performance in order to maintain their strength and exuberance for work (Day, 2000). By encouraging employees to devote time and effort to the organization, motivation predicts performance significantly. Work motivation is therefore linked to and influences the work performance of employees (Heinz, 2015).

Universities need academic staff that are able to get the job done, because academic staff performance is critical to the overall success of the university (Geofrey, 2010). Institution leaders need to understand the key benefits of academic staff performance so that they can develop consistent and objective methods for evaluating academics (Egginton, 2010). Doing so helps determine strengths, weaknesses and potential managerial gaps in the institution. Although performance evaluations are rigorous and challenging, they help university leaders determine performance levels for employees' especially academic staff (Kallio & Kallio, 2014). One of the most important factors in employee performance is to achieve goals (Turk, 2010). Ranking results have been shown to affect institutional

*Corresponding author's email: mafoloyan@aul.edu.ng

reputation, ability to secure funding, and recruitment of students and academic staff. Today, universities around the world face increasing pressure to perform well in rankings. The performance of academic staff is one of the key factors affecting the performance of rankings (Sousa, et.al 2010). It is therefore important to foster a positive, energetic work environment by encouraging high-performing academics to cultivate a positive work environment.

Organizational culture plays a central role in achieving performance (Lok & Crawford, 2001). A university's organizational culture denotes the set of common standards regulating the conduct of employees (Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013). Organizational culture should be encouraged to ensure academic performance motivation (Sempene, Rieger, & Roodt, 2002). Motivated academics are honored in their work and are therefore responsible for organizational triumphs. Although culture is considered one of the leading organizational analytical frameworks, relatively few empirical investigations were carried out in the educational setting to incorporate culture into the evaluation of academic staff performance. A number of prominent scholars of culture have highlighted the importance of understanding the relationship between culture and performance academic staff of higher institutions. Ngeis-Isik and Gursel (2013) found that organizational culture determines an institution's success and influences the motivation and satisfaction of academics significantly. Irfan and Maezuki (2018) established the moderating effect in relationship between work motivation and academic staff commitment. However, earlier researchers stressed the potential moderating and mediating effect in the relationship between motivation and organizational performance; there is a lack of research on the moderating role of organizational culture in the relationship between motivation and performance of academic staff, particularly in the context of Nigeria. The present research therefore examined the moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationship between work motivation and work performance of academic staff of Nigerian Universities. Based on this background, the following hypothesis was developed:

H₀₁: Organizational culture does not moderate the relationship between motivation and academic staff performance

2. Literature Review

2.1 Employee Performance

Employee performance refers to a worker's expected job-related activities and the execution of those activities (Yusuf et.al 2014). Many managers periodically evaluate employee performance to help them identify suggested areas for improvement. Managing employee performance starts with the input of

the employee in planning the work or task (Shields, 2016). They become much more motivated to see the plan succeed when employees create a workable plan themselves or with their manager. Monitoring the progress and success of the employee is important for the manager and constantly checking whether expectations are being met. It is also relevant for managers to regularly rate and provide feedback to employees and, most importantly, to recognize them (Proteco, 2011). Providing clear and concise plans and expectations enables employees to know what is of utmost value to the organization and how best to do their job (Ahmad et.al. 2015). In the context of universities, the performance of academic staff is evaluated based on teaching, research and university service. In other words, the performance of an academic staff is hinged on teaching effectiveness, research output and engagement with university service.

2.2 Teaching Effectiveness

This refers to the ability to generate gains on student achievement scores, taking into account a baseline measure of prior student achievement and other student intake characteristics; the teacher effect is identified in relation to the progress of students measured by later achievement (Trowler, et.al 2014). Effective teachers strive to motivate and involve all their students in learning instead of just accepting that some students can not be engaged and are destined to do poorly (Parmer & Colins, 2006). They believe that every student can succeed at school and do their utmost to find ways to make every student successful. Teaching effectiveness is important because effective teaching helps student learning. It has become even more important measure of faculty performance as the emphasis on quality in higher education has increased (Hénard & Roseveare, 2012). Effective teaching does not occur by chance. Effective teachers have become good at what they do because they evaluate their practice.

2.3 Research Output

The definition of a publication is anything published: a book, a research paper, or a news article describing the research output (Kelly, et.al 2014)). If it is published in a journal or conference, it is a research paper that has been published, or a publication. Research output for a particular entity—whether an individual university or institution, a state or a country — is defined as the number of publications with at least one author affiliated with that entity (Carpenter, et. al 2014). Peer-reviewed publications in high-impact journals are the means for academic researchers to communicate new ideas and evaluate each other's contributions. Scholarly peer review is a practice whereby other experts in the same field scrutinize a drafted paper or manuscript; the draft will only be published if those experts

find it suitable for publication (Ross-Hellauer, 2017). This is why research output of an academic staff is considered a major measure of academic staff performance

2.4 University Service

University service, just as it is with teaching and research-scholarship is a traditional responsibility of university academics (Schimanski & Alperin, 2018). Service can take several forms: some examples include working for the benefit of the community, active participation in professional organizations, and serving the university through committee work, assigned projects, or participation in shared governance. Service is one machinery in which academics can dynamically contribute in improving the policies and procedures of the university, from department, college, and university, to the system level. Sustaining balance between quality teaching, scholarly pursuits and service can be demanding it is teaching and research-scholarship is a traditional responsibility of university academics (Schimanski & Alperin, 2018). Service takes many forms: some examples comprise working for the benefit of the community, vigorous participation in professional organizations, and serving the university through committee work, assigned projects, or involvement in shared governance. Service is one instrument in which academics can enthusiastically participate in improving the policies and processes of the university, from department, college, and university, to the system level. Maintaining balance between quality instruction, scholarly pursuits and service can be difficult. However, campuses have all developed retention, tenure and promotion documents to reflect how faculty performance in each of these components is valued at that institution (Gentry & Stokes, 2015)

2.5 Work motivation

Work motivation is a set of active forces that initiate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to control its form, direction, intensity, and duration (Nordhall & Knez, 2018). Understanding what motivates an organization's employees is crucial to the learning of Motivation. Motivation is a person's internal temperament to be concerned with, approach positive incentives, and evade undesirable incentives. While motivation can often be used as a instrument to help forecast behavior, it varies greatly among individuals and must often be joined with ability and contextual factors to actually impact behavior and performance. In the context of the university environment with particular regard to academic staff, fostering an environment where employees want to motivate themselves is more rewarding (Zhang, 2014). This is an environment or setting that stresses and emphasizes intrinsic motivation over extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation initiates or

results from an individual wanting or desiring to perform a task because of an inner or innate drive and satisfaction received and derived from performing the task (Peters, et.al 2018). However, extrinsic motivation is being motivated by outside influences, such as monetary incentives. Universities that have more intrinsically motivated employees generally have less turnover and a higher degree of job satisfaction among employees (Nyambegera & Gicheru, 2016). If people or individuals are intrinsically motivated, they are usually performing the work or job task because they truly enjoy it and receive satisfaction from their duties, which generally translates or results in employees being more engaged for the long run. Extrinsic motivation undoubtedly is important but if one is only doing a job or performing a task for the money, burnout or lack of interest in the position or the task in question could happen sooner, leading concerns such as lower morale and/or productivity, and even in some cases, high turnover.

2.6 Organisational Culture

The term organizational culture could be defined as the norms of behavior that succinctly define a business, firm or other organization. Organizational culture can not be regarded of itself as a positive or negative force; however, certain forms and practices of organizational culture can have either beneficial or negative effects on a company's ability to operate (Towers, 2006). In a top-down process, organizational culture is usually created. Workers look to their bosses, managers, and senior management for clues as to the type of behavior being rewarded in the workplace (Sokro, 2012). Once an organization is fully permeated by a certain type of culture, it can be very hard to change. It is often true that hiring new top-level management with fresh ideas is the easiest way to change the culture of an organization. Organizational culture can affect a workplace in a multitude of ways. It can have a negative impact if it does not allow a business to change, even if those changes would represent an improvement (Schneider, et.al. 2013). Organization culture, however, provides an essential framework for business employment by setting a standard for workplace behavior and encouraging stability and sense of identity in the face of inevitable turnover and changes in staff. McNay (1995) developed a model to describe higher education institutions' organizational culture on two specific dimensions: the form and intensity of control and policy and strategy focus. McNay's model displays four quadrants corresponding to as many types of university organizational culture: enterprise, comprising of firm policy and loose operational control, focus on market, external opportunities, and relationships with stakeholders; corporate, involving of tight policy and operational control, dominance of senior management, executive authority; collegiate, comprising loose policy and loose operational control, decentralization, focus on individual freedom; bureaucratic, involving loose policy and tight

operational control, focus on rules, regulations, and precedents. However, most private universities in Nigeria adopt corporate organizational culture where there is dominant control by the executive, which in this context is usually the proprietor. On the other hand, most public universities adopt collegiate organizational culture comprising decentralized system of governance and academic freedom.

3. Methodology

The survey method was employed in order to elicit information from the academic staff of the selected institution. This was appropriate because it enhanced the determination of statistically significant results.

3.1 Population of the study

The population consisted of all academic staff of Covenant University. The institution is adjudged the best university in Nigeria and West Africa. This feat among other factors is attributed to the research output of the institution, which is mainly a function the productivity of the institution's academic staff. Thus, 578 academic staff of Covenant University constituted the population of the study

3.2 Sample Size Determination

The sample size was derived using the Barlett, Kotrlik and Higgins (2001) formula. Therefore, based on a population of 578 at alpha value of 0.05 a sample size of 100 respondents were used for this study.

3.3 Sampling Techniques

Multistage sampling techniques was used for this research to enhance representativeness of the sample. Purposive sampling technique was used to select Covenant University as the study area and stratified sampling technique was used to categorize respondents based on different colleges of the institution. Convenience sampling was used to select respondents from the strata based on availability.

3.4 Measurement of Variables

Academic staff motivation was measured based on three items; financial rewards, promotion and staff training/development regime in line with the study of Panagiotakopoulos (2013). Academic staff performance was measured based on three items; teaching effectiveness, research productivity and university service in line with the study of (Cadez et.al 2015). Organizational culture centered on

corporate university culture was measured based on three items; operational control, dominance of senior management, executive authority in line with the study of McNay (1995).

3.5 Questionnaire Administration

Questionnaires were designed and distributed to a sample of the academic staff of Covenant University. In order to ensure the questionnaires are filled and returned, a contact person was used to follow up and collect them. One hundred (100) copies of questionnaire were distributed to the academic staff of the institution out of which eighty-nine copies (89) (representing 89%) were returned and adjudged usable. Ten (11) copies were either not returned or not properly filled representing 11% of the total copies of questionnaire distributed.

3.6 Method of data analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 25 was used for the analysis. Specifically, Hayes Process Macro used to examine the moderating role of organizational culture in the relationship between work motivation and academic staff performance in Covenant University.

4. Results:

4.1 Measurement Model Evaluation

For the assessment of measurement model, convergent reliability was conducted and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used for the assessment of composite reliability and the average variance extracted (AVE) of each construct.

Table 1

	Loading	Indicator Reliability	Error Variance	Composite Reliability	AVE	No of Indicators
Constructs and Indicators	> 0.7		< 0.5	≥ 0.8	≥ 0.5	
Organizational Culture				0.8044	0.7120	3

Operational control (OC1)	0.8780	0.7709	0.2291			
Dominance of senior management (OC2)	0.8670	0.7517	0.2483			
Executive authority (OC3)	0.8650	0.7482	0.2518			

All loadings are significant at $p < 0.05$

Source: Field Survey, (2019)

OC 01...03 are three measures of organizational culture. Table 1 depicts the convergent reliability and Confirmatory Factor Analysis used for the assessment of composite reliability and the average variance extracted (AVE) of each construct. According to recommendations from Biggs, Brough, and Barbour (2014), all scale and measurement items are significant in the research instrument. The loading factor is above the 0.70 threshold, each composite reliability also exceeds 0.80 and the average extracted variance estimate (AVE) is above 0.50. The loading factor for the specific construct measures ranged from 0.8780 to 0.8650. The degree of fitness of the model's measurements is therefore valid.

Table 2

	Loading	Indicator Reliability	Error Variance	Composite Reliability	AVE	No of Indicators
Constructs and Indicators	> 0.7		< 0.5	≥ 0.8	≥ 0.5	
Motivation				0.8209	0.8980	3
Financial rewards (M1)	0.901	0.8118	0.1882			
Promotion (M2)	0.901	0.8118	0.1882			
Training and development regime (M3)	0.900	0.8100	0.1900			

All loadings are significant at $p < 0.05$

Source: Field Survey, (2019)

M 01...03 are three measures of motivation of academic staff. Table 2 depicts the convergent reliability and Confirmatory Factor Analysis used for the assessment of composite reliability and the average variance extracted (AVE) of each construct. According to recommendations from Biggs, Brough, and Barbour (2014), all scale and measurement items are significant in the research instrument. The loading factor is above the 0.70 threshold, each composite reliability also exceeds 0.80 and the average extracted variance estimate (AVE) is above 0.50. The loading factor for specific construct measurements ranged from 0.901 to 0.900. The degree of fitness of the model's measurements is therefore valid.

Table 3

	Loading	Indicator Reliability	Error Variance	Composite Reliability	AVE	No of Indicators
Constructs and Indicators	> 0.7		< 0.5	≥ 0.8	≥ 0.5	
Performance				0.8215	0.7314	3
Teaching effectiveness (P1)	0.906	0.8208	0.1792			
Research output (P2)	0.901	0.8118	0.1882			
University service (P3)	0.898	0.8064	0.1936			

All loadings are significant at $p < 0.05$

Source: Field Survey, (2019)

P 01...03 are three measures of performance of academic staff. Table 3 depicts the convergent reliability and Confirmatory Factor Analysis used for the assessment of composite reliability and the average variance extracted (AVE) of each construct. According to recommendations from Biggs, Brough, and Barbour (2014), all scale and measurement items are significant in the research instrument. The loading factor is above the 0.70 threshold, each composite reliability also exceeds 0.80 and the average extracted variance estimate (AVE) is above 0.50. The loading factor for the specific construct measures ranged from 0.906 to 0.898. The degree of fitness of the model's measurements is therefore valid.

Test of Hypothesis

Model : 1
Y : employee
X : motivati
W : orgnizat

Sample
Size: 89

OUTCOME VARIABLE:
Academic staff performance

Model Summary

R	R-sq	MSE	F	df1	df2	p
.52	.27	.31	10.66	3.00	85.00	.00

Model

	coeff	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
constant	3.85	.06	60.75	.00	3.72	3.98
motivation	.54	.12	4.63	.00	.31	.76
org.cult.	.06	.09	.63	.53	-.12	.23
Int_1	.00	.10	-.01	.99	-.21	.20

Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):

	R2-chng	F	df1	df2	p
X*W	.00	.00	1.00	85.00	.99

In Step 1 of the moderation model, the regression of motivation on employee performance, ignoring the moderator, was significant ($R^2 = 27.0\%$ $F = 10.66$ $P < 0.05$). However, in step 2 when the moderator organizational culture was introduced into the model the effect of motivation moderated by organizational culture was not significant ($R^2\text{change} = 0.00$ $F = 0.00$ $P > 0.05$). This suggests that organizational culture driven by a corporate university culture of Covenant University does not moderate, foster or strengthen the effect of motivation on the performance of the academic staff of the institution.

4.2 Discussion of Findings

Findings from the results of analysis suggests that there is a direct effect of motivation driven by financial rewards, promotion, and employee training and development regime on the performance of academic staff of covenant university. Performance in this context includes teaching effectiveness, research output and university service engagement. This supports the study of Akinfolarin, and Babatunde (2014) which revealed that encouragement for creativity and innovation, appreciation on genuine effort, award with impressive titles and acknowledge on achievement enhances the

performance of university lecturers. It also resonates with the study of Bamgbose and Ladipo (2017) which found that various forms of motivations like job security, wages and salary, relationship with colleagues, staff appraisal, financial incentives, and reward were available to the library employees; and that most of the motivational parameters have influence on the performance of the library employees largely. However, findings from the results of this present study also shows that the organizational culture of Covenant University which is typically a reflection of corporate university culture, does not foster the relationship between motivation and academic performance of the academic staff of the institution. This finding contradicts previous studies such as Irfan and Marzuki (2018) who found that organizational culture moderates the relationship between work motivation and commitment of academic staff in Pakistan. However, the context of academic staff performance differs from that of commitment hence, a culture that fosters academic freedom is required to foster academic staff performance.

5. Conclusion

One of the major challenges of a corporate university culture is the absence of academic freedom. Academic freedom is the conviction that the freedom of inquiry by faculty members is essential to the mission of the academy as well as the principles of academia, and that scholars should have freedom to teach or communicate ideas or facts without being targeted for repression, job loss, or imprisonment. An organizational culture such as the corporate university culture that does not foster academic freedom regardless of the motivation policies put in place, hampers academic staff performance as revealed in this present study.

5.1 Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

The results of the study cannot have a high degree of generalizability due to contextual nature. Upcoming studies may be conducted on a larger sample, distributed across multiple geographic areas in both public and private sectors to augment the generalizability of the research. Besides, interviews may be conducted to take the real picture of organizational culture. The influence of motivation and organizational culture on academic staff performance were investigated in the current study. Future research should study other contextual variables as moderators or mediators in different cultural context. Particularly, further research is suggested to explore the effects of work motivation on employee performance and investigate the preferred organizational culture along with the existing culture.

References

- Ahmad, T., Farrukh, F. & Nazir, S. (2015), "Capacity building boost employees performance", *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 47(2), 61-66.
- Akinfolarin, V. & Babatunde, G.E. (2014). Motivation and Effective Performance of Academic Staff in Higher Education (Case Study of Adekunle Ajasin University, Ondo State, Nigeria). *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*. 1. 157 -163.
- An ethnographic case study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(1), 221-228.
- Anunobi CV, Emerole N 2008. Motivation and encumbrances to research and publication: The case of Nigerian Library and Information Science (LIS) practitioners. *Educational Research and Review*, 3(2): 066-072.
- Bamgbose, A. A., & Ladipo, S. O. (2017). Influence of motivation on academic library employees' performance and productivity in Lagos, Nigeria. *Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 8(2), 33-47.
- Bartlett, J.E., Kotrlik, J.W., & Higgins, C.C. (2001). Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal*, 19(1), 43-50.
- Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. (2014). Strategic alignment with organizational priorities and work engagement: A multi-wave analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(3), 301–317.
- Cadez, S., Dimovski, V., & Zaman Groff, M. (2015). Research, teaching and performance evaluation in academia: the salience of quality. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-19. doi:10.1080/03075079.2015.1104659
- Carpenter, C.R., Cone, D.C., and Sarli, C.C. (2014). Using publication metrics to highlight academic productivity and research impact. *Acad. Emerg. Med*. 21, 1160.
- Day, C. (2000). Stories of change and professional development: The costs of commitment. In C. Day, A. Fernandez, T. Hauge & J. Moller (Eds.), *The life and work of teachers: International perspectives in changing times* 109–129. London: Falmer Press.
- Egginton, B. (2010) "Introduction of Formal Performance Appraisal of Academic Staff the Management Challenges associated with effective implementation". *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 38, 1, 119–133.
- Gentry, R., and D. Stokes. 2015. Strategies for professors who service the University to earn tenure and promotion.
- Geofrey, Y. (2010). Motivation and Academic Staff Performance in Public Universities in Uganda: The Case of Makerere University. Retrieved from <http://dspace.mak.ac.ug/handle/123456789/1339>
- Heinz, M. (2015). Why choose teaching? An international review of empirical studies exploring student teachers' career motivations and levels of commitment to teaching. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 21(3), 258–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2015.1018278>.

Hénard F. & Roseveare D. (2012). Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. An IMHE guide for higher education institutions, 7– 11.

Irfan, S. & Marzuki, A. (2018). The Moderating Effects of Organizational Culture on the Relationship between Work Motivation and Work Commitment of University Academic Staff. *International Journal of Learning and Development* 8(1) 137-155.

Kallio, K. M. & T. J. Kallio (2014) “Management-by-results and performance measurement in universities – implications for work motivation”. *Studies in Higher Education* 39, 4, 574–589.

Kelly, J., Sadeghieh, T., and Adeli, K., (2014). Peer review in scientific publications: benefits, critiques, & a survival guide. *EJIFCC*, 25(3), 227.

Lee, M & Kim, H. (2017). Exploring the Organization Culture’s Moderating Role of Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on Firm Performance: Focused on Corporate Contributions in Korea. *Sustainability* 10, 1883.

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2001). Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(8), 594-613.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000000006302>

McNay, I. (1995). Universities going international: choices, cautions and conditions, in P. Blok (ed.), *Policy and Policy Implementation in Internationalisation of Higher Education*, Amsterdam: EAIE.

Ngeis-Isik, A., & Gursel, M. (2013). Organizational culture in a successful Primary School:

Nordhall, O., & Knez, I. (2018). Motivation and Justice at Work: The Role of Emotion and Cognition Components of Personal and Collective Work Identity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 2307

Nyambegera, S. M., & Gicheru, C. N. (2016). Extrinsic and Intrinsic Factors Influencing Employee Motivation: Lessons from AMREF Health Africa in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 6(9), 20-31.

Palmer, A. & Collins, R. (2006). Perceptions of rewarding excellence in teaching: Motivation and the scholarship of teaching. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30 (2), 193–205.

Panagiotakopoulos, A. (2013). The impact of employee learning on staff motivation in Greek small firms: the employees' perspective. *Development and Learning in Organizations an : International Journal*, 27(2), 13–15.

Peters, D., Calvo, R. A., & Ryan, R. M. (2018). Designing for motivation, engagement and wellbeing in digital experience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1–15.

Proteco, K. (2011), “Human Resource Development and Employee Performance”, *International Journal of Development and Resource Management*, 7(3) 45-70.

Ross-Hellauer, T. *F1000Research* 6, 588 (2017).

Schimanski L, & Alperin JP. 2018. The evaluation of scholarship in the academic promotion and tenure process: Past, present, and future. *F1000Research* 5: 1605. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.16493.1>

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 361-388. Retrieved from 10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143809

Sempane, M. E., Rieger, H. S., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 23-30.

Shields, J. (2016), *Managing Employee Performance and Reward: Concepts, Practices and Strategies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Sokro, E. (2012). Analysis of the relationship that exists between organizational culture, motivation and performance. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 3, 106-119. Retrieved from www.scientiasocialis.lt/pmc/files/pdf/Sokro_Vol.3.pdf

Sousa, C. A. A., W. F. Nijs, & P. H. J. Hendriks (2010) "Secrets of the beehive: performance management in university research organizations". *Human Relations* 63, 9, 143–1460.

Towers, D. (2006). An investigation whether organizational culture is directly linked to motivation and performance through looking at Google Inc. An unpublished extended essay, 1–31.

Trowler P., Ashwin P., & Saunders M. (2014). The role of HEFCE in teaching and learning enhancement: A review of evaluative evidence. www.heacademy.ac.uk/about/news/role-hefce-teaching-and-learningenhancement

Türk, K. (2010) "Performance management of academic staff in the faculty of economics and business administration at Tartu University (pluses and minuses)". In 5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology. Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE ICMIT, 624–629. Singapore.

Türk, K. (2010) "Performance management of academic staff in the faculty of economics and business administration at Tartu University (pluses and minuses)". In *5th IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology. Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE ICMIT*, 624–629. Singapore

Viseu, J., De Jesus, S. N., Rus, C., Canavarro, J. M., & Pereira, J. (2016). Relationship between teacher motivation and organizational variables: A literature review. *Paideia*, 26(63), 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1982-43272663201613>

Vujcic, M. T., Oerlemans, W. G. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). How challenging was your work

Yusuf, M.O., Muhammed, U.D., & Kazeem, A.O. (2014). Management of Leadership Style: An Approach to employee performance and Effectiveness in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, 1(2), 17-29.

Zhang, X. (2014). Factors that motivate academic staff to conduct research and influence research productivity in Chinese Project 211 universities. Doctoral dissertation, University of Canberra.