

INFLUENCE OF COMPENSATION PACKAGES ON THE PERFORMANCE OF PERSONNEL IN FUNDED HIGHER INSTITUTIONS

Adebowale, Israel Olukayode (Ph.D)

Department of Business Administration, Bamidele Olumilua University of Education, Science and Technology, Ikere Ekiti. Email: adebowale.israel@bouesti.edu.ng

Abstract

This study explores the impact of compensation packages, with a specific focus on salary and allowances, on staff performance within selected Higher Institutions in Ekiti State. The research employs regression analysis to investigate the relationships between these components and staff performance, providing insights into the critical role they play in higher education institutions. The findings reveal that salary exerts a significant positive influence on staff performance, with a coefficient of 0.780 and a p-value of 0.000. This underscores the importance of competitive salaries in motivating and enhancing the performance of university staff. These results align with established theories and prior research, emphasizing the value of competitive compensation in attracting, retaining, and inspiring employees. Similarly, allowances were found to significantly impact staff performance, supported by a coefficient of 0.832 and a p-value of 0.000. The study reaffirms the well-established principle that supplementary benefits and allowances contribute to employee job satisfaction and, consequently, heightened job performance. These findings carry practical implications for higher education institutions. To foster a motivated, committed, and high-performing workforce, institutions are encouraged to establish and maintain competitive salary structures, regularly review and adjust allowances, and implement performance-linked incentives. Additionally, a systematic performance appraisal system, ongoing professional development programs, and initiatives to enhance employee engagement are recommended. By implementing these recommendations, higher Institutions can optimize their human resource management strategies, cultivate a culture of excellence, and contribute to academic success, institutional growth, and the attainment of educational objectives.

Keywords: Compensation Packages, Salary, Allowances, Staff Performance, Motivation, Employee Benefits

Introduction

State-funded higher institutions, including universities and colleges, constitute the backbone of a nation's educational infrastructure. These institutions are entrusted with the critical mission of nurturing future leaders, advancing research frontiers, and fostering innovation all vital components of societal progress and development. Central to the success of these institutions is the performance of their personnel, including faculty members, administrators, and support staff. The factors that influence and shape this performance are of paramount importance.

Amongst the myriad of factors that impact personnel performance in state-funded higher institutions, compensation packages emerge as a fundamental and multifaceted driver. Compensation packages encompass a broad spectrum of remunerative and non-remunerative components, including base salaries, bonuses, benefits, and opportunities for professional growth and development (Blau & Kahn, 2017; Podsakoff et al., 2019). These packages are designed not only to attract and retain talented individuals but also to motivate and engage them in their roles.

In recent years, there has been a growing recognition of the intricate relationship between compensation and personnel performance within the higher education sector. Researchers have sought to explore how compensation affects job satisfaction, motivation, productivity, and commitment among personnel (Ng et al., 2019; Sagie et al., 2017). Moreover, the global competition for academic and administrative talent has heightened the need for state-funded higher institutions to offer competitive compensation packages (Altbach, 2019; Scott & Buchmann, 2011).

In the light of these considerations, this study examines into the complex interplay between compensation packages and the performance of personnel in state-funded higher institutions. By focusing on this connection, the study aims to shed light on the critical role compensation plays in shaping the academic and administrative landscape of these institutions, with a specific focus on the context of funded higher institutions in Ekiti State Nigeria, southwest, Nigeria. The importance of this study lies in its potential to inform and guide both institutional decision-makers and policymakers. Funded higher institutions face an array of challenges in their pursuit of academic excellence, research breakthroughs, and societal contributions. It is compulsory upon these institutions to ensure that their personnel are not only well-qualified but also motivated, satisfied, in order to be committed to their roles (Meng, 2018; Trow, 2007). Compensation packages are instrumental in achieving these objectives.

Objectives of the Study

- i. Examine the composition and structure of compensation packages offered to personnel in funded higher institutions within Ekiti State Nigeria.
- ii. Evaluate the influence of compensation packages on the motivation and job satisfaction of personnel in these institutions.

By addressing these objectives, we endeavor to provide insights that can help funded higher institutions optimize their compensation practices and, in turn, enhance the performance, satisfaction, and commitment of their personnel.

Literature Review

The relationship between compensation packages and the performance of personnel in state-funded higher institutions has been a subject of increasing interest among researchers and policymakers. This literature review synthesizes key findings and insights from prior studies, offering a comprehensive overview of the multifaceted impact of compensation packages on personnel performance within the context of higher education.

Components of Compensation Packages

Compensation packages in state-funded higher institutions encompass a variety of elements, both monetary and non-monetary, that collectively contribute to the overall remuneration and job satisfaction of personnel. These components include basic salaries, performance-based bonuses, retirement benefits, healthcare coverage, tuition assistance, research grants, and opportunities for professional development (Blau & Kahn, 2017; Podsakoff et al., 2019).

Numerous studies have highlighted the importance of competitive basic salaries in attracting and retaining qualified faculty members and administrators. The ability to offer salaries on par with or exceeding industry standards has been linked to institutions' capacity to recruit and retain top-tier talent (Altbach, 2019; Meng, 2018). Additionally, non-monetary benefits such as healthcare and retirement packages have been shown to play a pivotal role in overall job satisfaction (Chaudhuri & Ghosh, 2019).

Motivation and Job Satisfaction

One of the central themes in the literature on compensation packages in higher education is the role they play in motivating personnel and enhancing job satisfaction. Competitive compensation has consistently been associated with increased motivation among faculty and staff members (Ng et al., 2019; Sagie et al., 2017). Motivated personnel are more likely to engage in their roles with enthusiasm, contributing positively to institutional goals, and student outcomes (Hossler & Gallagher, 2018).

Job satisfaction, often linked to motivation, has emerged as a significant outcome of well-structured compensation packages. Research suggests that personnel who perceive their

compensation as fair and equitable tend to report higher levels of job satisfaction (Scott & Buchmann, 2011). This, in turn, influences their commitment to the institution and their willingness to go above and beyond in their roles in objective attainment (Ekeh & Nkamnebe, 2019).

Commitment and Retention

The literature consistently demonstrates the strong association between compensation packages and personnel commitment to their respective institutions. When personnel are content with their compensation, they are more likely to exhibit loyalty and commitment to their roles and the overall mission of the institution (Trow, 2007). This commitment can result in reduced turnover rates, ensuring institutional stability and continuity (Meng, 2018; Adams, 2019).

Challenges and Areas for Improvement

Despite the recognised importance of compensation packages, challenges and areas for improvement remain. Many funded higher institutions face budgetary constraints that limit their ability to offer competitive compensation (Altbach, 2019). Additionally, there is a growing call for more equitable distribution of compensation among different personnel categories, particularly addressing disparities between faculty and support staff (Hossler & Gallagher, 2018; Oseghale et al., 2017).

Methodology

The study adopted descriptive research design of a survey type. The population of the study encompassed all staff members at Ekiti State University and Federal University Oye, including both teaching and non-teaching staff. The study selected two universities in Ekiti State, namely Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti (EKSU), and Federal University, Oye (FUOYE). This were deliberately chosen due to their proximity and the choice of federal and stated funded. A total of 200 staff members were randomly selected for participation, with 100 staff members from each university. To gather data, a well-structured questionnaire was employed. The questionnaire consisted of two sections: Section A collected demographic information about the staff members, while Section B focused on aspects related to compensation packages. To ascertain the reliability of the questionnaire used in this study, a Cronbach's Alpha test was conducted. The test resulted in an alpha coefficient of 0.781, surpassing the accepted threshold of 0.7 (Okwudili, 2015b). Therefore, the questionnaire used in this concluded study can be considered reliable.

Model Specification

In the concluded study, a logistic regression model was employed to assess the impact of compensation packages, encompassing salary, incentives, bonuses, and allowances, on the performance of university staff in Nigeria. The specified logistic regression model was as follows:

$$L = \ln \left(\frac{P_i}{1 - P_i} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1SAL + \beta_4ALL + U$$

Where:

Pi represented the probability of compensation packages influencing staff performance.

SALSAL represented Salary.

INCENINCEN stood for Incentives.

BONBON signified Bonuses.

ALLALL denoted Allowances.

U represented the Error term.

Method of Data Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were employed. The descriptive analysis involved calculating percentages to present a comprehensive overview of the selected staff members' characteristics. Additionally, logistic regression analysis was used as the inferential analysis method to examine the established relationship between compensation packages and staff performance.

Table 1: Questionnaire Response Analysis

Questionnaires	Responses	Percentage (%)
Number of Filled	188	94.0
Number of Unfilled	-	-
Number Not Returned	12	6.0
Total	200	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2023

The result in Table 1 revealed that the breakdown of the questionnaire responses, including the number of filled questionnaires, the absence of unfilled questionnaires, and the number of questionnaires not returned.

Table 2: Background Information of the Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	157	83.5
	Female	31	16.5
	Total	188	100.0
Age	21-30	52	27.7
	31-40	60	31.9

	41-50	76	40.4
	Total	188	100.0
Educational Qualification	First Degree	143	76.1
	Higher Degree	45	23.9
	Total	188	100.0
Years of Membership	1-5 years	63	33.5
	6-10 years	33	17.6
	11-15 years	8	4.3
	16-20 years	51	27.1
	Above 20 years	43	16.8
	Total	188	100.0
Marital Status	Single	76	40.4
	Married	98	52.1
	Divorced	14	7.4
	Total	188	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 2 presents background information about the respondents in the study. It includes data on gender, age, educational qualification, years of membership, and marital status.

The majority of respondents are male (83.5%), while females make up the remaining 16.5% of the sample. Respondents are distributed across various age groups, with 27.7% in the 21-30 age group, 31.9% in the 31-40 age group, and 40.4% in the 41-50 age group. A significant proportion of respondents (76.1%) hold a first-degree qualification, while 23.9% have higher degrees. The years of membership among respondents are diverse, with 33.5% having 1-5 years of membership, 17.6% with 6-10 years, 4.3% with 11-15 years, 27.1% with 16-20 years, and 16.8% with above 20 years of membership. Respondents have varied marital statuses, with 40.4% being single, 52.1% married, and 7.4% divorced.

Table 3: Salary

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remark
The pay structure is appropriate and reasonable.	3.14	0.656	Agreed
The salary I receive for my job is equal to others doing similar work in other institutions	3.43	1.451	Agreed
The salary I receive is fair for my responsibilities	3.29	1.378	Agreed
Salary is gradually increased for all employees.	2.91	1.274	Agreed
Salary is always paid on time	2.77	1.375	Agreed
Staff at the same level earn the same salary.	3.09	1.618	Agreed

Source: Author's Computation (2023)

Table 3 presents respondents' perceptions and evaluations of various aspects related to their salary and compensation. The Mean values indicate the central tendency of the responses, while the Standard Deviation reflects the variability or dispersion in the responses.

The pay structure is appropriate and reasonable: Respondents, on average, moderately agreed (Mean = 3.14) that the pay structure in their institutions is appropriate and reasonable. The relatively low standard deviation (0.656) suggests that there is a relatively consistent perception among respondents regarding this aspect.

The salary I receive for my job is equal to others doing similar work in other institutions: Respondents, on average, agreed (Mean = 3.43) that their salary is comparable to that of individuals in similar roles at other institutions. However, the relatively high standard deviation (1.451) indicates a wider range of opinions among respondents, with some strongly agreeing while others may strongly disagree.

The salary I receive is fair for my responsibilities: On average, respondents moderately agreed (Mean = 3.29) that their salary is fair for the responsibilities they have in their roles. Similar to the previous item, there is notable variability in responses (Standard Deviation = 1.378).

Salary is gradually increased for all employees: Respondents, on average, agreed (Mean = 2.91) that salary increases are provided gradually to all employees. The standard deviation (1.274) suggests some variation in opinions, with some respondents strongly agreeing and others potentially disagreeing.

Salary is always paid on time: The average response indicates a moderate agreement (Mean = 2.77) that salaries are consistently paid on time. However, the relatively high standard deviation (1.375) implies varying perceptions among respondents regarding the timeliness of salary disbursements.

Staff at the same level earn the same salary: On average, respondents moderately agreed (Mean = 3.09) that staff at the same level in their institutions earn the same salary. The relatively high standard deviation (1.618) suggests that there is significant variability in opinions on this matter, with some strongly agreeing and others strongly disagreeing.

Table 4: Allowance

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remark
The institution provides medical insurance for employees.	3.09	1.618	Agreed
I take an active role in my team's success for a better reward.	2.67	1.505	Agreed
There are allowances given to staff on top of salary in this institution	2.87	1.334	Agreed
The institution gives lunch allowances for its employees.	2.74	1.250	Agreed
Annual bonus is paid to staff whenever performance exceeds set target	3.51	1.472	Agreed

Source: Author's Computation (2023)

Table 4 presents respondents' perceptions and assessments regarding various aspects related to allowances and rewards within their institution. The Mean values reflect the central tendency of the responses, while the Standard Deviation indicates the level of dispersion or variability in the responses.

The institution provides medical insurance for employees: On average, respondents moderately agreed (Mean = 3.09) that their institution offers medical insurance to employees. The relatively high standard deviation (1.618) suggests that there is a wide range of opinions among respondents, with some strongly agreeing while others may strongly disagree.

I take an active role in my team's success for a better reward: Respondents, on average, agreed (Mean = 2.67) that they actively contribute to their team's success to secure better rewards. Similar to the first item, there is a notable degree of variability in responses (Standard Deviation = 1.505).

There are allowances given to staff on top of salary in this institution: On average, respondents agreed (Mean = 2.87) that their institution provides allowances in addition to the basic salary. The standard deviation (1.334) indicates some variability in opinions, with some respondents strongly agreeing while others may have reservations.

The institution gives lunch allowances for its employees: The average response suggests moderate agreement (Mean = 2.74) that the institution provides lunch allowances for its employees. The standard deviation (1.250) implies varying perceptions among respondents regarding the provision of lunch allowances.

Annual bonus is paid to staff whenever performance exceeds set target: Respondents, on average, agreed (Mean = 3.51) that annual bonuses are awarded to staff when their performance exceeds

set targets. The standard deviation (1.472) suggests some variation in opinions, with some respondents strongly agreeing while others may hold different views.

Table 5: Staff Performance

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Remark
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my active career in this institution.	2.87	1.072	Agreed
I really feel as if this institution's problems are my own.	2.74	0.923	Agreed
I am emotionally attached to this institution.	3.51	0.574	Agreed
This institution has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	3.09	1.469	Agreed
I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution.	3.36	1.440	Agreed

Source: Author's Computation (2023)

Table 5 presents respondents' perceptions and sentiments regarding various aspects related to their performance and attachment to the institution they work for. The Mean values represent the central tendency of the responses, while the Standard Deviation reflects the level of dispersion or variability in the responses.

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my active career in this institution: On average, respondents agreed (Mean = 2.87) that they would be very happy to continue their careers within their current institution. The relatively low standard deviation (1.072) suggests a relatively consistent level of contentment among respondents regarding their future in the institution.

I really feel as if this institution's problems are my own: Respondents, on average, agreed (Mean = 2.74) that they genuinely feel as though the institution's problems are their own. The standard deviation (0.923) indicates a moderate degree of variability in opinions, with some strongly agreeing while others may have differing levels of identification with institutional issues.

I am emotionally attached to this institution: The average response indicates a strong agreement (Mean = 3.51) that respondents are emotionally attached to their institution. The relatively low standard deviation (0.574) suggests a high level of emotional attachment consistently among respondents.

This institution has a great deal of personal meaning: On average, respondents agreed (Mean = 3.09) that the institution holds significant personal meaning for them. However, the relatively high standard deviation (1.469) implies a range of opinions, with some strongly agreeing while others may hold different views regarding the personal significance of the institution.

I feel a strong sense of belonging to this institution: Respondents, on average, agreed (Mean = 3.36) that they feel a strong sense of belonging to their institution. Similar to the previous item, there is notable variability in responses (Standard Deviation = 1.440).

Hypothesis 1: Salary has no impact on staff's performance in selected Higher Institutions in Ekiti State

Table 6: Regression Analysis

Variables	Coefficient	Std Error	T-Statistic	Prob.
C (Constant)	21.283	1.496	14.226	0.000
Salary	0.780	0.086	9.031	0.000
R	-			
R-Square	0.305			
F-Statistics	81.563			
P-Value (F. Stat)	0.000			

Source: Author's Computation (2023)

Table 6 presents the results of a regression analysis aimed at testing Hypothesis 1, which posits that salary has no impact on staff's performance in selected higher institutions in Ekiti State.

The coefficient for the "Salary" variable is 0.780. This coefficient represents the change in staff performance for each unit change in salary. In this case, for every unit increase in salary, staff performance is expected to increase by 0.780 units. The standard error for the coefficient of Salary is 0.086. This represents the standard deviation of the coefficient estimate. The t-statistic for the Salary variable is 9.031. It measures the significance of the relationship between salary and staff performance. A higher t-statistic indicates a stronger relationship. In this case, the t-statistic is highly significant, indicating that the relationship between salary and staff performance is statistically significant. The "Prob." column provides the p-value associated with the t-statistic. The p-value measures the probability of obtaining the observed t-statistic if the true relationship between salary and staff performance is zero (i.e., no impact). In this case, the p-value is 0.000, which is less than the typical significance level of 0.05.

Therefore, the null hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) that salary has no impact on staff performance is rejected. The result indicates that salary does have a statistically significant impact on staff performance in the selected higher institutions in Ekiti State. The R-Square value is 0.305, indicating that approximately 30.5% of the variability in staff performance can be explained by the variation in salary. This suggests that salary is a significant predictor of staff performance.

The F-Statistics value is 81.563, and the associated p-value (P-Value) is 0.000. This F-Statistics tests the overall significance of the regression model. The low p-value indicates that the regression model as a whole is statistically significant, further supporting the conclusion that salary has an impact on staff performance.

Hypothesis 2: Allowances have no impact on staff's performance in selected universities in Ekiti State

Table 7: Regression Analysis

Variables	Coefficient	Std Error	T-Statistic	Prob.
C (Constant)	3.205	0.701	4.571	0.000
Allowances	0.832	0.047	17.752	0.000
R	-			
R-Square	0.629			
F-Statistics	315.120			
P-Value (F. Stat)	0.000			

Source: Author's Computation (2023)

Table 7 presents the results of a regression analysis aimed at testing Hypothesis 2, which suggests that allowances have no impact on staff's performance in selected universities in Ekiti State. The coefficient for the "Allowances" variable is 0.832. This coefficient represents the change in staff performance for each unit change in allowances. In this case, for every unit increase in allowances, staff performance is expected to increase by 0.832 units. The standard error for the coefficient of Allowances is 0.047. This represents the standard deviation of the coefficient estimate. The t-statistic for the Allowances variable is 17.752. It measures the significance of the relationship between allowances and staff performance. A higher t-statistic indicates a stronger relationship. In this case, the t-statistic is highly significant, indicating that the relationship between allowances and staff performance is statistically significant. The "Prob." column provides the p-value associated with the t-statistic. The p-value measures the probability of obtaining the observed t-statistic if the true relationship between allowances and staff performance is zero (i.e., no impact). In this case, the p-value is 0.000, which is much less than the typical significance level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) that allowances have no impact on staff's performance is strongly rejected. The result indicates that allowances do have a statistically significant impact on staff performance in the selected universities in Ekiti State.

The R-Square value is 0.629, indicating that approximately 62.9% of the variability in staff performance can be explained by the variation in allowances. This suggests that allowances are a significant predictor of staff performance. The F-Statistics value is 315.120, and the associated p-value (P-Value is 0.000. This F-Statistics tests the overall significance of the regression model. The low p-value indicates that the regression model as a whole is statistically significant, further supporting the conclusion that allowances have an impact on staff performance.

Discussion of Findings

In the analysis of the impact of compensation packages on staff performance in selected higher institutions in Ekiti State, two significant components, namely salary and allowances, stood out as key drivers of enhanced performance. In this discussion, I will delve into the findings related to these components and draw connections with previous researches to provide a broader context for results.

The analysis unequivocally demonstrated that salary exerts a substantial and positive influence on staff performance within the selected universities. The coefficient of 0.780, accompanied by a remarkable p-value of 0.000, attests to the statistical significance of this relationship. These findings are consistent with a wealth of previous researches in organizational psychology and human resource management.

Previous studies have consistently emphasized the critical role of competitive salary structures in attracting and retaining top talent, as well as in motivating employees to excel in their roles. Competitive salaries not only provide financial security but also serve as a potent incentive for staff to put forth their best efforts. The correlation between salary and staff performance is a well-established phenomenon supported by renowned theories such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory.

The findings, therefore, align with this extensive body of knowledge, reaffirming the critical importance of competitive salaries in elevating staff performance across both academic and administrative functions in higher education institutions.

Similarly, the analysis underscored the significant impact of allowances on staff performance within the selected higher institutions. With a coefficient of 0.832 and an associated p-value of 0.000, the statistical significance of this relationship is unmistakable. These results resonate with previous research in the field of employee motivation and performance.

Studies in organizational behavior consistently highlight the role of supplementary benefits and allowances in enhancing employee engagement and commitment. Allowances encompassing housing, transportation, medical benefits, and more contribute to the overall well-being of staff members, alleviating financial concerns and augmenting their job satisfaction. This, in turn, translates into heightened job performance.

The findings corroborate these well-established principles, suggesting that allowances play a pivotal role in motivating staff and subsequently raising their performance levels within the higher education institutional context.

In conclusion, the comprehensive analysis has lightened the critical role of compensation packages, specifically salary and allowances, in shaping staff performance within selected higher Institutions in Ekiti State. The findings of our study reinforce the significance of these components and offer valuable insights into optimizing human resource management strategies in higher education institutions.

Salary Impact: the study unequivocally demonstrated that salary has a substantial and positive impact on staff performance. The statistical significance of this relationship, with a coefficient of 0.780 and a p-value of 0.000, underscores the importance of competitive salaries in motivating and enhancing staff performance. This aligns with established theories and prior research, emphasizing the role of competitive salaries in attracting, retaining, and inspiring employees.

Allowances Impact: Likewise, the analysis revealed that allowances significantly influence staff performance. With a coefficient of 0.832 and a p-value of 0.000, the statistical significance is evident. The study reaffirms the well-established principle that supplementary benefits and allowances contribute to employee job satisfaction and, consequently, heightened job performance.

Recommendations

Building upon the findings, the study proposes the following recommendations for higher education institutions in Ekiti State and beyond:

Competitive Compensation Structures: Universities should prioritize the establishment and maintenance of competitive salary structures that reflect industry standards. Regular reviews and adjustments should be made to ensure that salaries remain attractive, commensurate with the responsibilities and qualifications of staff members.

Diversified Allowances: Institutions should consider diversifying their allowance offerings to meet the diverse needs of staff members. This includes housing, transportation, medical benefits, and other supplementary allowances that alleviate financial stress and enhance overall well-being.

Performance-Linked Incentives: Implementing performance-linked incentives, such as bonuses tied to achieving institutional goals and individual contributions, can further motivate staff to excel in their roles. These incentives can serve as additional recognition and rewards for outstanding performance.

Regular Performance Appraisals: Establish a systematic performance appraisal system to provide feedback to staff members and identify areas for improvement. Performance evaluations should be tied to compensation adjustments to recognize and reward exceptional performance.

Employee Development Programs: Invest in ongoing professional development programs that empower staff with new skills and knowledge. Staff members who perceive opportunities for growth and advancement are more likely to perform at their best.

Employee Engagement Initiatives: Foster a culture of employee engagement and involvement within the university community. Engaged employees are more likely to feel a strong sense of belonging and commitment to their institutions, resulting in enhanced performance.

Benchmarking and Best Practices: Regularly benchmark compensation and HR practices against peer institutions and industry leaders. Incorporate best practices to continually improve the compensation and motivation strategies.

References

- Adams, S. J. (2019). *Employee compensation: Theory, practice, and evidence*. Pearson.
- Altbach, P. G. (2019). The dilemma of compensation for academic staff. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *Leadership for a Better World* (pp. 259-274).
- Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(3), 789-865.
- Chaudhuri, A., & Ghosh, S. (2019). Compensation, job satisfaction, and organizational performance: Evidence from a developing economy. *International Journal of Manpower*, 40(6), 1095-1115.
- Ekeh, P., & Nkamnebe, A. D. (2019). Motivation, job satisfaction, and employees' commitment in Nigerian universities. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 41(3), 695-714.
- Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. (2018). *Understanding compensation in the academy: A survey of faculty attitudes, 2018*. TIAA Institute.

- Meng, L. (2018). Higher education funding and university faculty salaries: The role of financial resources in shaping faculty compensation. *Research in Higher Education*, 59(5), 561-587.
- Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Eby, L. T. (2019). LMX and employee voice: The roles of LMX differentiation and leader humility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(7), 783-798.
- Oburu, L. N., & Atambo, W. N. (2016). The effect of nonfinancial compensation on employee performance of microfinance institutions: a case of WakenyaPamoja Sacco, Kisii County, Kenya. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)*, 2(6).
- Ogochukwu, A. I., Olubayo, T. O. & Akinwunmi, K. O. (2018). Performance Related Pay and Organizational Commitment – evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 34 (4), 58-80
- Okwudili, B. E. (2015a). Effect of non-monetary rewards on productivity of employees among selected government parastatals in Abia State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR- JBM)*. 17(2), 6-11.
- Okwudili, B. E. (2015b). Influence of monetary rewards on performance of employees in food service industry in Abia State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR- JBM)*, 17(2), 1-5.
- Okwudili, B. E., & Edeh, F. O. (2017). THE effect of compensation on employee performance in Nigeria civil service: A study of rivers state board of internal revenue service. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 6(2), 8-16
- Oseghale, B. O., Aluede, O., & Omokaro, C. (2017). Job satisfaction and turnover intentions among academic staff in state universities in Edo State, Nigeria. *Educational Research*, 8(1), 1-10.
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2019). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(1), 60-93.
- Rahaman, M. S., Abdul, M. & Rahman, M. M. (2016). Organizational Commitment: Do Employees' Compensations and Benefits Matter? *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 18(10), 135-141
- Sagie, A., Aycan, Z., & Singh, R. (2017). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical and research perspectives. Springer.
- Scott, J. T., & Buchmann, K. (2011). Paying for performance in education: The impact of the Teacher Incentive Fund on student achievement. *Educational Policy*, 25(2), 258-290.
- Trow, M. (2007). Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII. In P. G. Altbach, L. Reisberg, & L. E. Rumbley (Eds.), *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution* (pp. 7-27). Sense Publishers.