

Motivational Strategies and Security Service Delivery in Universities in Cross River State, Nigeria

Comfort R. Etor¹, Michael E. Asuquo^{1*}

¹Department of Educational Management, University of Calabar, Calabar-Nigeria

* Corresponding Author

Email: mikeasuquo2015@gmail.com

Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.5528849

Abstract

This study assessed two motivational strategies and their respective ties to the security service delivery in public universities in Cross River State. In achieving the central and specific targets of this research, four research questions and two null hypotheses were answered and tested in the study. The entire population of 440 security personnel in two public universities was studied, based on the census approach and following the ex-post facto research design. Three sets of expert-validated questionnaires, with Cronbach reliability estimates of 0.80, 0.79 and 0.83 respectively, were used for data collection. Collected data were analysed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics such as Pearson Product Moment Correlation and the One-way ANOVA. The level of incentives provision and security service delivery in universities was moderate. There were notable disparities between promotion, provision of incentives and security service delivery in universities. Security personnel discharged on average, services beyond the extent of promotion and incentives provided to them. Provision of incentives did not relate significantly to security service delivery; however, staff promotion significantly influences security service delivery in universities. It was concluded that there are loopholes in the motivational practices of universities to security personnel. The service delivery of security personnel at universities in Cross River State is yet to be at an acceptable point that can promote institutional safety and goal attainment in the short- and long run. It was recommended, among other things, that security personnel who are due for promotion should not be denied such an opportunity, as it represents one of the strongest motivational factors in universities.

Keywords: Incentives, motivation, personnel, promotion, security, service delivery.

Cite as: Etor, C. R., & Asuquo, M. E. (2021). Motivational strategies and security service delivery in universities in Cross River State. *International Journal of Educational Administration, Planning & Research*, 13(1), 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5528849>

Introduction

The works of the security staff are enormous. They patrol the school premises to ensure that buildings and equipment and offices are secured. They prevent losses and damage by reporting irregularities to the appropriate authority. However, it has been observed that some of these officers are not doing their work as expected. When there are challenging situations like rioting by students, invasion of the staff quarters by hoodlums, cases of theft in the offices and hostels,

some of this security personnel are not readily available to arrest the situation. According to Arop and Owan (2018),

engagement in these activities sometimes has led to killings, destruction of properties and threats posed to individuals within the setup. The external invasion into schools to put teachers and students into fear, and the damages caused is an indication that most of our institutions are not safe. Such security threats need to be defined, acknowledged and prevented. If something drastic is not done, the existing security threats such as invasion, terrorism, bombing, armed insurgency robbery and lack of proper physical security facilities like fences, good security personnel could spiral out of control, leaving a large number of students fearful, injured and deceased (p.3).

The researchers now wonder whether the nonchalant attitudes of this personnel are a result of a lack of motivational strategies such as promotion and provision of incentives. This is because every worker has a motive for working, which pushes them to behave or act the way they do. Motivation is those processes in a person which propels, stimulates, sustains and directs behaviour in ways that can bring benefit to the organization (Miner, cited in Lunebury & Ornstein, 2008). It is a set of energetic forces within and beyond an individual to exhibit or adopt work-related behaviour and also determine its form, focus intensity and duration (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In an era of terrorism, the above suggests that the administrators in universities can adopt some motivational strategies to motivate security personnel to help them in carrying out their work properly. The reason is that every worker, including security personnel need some level of extrinsic motivation for quality service delivery. Extrinsic motivation occurs when leaders do things to, or for people to spur them up to do better (Armstrong, 2009). The author also enlisted incentives, promotion for all staff and punishment (disciplinary action for the erring ones) as motivational strategies. The focus of this paper is to examine the extent to which university administrators motivate security personnel (through regular promotion and provision of incentives) and its impact on service delivery.

Promotion

Promotion, in some cases, can motivate an individual to work harder; but in other cases, workers who have been promoted to higher levels have been observed to pay less attention to their job. "Promotion is simply increasing the ranks of an employee based on their level of commitment, qualifications obtained, and years of service. It is usually done in years which vary from one organization to another" (Agunwa et al., 2019, p.393). It is the advancement of a worker from one job position to another with higher pay, designation, benefits and drastic change in job activities in some organizations (Heathfield, 2003; Your Article Library [YAL], 2015). This position has also been buttressed that staff are usually motivated when they have opportunities for advancement on the job through promotion, but where there are no opportunities for advancement workers tend to work at convenience (Ajayi, 2007). This may be the reason why Akpakwu (2012) reiterated that when staff are not promoted, they may become resentful and develop low morale, which may affect their performance and cooperation

with the management of their institutions. YAL (2015) stressed that industrial unrest, negative feeling, frustration; and job dissatisfaction among employees are on account of lack of promotion.

Murunga (2014) studied the effects of working conditions of private security guards on service delivery in Nairobi County. The findings showed that most guards had left private security companies due to low wages and salaries, poor work environment and mistreatment by supervisors, no promotion, working for long hours, poor working tools which expose them to more danger. In another study carried out by Achumba et al. (2013) on the role of stakeholders in the provision of security in higher institutions in Ghana. The result of one of the hypotheses revealed that there is a significant relationship between the regular promotion of security staff and improvement in their job performance. Accordingly, the security officers who were regularly promoted tend to be more committed to their jobs than those who were not. That is why Ukegbu cited in Etudor, Akwegwu and Etor (2007) and your article.com (2015) stated that promotion brings along with it more money, recognition of the individual performance, injects new life into the individual, activates his knowledge, skills and motivates him for effective job performance.

Susan et al. (2012) study on the influence of motivation on performance in the public security sector in Kenya revealed that there is a strong influence on the performance of regular police officers attributable to units of change in motivation. The finding suggested that the motivation of officers positively influence their performance which in the long run impacts the security situation as a whole. It was recommended that government and other concerned stakeholders should adequately motivate the police for improved service delivery.

Incentives

Incentives, as defined by Heathfield (2013), is an item of value or event which propels an employee to do more of what an employer encouraged through the chosen incentive. This means that an incentive must be an item that has value and spurs the worker to high productivity. To motivate workers to higher performance, employers can use an incentive wage system which is a form of direct compensation (Federick in Abraham & Nwabueze, 2017). Kelly (2012) also reiterated that any organization that is bent on encouraging productivity among workers often opt for an incentive programme for them. Incentive must be something the worker perceives as useful and valuable even though it may not be money. Wikipedia (2015) outlined the uses of an incentive programme to include reducing turnover, improving workers' wellness, boosting morale and loyalty of employees, increasing retention and propelling workers' performance on daily basis. This means that incentive programme in our universities can help our security officers who risk their lives daily to be effective in their job and also remain loyal to their employers.

Ogbuagu (2016) maintained that incentives are of two types – monetary and non-monetary. Monetary incentives satisfy the workers by providing them with cash reward which satisfies their social needs. Non-monetary incentives are non-financial incentives that can

satisfy the ego and self-actualizing needs of employees. These include security of service, praise or recognition, job enrichment. Incentives as described by Ozoemena (2013) are external measures put in place to influence and motivate individuals, groups or organization for better work performance. They are external measures because they are extrinsic to the work to be performed. These are what Herzberg (1968) referred to as hygienic or environmental factors that motivate workers and provide job satisfaction, such as salary, working conditions and job security. Incentives at work also include bonuses, awards, oral and written commendations for job performance, car loan, housing allowance, or loans to build personal houses and so on. These may motivate workers for improved performance at work. However, motivation indicators like promotion welfare, training, financial and non-financial incentives, recognition and so on may determine a workers' feeling whether they are indifferent, discouraged, disillusioned or generally dissatisfied (Ndum & David, 2010). These negative feelings could be reduced by using motivational factors such as regular promotion, financial benefits, a conducive physical working environment and so on (Etudor et al., 2007).

Ekpo (2010) in a study on incentives and staff attitude to work found that staff who received incentives exhibited a positive and favourable attitude to work than those who did not. This may be because such workers' morale is boosted by such recognition. Bakuwa et al. (2013) studied staff retention in developing countries. The findings of this study revealed that it was the non-financial/intangible rewards and not the financial package that significantly contributed to employees' feeling of satisfaction and their intention to continue working. That is why Erbasi (2012) also pointed out that many people are influenced more by non-monetary than monetary considerations. Nalla et al. (2016) studied the influence of organizational and environmental factors on job satisfaction among security guards in Singapore. The finding revealed that security guards and security supervisors' support, innovation, pay and benefits and support from non-security employees affect the participants' job satisfaction. These findings suggest that benefits such as incentives can engender job satisfaction which may cause a worker to take his or her work seriously.

Research questions

1. What is the level of security service delivery in Universities in Cross River State?
2. What is the level of the provision of incentives in universities?
3. What is the disparity between promotion and security service delivery in universities?
4. What is the disparity between the provision of incentives and security service delivery in universities?

Statement of hypotheses

1. There is no significant influence of promotion on security service delivery in universities
2. There is no significant relationship between the provision of incentives and security service delivery.

Methodology

The ex-post facto research design was used in this study. This research design is an empirical inquiry in which the researchers does not have direct control of the independent variable since their manifestations had already occurred. The population of the study comprised 440 security personnel in the University of Calabar and Cross River University of Technology. Census technique, which allows the usage of the entire population was used for this study. The sample size of this study was 440 security personnel gathered from the two universities.

The three instruments used for the study were tagged Promotion of Security Personnel Questionnaire (PSSQ), Provision of Incentives Questionnaire (PIQ) and Security Personnel Service Delivery Questionnaire (SPSDQ). The instruments were developed and validated by the researchers. The validity estimates of the instrument were determined using Cronbach Alpha Analysis and the reliability coefficient of 0.80, 0.79 and 0.83 were obtained. PSSQ sought information on the promotion, PIQ sought information on the provision of incentives while SPSPDQ sought information on security personnel service delivery. PSSQ measured 7 items, PIQ measured 7 items while SPSPDQ measured 14 items. Each item was weighed on a 4-point rating scale which ranged from Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD).

The instruments were administered to security personnel in the two universities with the help of two assistants who were briefed on how to guide the respondents to tick the responses. The questionnaire copies were retrieved by the assistance after a few days. 400 copies of the questionnaire were correctly filled and returned signifying a 91% return rate. Descriptive statistics, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis were used to analyze the data. Analysis of data involved both descriptive and inferential tools. Means were used to providing answers to the research questions, while ANOVA and Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used for testing the hypotheses. A decision rule was made for the research questions. A cut-off point of 2.50 was established as the mean result for the two research questions. A mean score below 2.45 was regarded as inadequate, a mean score of 2.50-2.99 was regarded as moderate while a mean score of 3.00 and above was regarded as highly adequate accordingly.

Results

Research question 1

What is the level of security service delivery in Universities in Cross River State? Table 1 shows on a general note that the level of security service delivery in universities in Cross River State is moderate ($\bar{X} = 2.63$). Specifically, the availability of security officers on campus, protection of negative occurrence on campus and interrogation of suspicious people with mean scores of 2.08, 2.27 and 2.08 respectively, were rated as being low by the respondents. However, the

presence of security officials at the gate was rated highly. Apart from these, other specific security services were rated moderately by respondents.

Table 1: Security service delivery in Universities in Cross River State Descriptive statistics

Security service delivery	Mean	SD	Remark
Always everywhere on campus	2.08	1.02	Low
Always on various gates	3.52	.53	High
Protection of negative occurrence	2.27	.84	Low
All being able to detect crime	2.69	.94	Moderate
Few being able to detect crime	2.75	.95	Moderate
Very unserious	2.62	.90	Moderate
Very few found on duty post	2.65	.91	Moderate
Foiling security challenges	2.94	.92	Moderate
Walking around offices and classes	2.71	.90	Moderate
Checking of non-university members	2.57	.92	Moderate
Interrogation of people	2.08	.79	Low
Report disorders to authorities	2.62	.92	Moderate
Protection of formal gathering	2.75	.93	Moderate
Protecting vandalization	2.62	.91	Moderate
Average	2.63	.88	Moderate

Research question 2

What is the level of the provision of incentives? Table 2 showed that all the items on the provision of incentives to security personnel were rated as moderate because the mean of the items were all above 2.50 but not up to the 3.00 high benchmark.

Table 2: Provision of incentives for security personnel in universities

Variable	Mean	SD	Decision
Being always provided	2.70	1.00	Moderate
Being never benefited by all	2.66	.95	Moderate
Being given to those who work hard	2.71	.93	Moderate
Being given to leaders alone	2.58	.95	Moderate
Serving as a motivator factor	2.73	.95	Moderate
Being not commensurate with the effort	2.72	.96	Moderate
Being given sparingly	2.83	.89	Moderate
Average	2.70	.95	Moderate

Research question 3

What is the disparity between the promotion of security personnel and security service delivery? The result in Table 3 showed that the mean promotion rate in universities was 18.90, while the security delivery rate was 36.85. The disparity between the promotion of security personnel and security service delivery is revealed by the mean difference of 17.95 in favour of service delivery. This implies that the extent of security service delivery in universities in Cross River State is greater than the promotion of security personnel.

Table 3: Disparity between the promotion of security personnel and service delivery

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference
Promotion of security personnel	400	18.90	2.36	17.95
Service delivery	399	36.85	3.48	

Research question 4

What is the disparity between the provision of incentives and security service delivery in Universities in Cross River State? Results in Table 4 showed that the extent of the provision of incentives was a mean of 18.92, while the extent of security service delivery was rate with a mean of 36.85. The disparity between the provision of incentives and security service was revealed through the mean difference of 17.93. The results further revealed that there was a higher extent in the service delivery of security personnel than the provision of incentives.

Table 4: Disparity between the provision of incentives and security service delivery

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Mean difference
Provision of incentives	400	18.92	2.59	17.93
Service delivery	399	36.85	3.48	

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant influence of promotion on security service delivery in universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. The result in Table 5 showed that the calculated F-value of 2.06 is significant with a p-value of .04 at 0.5 level of significance with 2 and 396 degrees of freedom. With this result, the null hypothesis was rejected. This result implies that the promotion of security personnel has a significant influence on service delivery in universities in Cross River State.

Table 5: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the influence of promotion on security service delivery in universities

Staff promotion	N	X	SD		
Regular promoted	108	36.77	3.31		
Rarely promoted	239	36.85	3.45		
Not promoted at all	52	37.04	4.01		
Total	399	36.85	3.48		
Sources of variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between groups	2.56	2	1.28	2.03	.04
Within groups	4829.71	396	12.20		
Total	4832.28	398			

p> = .05, df = 2, 396.

Hypothesis two

There is no significant relationship between the provision of incentives and security service delivery in Universities in Cross River State. The data in Table 6 showed that the observed correlation coefficient of .28 is less than the critical value of .09 needed for significance at .05 alpha level with 398 degrees of freedom. With this result, the null hypothesis was upheld. This implies that the provision of incentives to security personnel has a weak but positive relationship with security service delivery in Universities in Cross River State.

Table 6: Results of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis (r) of the relationship between the provision of incentives and security service delivery in universities

Variable	Mean	SD	r
Provision of incentives	18.91	2.59	0.28
Service delivery	35.24	7.10	

*p < .05; df = 398; critical value = .282

Discussion

The study aimed to connect promotion and incentives to security service delivery in universities. After data collection and analysis, this study established that the level of security service delivery in universities was moderate. This result was due to the moderate extents in security personnel ability to detect crime, be serious, be on duty post, foil security challenges, walk around offices and classes, check for non-university members, report disorders to authorities, protect formal gatherings, and protect vandalization. Although the presence of security personnel at various gates was high, their mere presence at the gates without a corresponding high service input makes them passive. This is because most of them are just at the entrance points, without being present on campus, protecting negative occurrences on campus and interrogating suspicious people. This finding aligns with the result of Murunga (2014) which showed that most guards had left private security companies due to low wages and salaries, poor work environment and mistreatment by supervisors, no promotion, working for long hours, poor working tools which expose them to more danger

This study also established a moderate extent in the provision of incentives to security personnel. The reason for this result may be attributed to the moderate extent in the way incentives are being always provided, benefited by all, given to those who work hard, commensurate with effort. It could also be because incentives are given sparingly and sometimes to leaders alone or because they did not serve as motivational factors. This position was confirmed by one of the core findings of this study that there were notable disparities between promotion, provision of incentives and security service delivery in universities. Security personnel discharged on average, services beyond the extent of promotion and incentives provided to them. This implies that security personnel were not adequately motivated through incentives, and where they were provided, they did not bring any additional motivation

to security personnel. This position contradicts the result of Ekpo (2010) which found, on the contrary, that staff who received incentives exhibited a positive and favourable attitude to work than those who did not.

However, staff promotion significantly influences security service delivery in universities. This agrees with the result of Achumba et al. (2013) which revealed that there is a significant relationship between the regular promotion of security staff and improvement in their job performance. Accordingly, the security officers who were regularly promoted tend to be more committed to their jobs than those who were not. On a general note, the research of Susan et al. (2012) in Kenya, found a strong influence on the performance of regular police officers attributable to units of change in motivation.

Considering that promotion is not the only motivational variable that could be used to reinforce security personnel, the present study is limited by not examining the composite effect of several motivational variables on security service delivery in universities. Thus, it is recommended that future studies should consider the interactive or cumulative effects of different motivational strategies on security service delivery. This study also faces the limitation of being a small-scale study in just a state in Nigeria, drawing respondents from just two public universities in the area of study. Therefore, large-scale prospective studies are recommended, adopting an inclusive focus on both public and private institutions.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that there are loopholes in the motivational practices of universities to security personnel. The service delivery of security personnel at universities in Cross River State is yet to be at an acceptable point that can promote institutional safety and goal attainment in the short- and long run. This implies that managers of universities and security personnel, alike, have some housekeeping activities to improve the extent of motivation and security services respectively. Based on this conclusion, it was recommended that:

- i. Security personnel who are due for promotion should not be denied of such an opportunity, as it represents one of the strongest motivational factors in universities.
 - ii. Security personnel should be paid their salaries, allowances and other dues in a timely and consistent manner. This will help in stirring up their extrinsic attributes for quality service delivery and by extension, institutional success.
 - iii. Security personnel with outstanding performance should be celebrated and if possible, rewarded for the re-occurrence of such positive outcomes.
-

References

- Achumba, P., Ighamereho, K. & Akpor, R. (2013). The role of stakeholders in the provision of security in higher institutions in Ghana Nordic. *Journal of African Studies*, 10(2), 245-264.
- Agunwa, J. N., Owan, V. J., & Ekpe, M. B. (2019). Personnel management: Implications for the effectiveness of the school system. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 3(10), 391–395. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4458655>
- Ajayi, I. A. (2007). *Topical issues in educational administration in Nigeria*. Ado-Ekiti: National Open University Course Guide.
- Akpakwu, S. O. (2012). *Educational management: Theory and practice*. Makurdi: Destiny Ventures.
- Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's Handbook on Human Resource Management*. 11th edition. London: Kegan Page.
- Arop, F. O., & Owan, V. J. (2018). Institutional variables and the supervision of security in public secondary schools in Cross River State. *International Journal of Innovation in Educational Management (IJIEM)*, 2(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3286244>
- Bakuwa, R. C., Chiasimpha, F. & Masamba, J. (2013). Staff resignation in developing countries: A case of an NGO in the health sector. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v3i1.3104>.
- Ekpo, G. E. (2010). Reward system and teachers' attitude to work in selected secondary schools in Calabar Municipality. National Open University of Nigeria. Calabar Study Centre. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis.
- Etudor, E. E., Akuegwu, B. A. & Etor, C. R. (2007). Motivational variables and satisfaction with the quality of supervision among teaching personnel in Akwa Ibom State secondary schools, Nigeria. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 2(2), 95-103.
- Heathfield, S. M. (2013). What are incentives at work? [humanresources.about.com>what-are.in](http://humanresources.about.com/what-are.in)
- Herzberg, F. (1968). *Work and the nature of man*. London: Grosby Lockwood Staples.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice* (8th edition). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ibrahim, N. M. & Nwabueze, A. I. (2017). The school managers' financial tasks: Staff compensation and wage administration in schools. In W.A. Amaewhule, N. A. Abraham
-

& J. D. Asodike, School Business Management theoretical and Practical Approach. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers International.

- Kelly, S. (2012). What are employee incentives? Types & Examples – Video study.com/academy/lesson/what-are... retrieved 8/9/2015.
- Lunenburg, F. C. and Ornstein, A. C. (2008). Educational Administration, Concepts and Practice (5th Edition) USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Murunga, P. L. (2014). The effects of working conditions of private security guards on service delivery: Case of Secure Force Security Company, Nairobi County. A thesis on Security Management and Police Studies of Humanities and Social Sciences of Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Nalla, M. K., Paek, S. Y. & Lim, S. S. (2016). The influence of organizational and environmental factors on job satisfaction among security guards in Singapore. Journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0004865816647995
- Ozoemena, P. O. (2013). Improved incentive system in the teaching profession as a strategy for quality delivery and enhanced productivity in contemporary Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1, 1-12.
- Susan, W. M., Wakure, R. W., Kirathe, E. K., Waititu, A. G. (2012). Influence of motivation on performance in the public security sector with a focus on Police Force in Nairobi Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(23), 195-204.
- Wikipedia (2015). Incentive program. www.https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/incen...
- Your Article Library (2015). Promotion of employee: Its meaning and definition – Explanation. yourarticlelibrary.com/promotion
-