

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND MOTIVATION AS CORRELATES OF ACADEMIC STAFF PRODUCTIVITY IN SOUTHWEST NIGERIA UNIVERSITIES

Omojola I.O, Ph.D

Department of Business Administration and Management
Villanova Polytechnic
Imesi Ile, Osun State

Abstract

The study examined performance appraisal and motivation as correlates of academic staff productivity in the universities of the Southwest, Nigeria. It looked at how performance appraisal and motivation are related to productivity of academic staff in southwest Nigeria Universities. The descriptive survey design was used for this study. The population of this study consisted of 154 Deans, 849 Heads of Department and 11,828 academic staff in Southwest Nigeria Universities. The sample was one thousand eight hundred (1,800) respondents, comprising 20 Deans, 70 Heads of Department and 1,710 academic staff. Multistage sampling procedure which involves simple random sampling, stratified random sampling and proportional stratified random sampling technique were used to select them. Two self-designed instruments were used, Questionnaire on Human Resource Management (QHRM) for academic staff and Productivity of Academic Staff Questionnaire (PASQ) for Deans and Heads of Departments. To establish the reliability of the instruments, the test-retest method was used. They were found to be 0.74 and 0.71 for QHRM and PASQ respectively. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics such as percentage; mean and standard deviation and Pearson's product moment correlation. The hypothesis were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The study revealed that performance appraisal and motivation were significantly related to productivity of academic staff. Based on the findings of this study, it was recommended that managers should evaluate the ability of the academic staff regularly and give them feedback after evaluation. Human resource managers should also motivate the academic staff through regular payment of salary and promotion.

Key Words: Performance Appraisal, Motivation, Academic Staff and Productivity.

Introduction

This work dwells on performance appraisal and motivation as correlates of academic staff productivity in the universities of the Southwest, Nigeria. It seems the Deans and the Heads of Departments are not assessing the academic staff regularly, using the performance appraisal format. Again, they may not be

frequently motivated through regular payment and incentives. This lapses may be reducing the productivity of academic staff in the universities of the southwest, Nigeria.

Performance appraisal and motivation are some of the factors that can be militating against the productivity of academic staff in southwest Nigeria Universities. Performance appraisal deals with measuring employee productivity. In a situation where ability of the academic staff is not regularly evaluated or when the performance appraisal is not done objectively or employees' goals are not well defined or when departmental evaluation is not conducted and academic staff do not receive feedback after evaluation, this may result in low productivity since evaluation brings about improvement.

Many human resource managers in the universities in Nigeria (Deans and Heads of department) seem not to be motivating their academic staff. In the early stage of University education in Nigeria, there were provisions for staff quarters, sports centers to give healthy atmosphere to the academic staff, security was sure and schools were available to take care of the children of academic staff. All these were done to stimulate academic staff to stay regularly within the campus during and after the school hours.

The campus in the past was like a village where all the needs of the academic staff were adequately met. They had satisfactory compensation, deserved benefits and regular basic needs. Today, remunerations, allowances and promotion and other benefits that can make academic staff to be productive appear not to be encouraging. The academic staff seems to be coping with inconveniences and less qualitative life which may affect their productivity.

In the observation of Root (1995), performance appraisal has a great influence on the productivity of an organization. To him, in any evaluation of all the condition necessary for the growth and survival of an organization, the role of performance appraisal is a strategic factor. It is believed that both the individual and the organization need to know how well actual performance is contributing to the accomplishment of the job plans, the staffing plan, and ultimately the overall strategic plan of the organization. In addition, the individual employee requires feedback relative to his or her own goals development, as well as that relative to management expectations. Employees can be inspired by a comprehensive and honest performance appraisal.

However, Morris and Stanton (2007) state that, performance appraisals are being used to reward staff in areas that were traditionally considered as standard working rights and conditions.

In the same vain, Bernardine and Russel (2013) feel that the information collected from performance management and appraisal system is typically used for compensation, performance improvement or management (e.g personnel decision making), and documentation. Performance data are often used for staffing decision (e.g promotion, transfer, discharge, termination and layoff), and this is where the entire personnel appraisal and appraisal system may fall under the close scrutiny of the courts. Performance appraisal is also used for training needs analysis, employee development, and research and programme evaluation. For example validation and research for selection.

The study conducted by Gabris and Ihrke (2001) examined the relationship between employee perceptions of performance appraisal and job satisfaction. They find that performance-appraisal highly relates to burnout and he suggested that the best-performing employees should receive not only the highest performance-appraisal scores, but also commensurate rewards.

Jalbani (2009) in agreement with Gabris and Ihrke (2001) says that the technical core of evaluation is measurement of how to determine what contribution people have made to the organization. Almost every organization uses one form of evaluation, whether it is through individual meeting, a form about present and potential work, or a review of management by objectives results.

According to Mani (2002), the techniques of performance appraisal are varied, but can generally be condensed into three major categories: trait formats, management by objectives (MBO) formats, and behavioral system formats, such as Behavior Observation Scales (BOS). Trait formats are intended to evaluate employees based on specific personality traits. MBO formats are intended to evaluate employees on how well they have achieved previously developed work-related goals, while behavioral system formats are intended to evaluate employees based upon specific work-related behaviors that the organization deems important and desirable.

The study conducted by Morris and Stanton (2007) show that the majority of enterprise bargaining agreements in Australian universities express a strategic link to performance management, with the result being that individual academic performance is increasingly being linked to organizational goals.

Performance appraisal has many benefits and Yaney (1995) states that it gives direct information for changing present operations and comparative data among individual personnel and work groups. It also offers a basis for future planning. An effective performance review system serves these general purposes.

Also analyzing the importance of performance appraisal to productivity, Mani (2002) states that performance management systems -including performance appraisals or evaluations are critical cohesive for human resource management. Appraisal ratings may be criteria in decisions to retain employees during layoffs, to assess the quality of training programs, to measure equitable treatment of different groups of employees, to increase employees' pay, and to promote or terminate employees. Appraisals may help poor performers improve performance by giving specific feedback about needs for development and appraisals may help employees who excel continue to excel by giving positive reinforcement. This type of feedback is essential to improve performance of employees at all levels. Also, and to assess the accomplishments of the organization overall.

However, according to Gupta (2009), employee feel that management used appraisal for the following: Performance feedback, Compensation administration, Promotion decision, Identification of management development needs, Workforce planning, Validation of selection procedure. The discrepancy between the slated objectives and the perceptions of employees may be one of the reasons that performance appraisal is negatively viewed and generates anxiety among subordinates.

Nevertheless, the research of Rehman and Mohammed (2013) reveal that if a system is based on a good performance appraisal program, it will enhance the productivity of workers and at the same time provides motivations to poorly performing workers to go for improving their work performance to get more and more money. Bernardine and Russel (2013) then state that a person's performance depends on some combination of ability or competency, motivation or effort, and of course the opportunity to perform. Performance should be measured in terms of outcomes or results produced in the context aligned with organizational objectives. Performance appraisal information is often used by supervisors to manage performance of their employees.

The research of Mani (2002) on performance appraisal systems, productivity and motivation, it intended to know if any relationship occur between the

variables. The finding reveals that there is no significant relationship between performance ratings and productivity. Another study was carried out by Schnake, Williams and William (2007), intending to know the link between human resource management practices and important work related outcomes such as employee attitudes and behaviour and firm financial performance. The results show that frequency of use of career management practices was positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and negatively related to perceived job stress and job insecurity.

It can therefore be inferred from the above review that performance appraisal system is now widely recognized as a significant vehicle for improving performance and productivity of both employees and the entire organizations. Rebecca (2012) asserts that motivation and productivity are twin concepts in organizational development. Motivation works as the means toward attaining productivity as an end. Motivation is the best cause to reach productivity as a favorable effect and motivation is the stimulus to trigger productivity as a response.

Stang (2000) states that employee satisfaction and productivity are goals that administrators should stress in order to accomplish the objectives of an educational facility. However, principals should accept the diversity of human attitudes, feelings and motives and professionalism while working with each teacher to personalize his/her needs.

The study of Oluwatoba (1997), on attitude and productivity in public organizations: A case study of NISER, Ibadan. It was expected to measure if workers' attitude to work can influence productivity. She finds out that motivation will influence the attitude of male and female workers to be productive. This by implication means that staff need much attention to be productive.

Also, Barbra (2014) notes that, there are a vast number of motivational theories that have been put forward to explain the motivational factors that affect or influence the performance and the perception of individuals and what this perception does to the organizational performance. For example, according to the equity theory, the perception that individuals have about their compensation for their work is such that when they are underpaid, the response is more likely to be that the individuals will decrease their efforts accordingly regardless of whether they have high internal (intrinsic) motivation.

Nwadiani (2009) shows that lack of motivation may lead to stress which eventually may translate to ineffective classroom management and deprive school improvement. A study by Stang, (2000) reveals that motivational values and effectiveness depends substantially upon wages to the teaching professional in return for educational services rendered.

By implication therefore, it is very important for the human resource managers to understand that human beings need the job to survive and must be motivated to work well. Human resources play a vital role in every business enterprise. Other factors of production are worthless without the human factor.

The research of Levoy (2012) reveals that a motivated employee is more likely to output more to the benefit of the organization. Most of the successful people that are around have been proved to be very efficient time managers. The efficiency of an organization is seen in its productivity.

With confidence however, Sheikh (2003) says that human resource motivation is the key to organizational effectiveness. The manager in general has to get the work done through others. These 'others' are human assets or resources. They are to be motivated at work. The key to human resource motivation is that they should be treated with dignity and respect, and their contributions to the organization in relation to productivity must be recognized.

The research conducted by Bloom (2013) reveals that structured work environments will facilitate interest in professional growth and productivity of workers. He then suggested that administrator support should be provided in the form of positive informational feedback concerning teachers' classroom practice and professional development goals. Similarly, positive co-worker relations should be facilitated by structuring physical layout, planning time, and program policies and processes in ways that promote trust, respect, and collaboration.

A research was carried out by Ugah (2008) for the purpose of identifying the place of motivation in developing human resources in the library. The study finds out that motivation help to determine performance. It is generally believed that the level of compensation paid to employees must reflect their contributions or their level of productivity within the organization. This course follows from the equity theory which many private sector organizations use to determine wages of workers. Specific and measurable goals and objectives are established for employees as against the public sector where no such goals are set. Salary

increases are often awarded uniformly for everyone on the same grade based on years on the job.

Assessing productivity in education sector therefore, the issue of compensation and workers' welfare seem to be the greatest determinants of productivity in countries such as Nigeria where the lowest order needs are yet to be adequately satisfied. Also, in discussing employee management and productivity the issue of staff personnel management must be geared to attract, retain and motivate the best human assets available. Nigerian employees especially in the educational sector are capable of being as productive as their counterparts in other parts of the world if they are properly mobilized towards greater productivity.

This study will therefore investigate the performance appraisal and motivation as correlates of academic staff productivity in southwest Nigeria universities.

Purpose Of The Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how performance appraisal and motivation correlates with productivity of academic staff in southwest Nigeria Universities. This means that the study examined how performance appraisal and motivation relates with academic staff productivity. The study then made recommendations based on the findings.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were generated for the purpose of the study:

1. T
here is no significant relationship between performance appraisal and productivity of academic staff.
2. T
here is no significant relationship between motivation and productivity of academic staff.

Methodology

The study made use of descriptive research of survey design. The population of this study consisted of 154 Deans, 849 Heads of Department and 11,828 academic staff in Southwest Nigeria Universities.

The sample of this study was (1,800) respondents, comprising 20 Deans, 70 Heads of Department and 1,710 academic staff. Multistage sampling procedure

which involves simple random sampling, stratified random sampling and proportional stratified random sampling technique were used to select the states, universities and individuals to be used for the study.

Two sets of self-designed instruments were used for this study. The first instrument was Questionnaire on Human Resource Management (QHRM). The second instrument is Productivity of Academic Staff Questionnaire (PASQ). These were used to collect relevant data from the subjects. The instruments were validated based on the judgments of experts in Educational Management and tests and Measurement s in Ekiti State University. Reliability coefficients of 0.74 and 0. 71 were obtained for QHRM and PASQ respectively using test re-test method. Two hypotheses were postulated. The data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentage, mean, standard deviation and Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal and productivity of academic staff.

In testing the hypothesis, scores relating to performance appraisal were computed using items 8-15 of QHRM while productivity of academic staff scores were computed using items 1-27 of PASQ. The scores (performance appraisal and productivity of academic staff) were subjected to statistical analysis using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance. The result is presented in table 1.

Table 1: Pearson Product Correlation of performance appraisal and Productivity of academic staff

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r-cal	r-table
Performance Appraisal	1495	21.08	5.823	0.426*	0.195
Productivity of Academic Staff	1495	113.00	9.061		

*P<0.05

Table 1 revealed that the relationship between performance appraisal and productivity of academic staff is statistically significant at 0.05 level. (r= 0.426;

p<0.05). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between performance appraisal and productivity of academic staff.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant relationship between human resource motivation and productivity of academic staff.

In testing the hypothesis, scores relating to motivation were computed using items 22-28 of QHRM while productivity of academic staff scores were computed using items 1-27 of PASQ. The scores (motivation and productivity of academic staff) were subjected to statistical analysis using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance. The result is presented in table 5.

Table 2: Pearson Product Correlation of motivation and productivity of academic staff

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r-cal	r-table
Motivation	1495	18.16	5.028	0.532*	0.195
Productivity of Academic Staff	1495	113.00	9.061		

*P<0.05

Table 2 showed that the relationship between motivation and productivity of academic staff is statistically significant at 0.05 level. (r= 0.532, p<0.05). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between motivation and productivity of academic staff. Hence, there was a positive relationship

Discussion

The study revealed that there is a significant relationship between Productivity of Academic Staff and Performance Appraisal. This by implication means that if academic staff' ability are regularly assessed and evaluated, their productivity will be enhanced. This finding may be as a result of the influence of performance appraisal on promotion and lay off of academic staff in the universities of the southwest as the case may be. However, the finding supports the research work of Gabris and Ihrke (2001), Morris and Stanton (2007) and Rehman and Mohammed (2013). The research they carried out revealed that performance appraisal is related to productivity. Moreover, if a system is based on a good performance appraisal program, it will enhance the productivity of

workers and at the same time provides motivations to poorly performing workers to improve.

This finding contradicts the outcome of the research carried out by Mani (2002) and Schnake, Williams and William (2007). Their works revealed that there is no significant relationship between performance ratings and productivity. Also that regular use of performance appraisal is negatively related to perceived job stress and job insecurity.

The finding also showed a significant relationship between Productivity of Academic Staff and Motivation. This implies that since motivation improves performance, academic staff will be more productive if well motivated through regular payment of salaries/allowances and making the environment conducive for them. What may be accountable for this is that motivation will bring about the encouragement to work better and harder. The finding is related to the study conducted by Oluwatoba (1997), Flora and Robert (1996), Nwadiani (2009), Stang, (2000), Levoy (2012), Bloom (2013) and Ugah (2008). They all found out that a motivated employee is more likely to output more to the benefit of the organization. The finding however contradicts the study of Barbra (2014), which concluded that motivation is inbuilt within oneself and that nobody can motivate another. This means that, no matter what the human resource managers do, it may not have much effect on the academic staff because it has to do with what one is made up of in relation to individual's behavior.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that performance appraisal and motivation are important factors in the productivity of academic staff in the southwest Nigeria Universities.

Recommendations

In view of the fact that performance appraisal is significantly related to productivity, the managers should evaluate the ability of the academic staff regularly, promote them as and when due and give them feedback after evaluation. Since there is a significant relationship between motivation and productivity of academic staff, human resource managers should motivate the academic staff through regular payment of salary, promotion as and when due, rewarding those performing well among them and by making social amenities available in the school.

References

- Barbra, D.B. (2014). *The Effect of Motivation on Productivity*. Just another Word Press.com weblog.
- Bloom, P. J. (2013). Factors influencing overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment in early childhood work environments. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 3(2): 107-122.
- Bernardine H.J. & Russel J.E.A. (2013). *Human resource management: An experiential approach*. Singapore, New York, 10020.
- Gabris, G. & Ihrke D. (2001). Does performance appraisal contribute to heightened levels of employee burnout? The results of one study. *Journal on Public Personnel Management*. 30 (2): 123-134.
- Gupta, M. (2009). *Principles of management PHI learning private limited*. New Delhi- 10001.
- Levoy B. (2012). Quiz: Test your knowledge of employee motivation strategies. *Veterinary Economics*, 50(2): 18.
- Mani, B. G. (2002). Performance appraisal systems, productivity, and motivation: A Case Study. *Journal on Public Personnel Management*. 20 (4): 36-70.
- Morris, L. & Stanton P. (2007). Performance management in higher education – development versus control. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations (Online)*.32(2).
- Nwadiani, M. (2009). Dystrophies in Higher Education: The Nigerian Experience. *Higher Education Review*. 3 (3): 17.
- Oluwatoba M.E. (1997). *Workers' attitude and productivity in public organization: A case study of NISER*. Ibadan. Unpublished Masters Dissertation of the department of Guidance and Cancellation of University of Ibadan.

Rebecca A.C. (2012). The Relationship between Motivation and Productivity!<http://www.brighthub.com/office/home/articles/83187.aspx>

Rehman, R. A. & Mohammed, A. (2013). Is pay for performance the best incentive for employees? *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management*. 4(6): 34- 53.

Root, G.N. (1995). *The Effect of Performance Appraisal in Improving Productivity in an Organization*. <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/effects-performance-appraisals-employees-17558.html>.

Schnake, M.E, Williams R.J &William F. (2007). Relationships between frequencies of use of career management practices and employee attitudes, intention to turnover, and job search behavior. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*. 11(1):14-29

Stang, J. (2000). Management and Motivation: An Analysis of Productivity in Education and the Workplace. *Education Journal*. 121(1): 67-90.

Ugah, A.D (2008). Motivation and Productivity in the Library. *Academic Journal Article by Library Philosophy and Practice*, July 2008.

Yaney, J.P (1995). *The personnel management: Reaching organization and human goals*. Charles E. Merrill Company. USA.