

FACTORS THAT DETERMINE ACADEMIC STAFF JOB PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA

Omojola I. O., PhD

Department of Business Administration and Management

Villanova Polytechnic, Imesi Ile

Osun State

omojolassma@yahoo.co.uk; +2348057946853

Abstract

The study examined the factors that determine academic staff job performance in Nigeria. It investigated the relationship between personnel recruitment, performance appraisal, human resource development, motivation and communication and job performance of academic staff. The study also investigated the relative contribution of these variables to the job performance of academic staff in Nigeria. The descriptive survey design was used. 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 job performance of Academic Staff Questionnaire (JPASQ) 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 JPASQ respectively. The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentage; mean and standard deviation, Pearson's product moment correlation and regression analysis. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance. The study revealed that personnel recruitment, performance appraisal, human resource development, motivation and communication and job performance of academic staff were significantly related. Based on the findings of this study, it was recommended that academic staff should be more committed to their job to ensure qualitative teaching, research and community services for better job performance. The managers should encourage the academic staff perform better in areas of teaching, research and community services.

Keywords: Factors, Academic Staff and Job Performance.

Introduction

Universities are expected to be agency saddled with the task of extending the frontier of knowledge for the overall benefit of the society. The strategic position occupied by Universities all over the world in national development is beyond doubt. Their contributions to social, political and economic development of a nation cannot be over-emphasized. This is why many nations invest heavily in university education. The university education objectives may not be achieved without proper job performance of academic staff. (Ogbodo and Nwaoku 2007). Human resources in the universities need to be well managed, in order to increase their job performance. However, there are many factors that determine the job performance of academic staff in the university system.

The perceived factor that determine academic staff job performance may be due to the fact that in some cases, good and qualified candidates may not be recruited to the university system. Job performance of any university will always reflect in the quality of its staff. Recruitment is the process of attracting qualified people to apply for the job openings in the organization. It is the first step in the process of filling a vacancy in an organization. The research of Jansen (2013) reveals that finding, attracting and keeping the best people will be achieved through effective recruitment and selection processes. He also concluded that an organization will be guaranteed the right calibre of people for the organization's needs through proper recruitment procedure.

Chidi (2014) investigates the effect of selection practices on performance of unionised organizations in the Food, Beverage and Tobacco Industry in Lagos State. The study revealed that, selection practices exhibited positive and significant relationship with all measures of performance. The study conducted by Lavigna (1996) on Innovation in Recruiting and Hiring: Attracting the Best and Brightest to Wisconsin State Government aimed at using computer based text to select the best candidates. He finds out that even in this era of public sector reorganization and downsizing, hiring the best and the brightest candidate is critical. He concluded that, when hiring is limited, it is more important than ever to ensure that when government does recruit, it attracts and hires talented people to improve productivity.

The study of Ariss and Timmins (2009) on employee education and job performance found that educational level is positively related to job performance. The study of Abraham (1998) discloses that work experience has no

effect on job performance in an organization. This implies that in recruiting personnel, work experience may not necessarily be a criterion. The study of Lavigna (1992) reveals that it is better to base employee screening/selection decisions on specific job-related knowledge like skills and abilities, instead of relying primarily on background characteristic "signals." However, Arvey (2006), exhibits that major field of specialization is highly related to employees' performance.

According to Aswathappa, (2009) human resource practitioners do not follow their institution's recruitment and selection processes in the appropriate manner. Hence, institutions experience high labour turnover, high staff absenteeism, job reworks, high training expenses, labour unrest and low job performance.

Another factor that can determine academic staff job performance is performance appraisal. Academic staff may not be regularly evaluated in relation to performance appraisal. Performance appraisal is a formal and systematic assessment of an employee to determine the degree to which the employee is performing his/her job effectively. It is usually made in a prescribed manner of specific intervals such as quarterly, bi-annually or even annually. Each employee at one time or the other wants his immediate boss or more still his employer to assess his on-the-job performance, and where necessary give him guidelines or advice for improving his efficiency (Yaney 1995). 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.

Mani (2002), states that 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.

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.

In the same vein, 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 both employee burnout and experienced job satisfaction. It reveals 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.

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.

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. 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.

It seems that the academic staff do not engage in regular training, seminars and workshops and by attending conferences for development. These may be one of the factors that can determine their job performance. Development is a way of equipping human resource for improvement to enable them to function well in their various assignments.

Willie (2010) is of the opinion that programmes should be designed to train members to be productive. This according to him will be based upon extent of diversification, expansion plans and development programmes. Training programmes depend upon the extent of improvement in technology and advancement to take place. It is also done to improve upon the skills, capabilities, knowledge of the workers.

Rebecca (2012) asserts that motivation and job performance are twin concepts in organizational development. Motivation works as the means toward attaining productivity and better job performance as an end. Motivation is the best cause to reach job performance as a favorable effect and motivation is the stimulus to trigger as a job performance response. Communication and job performance are related in achieving the goals of the universities. Epstein (2002) reveals that strong positive relationships between communications and job satisfaction occur. The study also shows that clear and positive pattern of relationships between an employee's perceptions of communications and his or her job satisfaction do aid performance. The research of Lee (2007) reveals that both task and person communication roles were significantly predictors of job performance in the faculties.

Sandra and Lisa (1996) carried out a study which reveals that adequate human development and training has much impact on their performance and

productivity. Manpower training and development is an important tool for improving human power and productivity in both skills and orientation; many organizations do not take it very serious which always undermines their job performance, productivity and growth (Owusu-Acheaw 2007).

In the study carried out by Majekodunmi (1999), he discovers that there was a significant relationship between training programmes and improved performance of employee. He equally found out that training activities have significantly improved productivity in NISER. Also, that personnel training have significantly led to advancement, upgrading, promotion or re-designation of NISER workers. It was then recommended that more training should be conducted for the staff of this organization to be more productive.

Hamid (2011) in a study emphasizes that training is an important human resource development tool and that training should be provided to employees of different levels, specially the middle level managers in the organizations to cope with social and technological changes and improve their job performance.

In another study conducted by Babaita (2010) which sought to determine if productivity is a driving force for investment in training and management development in the banking industry in Nigeria. The population was made up of 320 old and new generation banks. Babaita finds that job performance is really one of the driving forces for investment in training and management development. He recommended that it is vital that managers, senior executive, as well as all employees receive training.

In another study carried out by Iwuoha in Ezeani and Oladele (2013), aimed at identifying the adequacy of development programme provided to the secretaries in the selected business organization in Owerri. They discover that if development programmes is adequately provided for the secretaries by the management of these organizations in such areas as seminar, conferences, workshops, their job performance will be enhanced. The research carried out by Kotey and Folker (2007) revealed that employees need to be trained to fill the new positions that open with firm growth. However, a number of research studies report a low level of relationship (correlation) between training and employee productivity (Taymaz, 1998).

More factor that seems to be affecting the job performance of academic staff may be motivation. It appears that the academic staff needs are not been met as at when due, therefore they appear not to be well motivated. It is like the salaries and incentives of academic staff are poorly attended to.

Emphasizing the importance of motivation to job performance, Barbra (2014), found out that motivation is inbuilt within oneself and all that is needed is for individuals to realize this and to address it. Nobody can motivate another, but one can inspire another person to make the changes that are necessary to become motivated. Motivation has been seen to have a great influence on the job performance of the organization and hence this should be taken with the seriousness it deserves.

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 job performance.

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.

The research of Flora and Robert (1996) reveal that if faculty staff are well motivated, such a faculty will be productive. In the same disposition, Olochukwu (1990) feels that motivation is a management function that stimulates individuals to accomplish laid down institutional goals. It is purposive, designated and goal-oriented behaviour that involves certain forces acting on or within the individual in order to initiate, sustain and direct behaviour. Nwadiani (2009) shows that lack of motivation may lead to stress which eventually may translate to ineffective classroom management and deprive school improvement.

The research conducted by Bloom (2013) reveals that structured work environments will facilitate interest in professional growth and job performance 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.

Nevertheless, Owens in Stang (2000), states that the educational leader is an important part of the educational environment of the school. It is with this educational environment that the organization's members interact and therefore the principal can determine the nature and quality of the teachers' motivation. Still, a strong organization and positive work environment will encourage, and even promote greater motivation and productivity of staff.

The communication link between human resource managers and the academic staff appears to be poor, which may result in poor disseminating of information in the work place. The communication gap may also be a factor that is can determine the academic staff job performance.

Communication has been stated as an important tool in academic staff job performance. The study carried out by Goris and Pettit (1997) that was aimed at investigating the moderating influence of organizational communication on the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. They find out that appropriate and accurate information enhances both performance and satisfaction with work. This finding implies that individuals receiving proper, correct, and clear information may perform adequately, which in turn may give rise to positive feelings about their jobs, or vice versa. Supervisors will be able to promote adequate levels of job performance and job satisfaction among their employees by providing them with appropriate and accurate information.

The research conducted by Tolorunsagba (2015) reveals that a great relationship occurs between communication functions of principals and teachers job performance. In the view of Linda (2014), management should put in place good communication channels that are meant to converse information both ways, from the employees to the management as well as from the management to the employees. The channels should remain open so that communication can be done at any moment when there is information that might be needed.

The study conducted by Ezeani (2012) reveals that the vital and fundamental element in the management process is based on working with people, which is

done through some forms of communication. The study also found out that the success of principal's administrative action depends to a large extent on the effective use of communication process. Another study by Muraina (2014) discovers that no principal can meet the needs of his or her teachers without proper communication.

Csoka (2009) finds that communication satisfaction dimensions impacted the employees' productivity. Although such dimensions as "communication with coworkers," "meetings and memos;" and "corporate-wide information," impacted productivity somewhat, employees in both organizations perceived "personal feedback" from their supervisor to have the highest impact on productivity. Also, satisfaction of an employee with a particular dimension of communication did not necessarily mean his or her productivity was affected.

However, the research conducted by Downs (2006), on the relationship between communication, satisfaction and productivity: a study of two Australian organizations; he comes out with the fact that communication with co-workers, meetings and memos (Media Quality), and corporate -wide information had relatively low impacts on job performance. Nevertheless, the research of Dobbins (2004) indicates that communication tends to have adverse relationship with job performance. Thus, communication in an organization is not likely to improve performance.

It can then be inferred from the review that job performance of academic staff is better achieved through the much attention paid into the level and caliber of recruited staff, the extent of motivation, regular training. Assessment through performance appraisal format and communication between the managers and the academic staff.

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the factors that determine academic staff job performance in Nigeria. It investigated the relationship between personnel recruitment, performance appraisal, human resource development, motivation and communication and job performance of academic staff. The study also investigated the relative contribution of these variables to job performance of academic staff.

Research Hypotheses

1. here is no significant relationship between motivation and job performance of academic staff. T
2. here is no significant relationship between human resource development and job performance of academic staff. T
3. here is no significant relationship between performance appraisal and job performance of academic staff. T
4. here is no significant relationship between communication and job performance of academic staff. T
5. human resource variables will not jointly contribute to the job performance of academic staff significantly. H

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 was Job Performance of Academic Staff Questionnaire (JPASQ). 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 JPASQ respectively using test re-test method. Five hypotheses were postulated. The data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentage, mean, standard deviation and

Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient. All the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Hypothesis 1:

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 JPASQ. 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 1.

Table 1: 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 1 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

Hypothesis 2:

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

In testing the hypothesis, scores relating to human resource development were computed using items 16-21 of QHRM while productivity of academic staff scores were computed using items 1-27 of JPASQ. The scores were subjected to

statistical analysis using Pearson Product Moment Correlation at 0.05 level of significance. The result is presented in table 2.

Table 2: Pearson Product Correlation of Human Resource Development And Productivity of Academic Staff

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r-cal	r-table
Human Resource Development	1495	18.97	3.491	0.908*	0.195
Productivity of Academic Staff	1495	113.00	9.061		

$P < 0.05$

Table 2 showed that the relationship between human resource development and productivity of academic staff is statistically significant at 0.05 level. ($r = 0.908$, $p < 0.05$). Thus the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between human resource development and productivity of academic staff. Therefore, there was a positive relationship

Hypothesis 3:

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 JPASQ. 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 3.

Table 3: 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 3 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 4:

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

In testing the hypothesis, scores relating to communication were computed using items 8-15 of QHRM while productivity of academic staff scores were computed using items 1-27 of JPASQ. The scores (communication 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 8.

Table 4: Pearson Product Correlation of communication and Productivity of academic staff

Variable	N	Mean	SD	r-cal	r-table
Communication	1495	14.63	4.139	0.392*	0.195
Productivity of Academic Staff	1495	113.00	9.061		

* $P<0.05$

Table 4 showed that the relationship between communication and productivity of academic staff is not statistically significant at 0.05 level. ($r= 0.392$; $p<0.05$). Thus the null hypothesis rejected. This implies that there is significant relationship between communication and productivity of academic staff. Hence, there was a positive relationship

Hypothesis 5

Human resource variables will not jointly contribute to the productivity of academic staff significantly.

Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis Showing the Relative Contribution of Human Resource Variables on Academic Staff Productivity

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	102.630	15.514		6.615	.000
Human Resource Management	2.639	10.673	.247	5.182	.808
Personnel Recruitment	3.227	10.687	.302	1.286	.767
Performance Appraisal	2.002	10.830	.185	1.280	.856
Human Resource Development	2.489	10.646	.234	1.317	.819
Motivation	2.500	10.744	.233	1.407	.819
Communication	2.319	10.863	.213	1.040	.834

Dependent Variable: Productivity of Academic Staff

Multiple R = .530

Adjusted R² = 0.28

F = .914

The following regression can be derived from table 9.

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6$$

Where

X_1 = Human Resource Management

X_2 = Personnel Recruitment

X_3 = Performance Appraisal

X_4 = Human Resource Development

X_5 = Motivation

X_6 = Communication

b_{1-6} = Regression Weight Coefficient

a = constant (other variable other than $X_1 - X_6$)

The multiple relationship between the dependent and independent variables can therefore be given as follow:

$$Y = 102.630 + .247X_1 + .302X_2 + .185X_3 + .234X_4 + .233X_5 + .213X_6$$

The table revealed that there is a positive multiple correlation between the predictor variables and productivity of academic staff in the Universities ($R = .530$) this implies that all the predictor variables are factors that can exert influence on productivity of academic staff. The value of the coefficient of determinant ($R^2 = 0.28$) indicates that all the predictor variables jointly accounted for 28% of the total variance in the productivity of academic staff of Universities while the remaining 72% unexplained variation is largely due to other variables not examined in this study. This implies that there are other variables that can account for productivity of academic staff of Universities.

The regression result in the table reveals that the most important predictor variable that contributed to the total variance in the productivity of academic staff of Universities is personnel recruitment ($\beta = .302$). The second in the ranked order is human resource management ($\beta = .247$) while human resource development came third in the order of relative contribution ($\beta = .234$). After human resource development, motivation was the next ($\beta = .233$) coming fourth in the ranking of the contribution. Communication came fifth ($\beta = .213$) and performance appraisal is the variable with the least contribution ($\beta = .185$). The calculated F-ratio (.914) was not significant at 0.05 level of significance. This implies that the predictor variables provide an insignificant explanation in the productivity of academic staff in southwest Nigeria Universities.

In terms of magnitude of the weight of regression co-efficient, personnel recruitment had the highest contribution (30.2%) to productivity of academic staff followed by human resource management (24.7%). This is followed by human resource development (23.4%). The others that followed are motivation (23.3%), communication (21.3 %) and performance appraisal (18.5%) with the least contribution.

Discussion

The finding showed that there was significant relationship between job performance of academic staff and personnel recruitment. This by implication means that the nature of staff recruited must determine their job performance. The finding is in agreement with the views of Chidi (2014) and that of Arvey (2006) that selection practices exhibited positive and significant relationship with

all measures of performance. Also, that of Lavigna (1996) and Ariss and Timmins (2009) that educational level is positively related to job performance. However, the finding is in disparity with the study of Abraham (1998) that arrived at the fact that in recruiting personnel, work experience may not necessarily be a criterion for productivity.

The finding also showed a significant relationship between job performance 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. 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.

The study revealed that there is a significant relationship between job performance of Academic Staff and Human Resource Development. It implies that academic staff will be highly productive if regular development is encouraged. The finding is quite close to the outcome of the study of Sandra and Lisa (1996), Majekodunmi (1999), Hamid (2011), Babaita (2010), Iwuoha in Ezeani and Oladele (2013), Ezeani and Oladele (2013) and Kotey and Folker (2007). They discovered that human development and training has much impact on their performance and productivity. They also found out that there was a significant relationship between training programmes and improved performance of employee.

The finding contradicts the result of the study of (Taymaz, 1998) which reported a low level of relationship (correlation) between training and employee productivity. Also, that previous studies based on meta-analysis do not indicate a clear picture about the relationship between training and productivity.

The study also revealed that there is a significant relationship between job performance of Academic Staff and Performance Appraisal. This by implication

means that if academic staff' ability are regularly assessed and evaluated, their job performance will be enhanced. 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 job performance. 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 that there is significant relationship between job performance of Academic Staff and Communication. It implies that communication influence the productivity of academic staff. It equally means that the academic staff need the human resource managers to remind them about their responsibilities in relation to teaching, research and community services.

The finding contradicts the outcome of the research works of Dobbins (2004) and Downs (2006) that indicated that communication tends to have an inverse relationship with job performance. Thus, communication in an organization is not likely to improve productivity. The finding supports the research outcome of Epstein (2002), Lee (2007) Csoka (2009), Tolorunsagba (2015) and Goris and Pettit (1997) that presented strong positive relationships between communications and job performance

The finding showed that the best predictor of productivity of academic staff in southwest Nigeria Universities is human resource recruitment followed by human resource management and human resource development. Motivation is next to communication while performance appraisal is the least in the rank order. With the F-ratio of .914 however, the variables in this study do not make significant contribution to the productivity of academic staff. What may be responsible for this finding is the fact that there other variables apart from those examined in this study could be responsible for the low productivity of academic staff in the southwest Nigeria Universities.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that Human resource management variables such as performance appraisal, motivation, human resource development and communication are important factors that determine the job performance of academic staff in the Nigeria.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

In view of the fact that human resource recruitment is significantly related to academic staff productivity, the managers should pay attention to the quality of the personnel to be hired into university system so that they will be able to do effective research and be more productive. The managers should also endeavour to select the best candidate during recruitment and have orientation for the staff so that they will adapt easily into the system. Managers should also encourage the selected candidates and guide them well during the probation period so that they will be productive.

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.

In view of the fact that communication is significantly related to productivity, academic staff should communicate effectively with academic staff on all matters relating to their job in order to improve their productivity. Since human resource development is significantly related to productivity, human resource managers should encourage the academic staff to develop themselves through seminars, workshops and conferences. Those to be trained should be identified and be allowed to have in-service training.

References

Abraham, K.G. (1998): Experience, Performance, and Earnings. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 65 (17): 703-736.

- Ariss, S.S., & Timmins, S.A. (2009). Employee Education and Job Performance: Does Education Matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 18(1): 1-10.
- Arvey, R.D. (2006). General Ability in Employment: A Discussion. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 29 (3): 415-420.
- Aswathappa, K, (2009). Human resources management: text and cases, Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.
- Babaita, I.S. (2010). Productivity as a driving force for investment in training and management development in the banking industry. *European Journal of Social Science*, 13(2): 278-290.
- 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.
- Chidi, O.C. (2014). Human capital selection practices and performance of unionized organisations in the food, beverage and tobacco industry in Lagos State, Nigeria. 22(1): 614-636.
- Csoka, L. (2009). *Closing the Performance Gap: A Research Report*. New York: The Conference Board. 11-12.
- Dobbins, C. (2004). *Communication and Performance: Alternative Perspectives*. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Company, p. 4.
- Downs, A. (2006). *The relationship between communication satisfaction and productivity: a study of two Australian organizations*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Kansas.
- Epstein, P. D. (2002). Get ready: The time for performance measurement is finally coming! *Public Administration Review* 52(5): 513-519.
- Ezeani, N.S & Oladele, R. (2013). Implications of training and development programmes on accountants productivity in selected business organizations in Onitsha, Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Asian Social Science* 3(1): 266-281.
- Ezeani, W.S. (2012). Application of entrepreneurship education: A panacea for effective secondary school management in Nigeria. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*, 1 (15): 27-45.
- Flora F. T. & Robert T. B. (1996). Research Motivation, and Faculty Research Productivity: Measure Refinement and Theory Testing. *The Journal of Higher Education*, (67) (1): 2-22.

- 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.
- Goris, J. R. & Pettit J. D. (1997). An examination of organizational communication as a moderator of the relationship between job performance and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34 (1): 324-354.
- Hamid, S. (2011). A study of effectiveness of training and development programs of UPSTDC, India- an analysis. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*, 4(1): 72-82.
- Jansen, J. D. (2013). On the state of South African universities: guest editorial. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. (17) 3:9.
- Kotey, B. & Folker, C. (2007). Employee training in small and medium-sized enterprises: Effect of size and firm type-family and non-family. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 45 (2): 13-28.
- Lavigna, R. J. (1992). Predicting job performance from background characteristics more evidence from the public sector. *Journal of Public Personnel Management*. 21(3): 54-76.
- Lavigna R.J. (1996). Innovation in recruiting and hiring: Attracting the best and brightest to Wisconsin State Government. *Journal of Public Personnel Management*. 25 (4): 67-81.
- Lee Y. (2007). A study of the relationship between communication and job satisfaction among faculty at the junior colleges of technology in the republic of China. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Drake University*.
- Levoy B. (2012). Quiz: Test your knowledge of employee motivation strategies. *Veterinary Economics*, 50(2): 18.
- Linda R. (2014). The Effect of Communication on Productivity. *Stratflow Facilitators* www.stratflow.com.
- Majekodunmi, B. O. (1999). *Training and productivity: A case study of effects of training on job performance of workers of the Nigerian institute of social and economic research (NISER) Ibadan*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation of the department of Guidance and Counseling of University of Ibadan.
- 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).

- Muraina, M.B. (2014). Principal's managerial skills and administrative effectiveness in secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Business Research, Administration and Management*. 14 (3): 50-54.
- Nwadiani, M. (2009). Dystrophies in Higher Education: The Nigerian Experience. *Higher Education Review*. 3 (3): 17.
- Ogbodo, C.M. & Nwaoku, N.A. (2007). Quality Assurance in Higher Education. *Paper presented at the second Regional Conference on Reforms and Revitalization in Higher Education, held at IITA, Ibadan, Nigeria, August 13-16, 2007.*
- 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.
- Oluchukwu, E.E. (2000). Staff motivation towards effective job performance in Nigerian schools. *Management in Nigerian Education: Personal Administration and Quality in Education*. Fadipe, J.O. and Ojedele, P.K. (eds) Vol.3 p. 25-39.
- Owusu-Acheaw, (2007). Staff development and employee welfare practices and their effect on productivity in three special libraries in Ghana. *Productivity, Special Libraries, Ghana Library Journal*, 19 (1): 83-96.
- 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.
- Sandra E. B. & Lisa M. L. (1996). Human-Capital Investments and Productivity. *The American Economic Review*, 86, (2), *Papers and Proceedings of the Hundredth and Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association San Francisco, CA*.263-267.
- 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.
- Taymaz, (1998) in Davar, S. C & Parti, M. (2013). Does training affect productivity of employees? Two methods of meta-analysis" *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*. 3 (1): 65- 90.

- Tolorunsagba, J. (2015). *Administrative effectiveness of principals of secondary school as a correlate of teachers' productivity in Kogi State, Nigeria*. An unpublished master's thesis submitted to the department of Educational Foundation and anagement, Ekiti State University.
- Ugah, A.D (2008). Motivation and Productivity in the Library. *Academic Journal Article by Library Philosophy and Practice*, July 2008.
- Willie R. (2010): http://wikieducator.org/User:Satarupa/Temp/BasicConceptofPersonnel_
- Yaney, J.P (1995). *The personnel management: Reaching organization and human goals*. Charles E. Merrill Company. USA.