

## **AN EMPIRICAL APPRAISAL OF ACADEMIC STAFF PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTHWEST, NIGERIA**

**NWAMADI, BRIGHT C.**

**PhD student, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Adeleke University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria  
Email: bocenn@yahoo.ca**

**&**

**OGBONNA, OLUCHI PRECIOUS**

**University Library, Adeleke University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria  
ooluchi9@gmail.com Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/000-002-6265-112X>**

### **Abstract**

*This study examined the academic staff performance in selected universities in South-West, Nigeria. The study employed the descriptive research design of correlational type. Data for the study was collected using structured questionnaire. Data analysis was done descriptively with Relative Importance Index (RII) approach as well as correlation analysis. The study revealed that the RII of all the items were greater than the threshold of 0.5. The findings revealed The outcome of this study indicated a high level of academic staff performance with regards to published paper assessment (RII=0.725), teaching, research (RII=0.705), general performance appraisal (RII=0.698), community service (RII=0.685), research, teaching and community service (RII=0.681), project evaluation appraisal (0.676), employee self-assessment (0.671), advisory and counsel service (0.667), new curricula designed and developed (0.663), attraction of research grants (0.651) and success in general external funding to support research or other program (0.626). With regards to the challenges confronting performance appraisal methods, the study shows that Community service accounted for the highest RII of 0.716, followed closely by the remaining challenges which includes; employees' perception of the appraisal method (0.714), challenges in measurement of teaching (0.713), procedural (0.709), research and publication (0.705), favoritism (0.682) and bias (0.671). The study concluded that there is a significant relationship between the parameters of performance appraisal and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria.*

**Keywords: Appraisal, Academic Staff, Performance, Universities, Southwest Nigeria.**

### **Introduction**

Academic staff performance appraisal in the universities occupies strategic position in national development, as the university is central to social, political and economic development of a nation. The universities as well as other tertiary institutions are the primary focus for innovation and for the expansion of manpower needed to address the challenges of national development (Idumange and Major, 2006). Moreover, increased competition with respect to students' enrolment, faculty proficiency, technology and research

accomplishments, among others, create the need to reflect on performance appraisal system in ensuring optimal performance in higher institutions of learning (Fapohunda, 2015). In the university, the perceived factor that determines academic job performance may be due to the fact that in some cases, good and qualified lecturer always reflect in the quality of learners and institution efficiency (Omojola, 2019; Ogbodo and Nwaoku 2007). Grappa (2010); Sanders (2008) further claim that the correlates of performance appraisal in higher institutions of learning is that qualitative educational system largely depends on lecturers' job performance. Developing a well-motivated and qualified staff requires established mechanisms to evaluate their performance with a goal of informing and designing programmes that can bring about improvement in their performance (Aslam, 2011; Owusu, Kuranchie and Nanyele, 2018).

Measures to determine performance of academic staff in universities include teaching; research and publication; innovation and community service (Abdulkareem, Yusuf and Ogbudinkpa, 2017). The appraisal of these roles to measure productivity are direct, and does not completely impact on the other sphere of productivity in the university. Aside the specific impacts of the integration of these roles in the life, health and growth of a particular university, on the long run, it is necessary for the advancement and development of society. Academic staff performance on these tasks are indexed and measured on a periodic appraisal bases which shows the rate at which lecturers achieve their individual objectives, institutional goals and promote national development (Sanda, 2008; Oslow, 2007). Regarding the interrogation of performance appraisal and academic staff productivity, the South-west Nigeria is the pioneering region of university education in Nigeria. It is a host to distinguished and best rated public and private universities in Nigeria. While Universities in Nigeria have continued to decline with regard to the global rating, even when compared with other African countries like South Africa, the South-western Nigeria however, hosts the most performing universities in Nigeria. It is the zone with the highest number of private universities in Nigeria as well. How these universities, whether private or public, including state owned have continued to sustain comparative advantage and obvious better performance rating is of utmost interest for academic interrogation.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Academic staff are at the core of teaching and their performance and competencies measured through trainability, efficiency, capability, capacity and effectiveness are usually appraised and rated in order to underscore productivity. While the impacts of these attributes to an institution is not far-fetched, however, how these attributes are gauged remain of utmost concern with obvious variations from university to university in Nigeria in terms of scope, purpose and proprietorial needs. At the same time, why universities' global rating in Nigeria is declining is also a cause for concern and one that needs appraisal. The existing models, tools, strategies and systems of measuring performance has remained inadequate as it is fraught with incomprehensiveness as well as being deficient in drawing insight from other key stakeholders in any particular university. The existing rich and well documented research about productivity focused on academic staff in different categories of tertiary institutions. However, existing literature seemingly have converged on three main factors in even unequal proportion: teaching, research and publication. How these three factors are gauged in the midst of ever evolving thrusts to university human resource managing across selected universities remains of great concern.

*In line with the above, the main objective of this research is to examine the relationship between performance appraisal and productivity of academic staff of selected universities in South-west Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:*

- a) examine the various methods of performance appraisal in the selected universities in South-West Nigeria;
- b) Investigates the challenges confronting performance appraisal methods.

### **Hypothesis**

- c) Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria

### **Review of related literature**

#### **Employee performance**

Employee performance consists of more than one kind of behavior and a source of competitive advantage to promote responsiveness in enhancing overall organizational effectiveness. Employee Performance represents the levels of achievement of job and the fulfillment of organizational regulations, expectations, or requirements for an official role (Prasetya and Kato, 2011). Performance is the outcome of actions and skills of employees who perform in some situation. It is a deed and exhibition of employee skill. Hsu (2005) maintain the position that performance is an employee's overall work outcomes, including efficacy, efficiency, and effectiveness. Gibson, Ivancevich dan and Donnely (1995), state that the employee's performance is the result of work accomplished by a person in connection with his position in the organization. Employee performance is a mutual result of effort, ability, and perception of tasks. As rightly posited by Shadare and Hammed (2009) employee performance is determined by a number of factors like managerial standards, knowledge, skill and commitment on a particular task. Hakala (2008) outlined the following indicators of performance: quality of work, quantity, timeliness, and cost effectiveness, creativity, and innovation, adherence to policy, personal appearance /grooming and management by objectives.

Vroom (2000) states that performance of a person on a job can be considered a function of two different variables; ability or skill of the individual to perform the job; and motivation to use this ability or skill in the actual performance of the job. In this regard, Madukoma and Popoola (2012) maintain that performance is the product of information accessed and effectively applied on the job for maximum productivity. Johari and Yahya (2009) defined performance as the level of an individual's work achievement after having exerted effort. Muchinsky (2003) aver that job performance is the set of workers' behaviour that can be monitored, measured, and assessed achievement at individual level. These behaviours are also in agreement with the organizational goals. Saetang, Sulumnad, Thamppitak and Sungkaew (2008), view job performance as human behaviour which is an important factor for individual work effectiveness evaluation. This implies that organizations' success or failure is dependent on job performance of the individuals in that organization.

Liao, Lu, Huang and Chiang (2012) viewed employee performance as an index for improvements, recompenses, retributions, reviews and remuneration changes. It also gratifies the desires for employees to realize themselves. Ahmad and Khurram (2011) are of the opinion

that employee performance embodies the belief of the personnel in relation to their conduct and aids in the direction of the achievement of the organization's goals. Khan, Razi, Ali and Asghar (2011), view employee's job performance as work performed in relation to both quality and quantity as anticipated by an employee. Ahmad and Shahzad (2011) are of the opinion that performance of an employee expresses the entire conviction of an employee in regards to the actions and input to the attainment of the organizations goals and mission. They further argued that practices of compensation, evaluation of performance and practices concerning promotion of and employee are the benchmark for performance of a worker. Also, Anitha (2013) claims that performance of an employee is a gauge or pointer of monetary or other result of the employee that has undeviating relationship with organization performance and accomplishment as well.

Alagaraja1 and Shuck (2015) reveal that employee performance can be measured by means of regular training and improvement. Moreover, Anitha (2013) aver that atmosphere at which employee perform task and other schedules, relationship with bosses, co-employee and that of team, compensation procedure, and engagement of an employee are determining factors for performance. Employee performance has been described as activities which aim at improving, updating or maintaining employee skills and abilities (Elnaga and Imran, 2013; Malaolu and Ogbuabor, 2013). It is a set of systematic and planned activities designed by the management to provide its employees with the opportunities to acquire necessary skills to meet current and future demands of work (Werner and DeSimone, 2006). Performance programmes are to begin immediately an employee is employed and should continue throughout his career. Therefore, performance of an employee is the combination of expected behaviour and task-related aspects which provide innovation among employees in a manner that ensure work is accomplished (Motowidlo, 2003).

Hafeez and Akbar (2015) define employee performance as the achievement of specified tasks measured against predetermined or identified standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed. It is a multi-dimensional construct involving job-specific task proficiency, non-job-specific proficiency such as organizational citizenship behavior, written and oral communication proficiency, demonstration of effort, maintenance of personal discipline, facilitation of peer and team performance, supervision and management administration aspects (Abba and Mugizi, 2018). Nakpodia (2011) describe employee performance as a multidimensional phenomenon which has the following elements: effectiveness, efficiency, economy, productivity, quality and behaviour. In a nutshell performance has to do with being able to achieve set organizational goals. It involves the ability to sharpen these goals, revise them at critical conjectures and prepare towards optimum productivity with the scope of efficient use of available resources. In essence, effective employee performance leads to accomplishing of organizational goals and objectives, quality of output, workmanship, and adherence to standards, achievement of performance standards, increased effectiveness and a better use of available resources.

### **Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal is a formal process of human resource management practices in organizations that helps to evaluate employees' performance and identifying employee's potential for further growth and advancement within the organization (Igbojekwe and Ugo-

Okoro, 2015). As argued by Girma, Lodesso and Sorsa (2016) employee's performance and productivity attainment is derived through the performance appraisal capability in reflecting, measuring and evaluating an individual employee's behaviour. This study will adopt the use of the following terms: process, method, technique and system interchangeably.

Danielle (1998) posit that the measurement of performance appraisal usually includes both behaviours (what an employee does) and results (the outcomes of an employee's behavior). Monga (1989) defined performance appraisal as an evaluation in which the performance level of employee is measured against established standards and useful for making decisions about promotion, compensation, additional training or termination of appointment. The main purpose of appraisal is to help managers to monitor employees and to enable them perform better on job. If properly conducted, performance appraisal is a useful tool for understanding and assessing employee skill and potential, and also leads to higher motivation of individuals towards better job performance (Peleyeju and Ojebiyi, 2013). Rao (1985) identified six steps in performance appraisal process;

- i. Establishing performance standards;
- ii. communicating those standards to employee;
- iii. determination of appropriate appraisal methods;
- iv. observation and evaluation of employee's performance in relation to set standards;
- v. discussion of evaluation result; and
- vi. post-appraisal action.

DeNisi and Pritchard (2006) assert that performance appraisal is an organizational discrete and formal event usually occurring once or twice a year, which has clearly stated performance dimensions and criteria that are used in the evaluation process. It is an evaluation process because quantitative scores are often assigned based on the judged level of the employee's job performance on the dimensions or criteria used, and the scores are shared with the employee being evaluated. By appraising employee's achievements, it enables the management to discover staff strengths and weaknesses which should motivate the employees to raise their levels of performance.

Muchinsky (2012) describes performance appraisal as a method by which the job performance of an employee is documented and evaluated. It is a part of career development and consists of regular reviews of employee performance within an organization. Performance appraisal is a structured and formal interaction or a periodic interview between the two subsequent levels, superior (manager) and subordinate (employee). *Odunayo, Salau, Fadugba, Oyinlola and James* (2014) are of the opinion that the process of performance appraisal begins with the establishment of performance standards, followed by communicating the standards to the employees because if left to themselves, would find it difficult to guess what is expected of them. This is followed by measurement of actual performance and then comparing the actual performance to the performance standard set and discussing the appraisal outcome with the employee and if necessary, initiate corrective actions.

### **Theoretical Framework: Expectancy Theory**

The Expectancy Theory was selected for this study. The theory attempts to explain the specific things which actually motivate the individual at work and assist in identifying people's needs, their relative strength and the goals they pursue in order to satisfy their needs. It also focuses

on the assumption that individuals are motivated by the desire to fulfill inner needs. Boeree (2006) observes that expectancy theory is used by managers to provide framework on how to understand motivation and guide them on how to meet the needs of their employees. In essence, academic staff of universities may have their coordination enhanced when they share good relationship with fellow colleagues where every team player looks out for the optimal performance of every single staff. In the same vein, recognition of personal efforts of academic staff of a university can bring out their optimal performance and productivity.

Expectancy theory is of the opinion that only the aspects related to job content satisfy and motivate people to work. Mullins (2005); Fletcher (2001) suggests that the more employees understand the appraisal process, and the more appraisals are used as developmental opportunities rather than occasions for criticisms, the more the need for self-actualization will be satisfied, and the more morale will be enhanced. Appraisal of the subject matter from the prism of the realities of a university will definitely serve as a feedback on the success of other human resources processes, such as recruitment, selection, orientation, and training. In support of this view, Robbins et al. (2007) maintains that performance appraisals can be used to provide for increased salaries and promotion decisions, for determining training and development needs and the validity of selection procedures, and for the human resources planning process and counseling needs. The theory is also used to determine the effectiveness of academic staff towards set objectives and provides feedback about performance to determine the need for discipline. Employees' desire performance feedback, or information on how well they are performing their jobs, and this feedback should be provided to them when it is relevant (Fapohunda, 2015).

Expectancy theory is found to be useful in explaining employee satisfaction and effectiveness alongside the nature of employee's interaction with the management. Employees expect human and impartial treatment from the management and the management in return expects undivided loyalty and effective performance from the employees so that in the end, common objective of achieving the organizational goal may be attained. Ojo (1998) argues that expectancy theory is an important component of human resource management used as a tactical function such as training, compensation, promotion, discipline, transfer and layoff. Where it is appropriately carried out, expectancy can improve reciprocal consideration between supervisors and subordinates, offer prospects for employees to develop themselves and support industrial harmony through reasonable and objective handling of appraisal concerns associated with compensation.

This theory is relevant to the study because it helps the management to ensure that existing benefits for academic staff are fairly, justly and competitively allocated to them as this affect their level of commitment and overall performance. In essence, salary, package, organizational policies, work condition, social context of the job, as it relates to academic autonomy, relationship with academic colleagues, participation in decision making, promotional opportunities, among others will have effects on faculty's commitment to academic activities and subsequently impact on their performances.

## Methodology

This research work is descriptive in nature and survey design method has been adopted to collect data from the sample that is drawn from a study population of Five thousand, three hundred and fifty two (5,352) academic staff. The target population for this study consisted of all categories of academic staff in the following universities in South-West Nigeria: University of Ibadan (UI), Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomosho (LAUTECH), Lead City University, Ibadan (all in Oyo State); Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta (FUNAAB), Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye (OOU), Babcock University Ilesan-remo (BU) (all in Ogun State); Obafemi Awolowo University Ile-Ife (OAU), Osun State University (UNIOSUN), Oduduwa University Ipetumodu (OUI) (all in Osun State). A 99% confidence level with a margin of error (degree of accuracy) of 3.5% was adopted in determining the sample size for this study, resulting in a sample size of 1011 from a population of 5352. This study involve the use of both stratified and purposive sampling techniques. In view of this, the universities were purposively selected and stratified into Federal, State and Private universities. The main data collection instrument was structured questionnaire. Primary data was collected through structured questionnaire as well as interviews. Secondary data was derived from relevant textbooks, journals, periodicals, newspapers, magazines, seminar papers, archives, government and international organization publications, documentary and records, internet and other related materials. The data collected for the study was analyzed descriptively with Relative Importance Index (RII) approach. Relative importance index helps to rank the criteria according to their relative importance. The following formula is used to determine the relative index.

$$R.I = \sum \frac{W}{A*N} \quad \text{or} \quad RII = \frac{\text{Sum of weights } W_1 + W_2 + W_3 \dots + W_n}{A*N}$$

R.I. = or RII

Where:

**W** is the weighting as assigned by each respondent on a scale of one to five, with one implying the least and five the highest.

**A** is the highest weight and

**N** is the total number of the sample. Based on the ranking (R) of the relative Importance Index (RII), the weight average of the two groups will be determined. According to Akadiri (2011), five important levels are transformed from (RII) values: H(H) ( $0.74 \leq RII \leq 1$ ), High-Medium (H-M) ( $0.69 \leq RII \leq 1$ ) and low (L) ( $0.59 \leq RII \leq 1$ ).

## Results

### Results

**Table 1: Respondents' Socio demographic Characteristics**

Parameters	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
State	Ogun	462	45.7%
	Osun	353	34.9%
	Oyo	196	19.4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>
Gender	Male	568	56.2%
	Female	443	43.8%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>
Age	21-30	64	6.3%
	31-40	356	35.2%
	41-55	430	42.5%
	56 and above	161	15.9%

	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>University</b>	Oduduwa University	9	0.9%
	University of Ibadan	282	27.9%
	FUNAAB	104	10.3%
	Osun state University	79	7.8%
	Lead city University	47	4.6%
	LAUTECH	106	10.5%
	OAU	263	26.0%
	OOU	47	4.6%
	Babcock University	74	7.3%
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>
<b>Lecturer's Cadre</b>	GA	7	0.7%
	AL	38	3.8%
	LII	84	8.3%
	LI	96	9.5%
	SL	300	29.7%
	AP	272	26.9%
	Prof	214	21.2%
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>
<b>Highest Qualification</b>	BA/B.Sc	17	1.7%
	MA/MSC/LLM/MLIS	130	12.9%
	PHD	864	85.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Discipline</b>	Management/social science	304	30.1%
	Art and humanities	132	13.1%
	Engineering and tech	163	16.1%
	Pure and applied science	105	10.4%
	Education	37	3.7%
	Health sciences	187	18.5%
	Environmental sciences	10	1.0%
	Agricultural sciences	67	6.6%
	Statistics/mathematics	6	0.6%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	976	96.5%
	Single	35	3.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Work experience</b>	Yes	681	67.4%
	No	330	32.6%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1011</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source: filed survey 2021**

Table 1 revealed that the highest percentage of the respondents 45.7% were from Ogun state, followed by 34.9% from Osun state, while 19.4% accounted for Oyo state. 56.2% were males while 43.8% were females. Similarly, majority 42.5% fall between ages 41-55, followed by 35.2% of them who fall between ages 31-40, 15.9% falls between ages 56 and above and 6.3% who are 30 years and below. Respondents from university of Ibadan accounted for the highest percentage 27.9, followed closely by Obafemi Awolowo University 26.0%, 10.5% of the respondents are from LAUTECH, 10.3% from FUNAAB, 7.8% from Osun state university, followed closely by 7.3% by Babcock university, 4.6% from both Lead city and Olabisi Onabanjo University and finally 0.9% from Oduduwa University. The table also shows that senior lecturers accounts for the highest percentage 29.7%, followed closely by assistant professors 26.9%, 21.2% were professors, 9.5% were lecturer 1, 8.3% were lecturer II, 3.8% were



assistant lecturers and minority 0.7% were graduate assistant. Majority 85.5% accounted for respondents with a highest qualification of PhD, 12.9% had MA/MSc/LLM/MLIS, while minority 1.7% had BSc as their highest qualification. 30.1% of the respondents did management/social science as their discipline, followed by 18.5% who studied health sciences, 16.1% studied Engineering/tech, 13.1% studied arts and humanities, 10.4% studied pure and applied science, 6.6% studied agricultural science, 1.0% studied environmental science while 0.6% studied mathematics/statistics. Majority, 96.5% of the respondents were married while 3.5% were single. A larger percentage of the respondents had working experience while 32.6% had no working experience.

## Analysis of Data

### Methods of performance appraisal in the selected universities in South-West, Nigeria

**Table 2: Methods of performance appraisal in the selected universities in South-West, Nigeria**

Performance appraisal items	N	Mean	Std. Dev	RII	Ranking
Published paper assessment	1011	3.62	1.13	0.725	1 <sup>st</sup>
Teaching	1011	3.62	1.06	0.725	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Research	1011	3.53	1.00	0.705	3 <sup>rd</sup>
General performance appraisal	1011	3.49	0.95	0.698	4 <sup>th</sup>
Community Service	1011	3.43	1.14	0.685	5 <sup>th</sup>
Research, teaching and community service	1011	3.41	1.01	0.681	6 <sup>th</sup>
Project evaluation appraisal	1011	3.38	0.88	0.676	7 <sup>th</sup>
Employee self-assessment appraisal	1011	3.36	1.06	0.671	8 <sup>th</sup>
Advisory and counsel service	1011	3.33	1.01	0.667	9 <sup>th</sup>
New curricula designed and developed	1011	3.31	1.05	0.663	10 <sup>th</sup>
Attraction of research grants	1011	3.26	1.15	0.651	11 <sup>th</sup>
Success in general external funding to support research or another program	1011	3.13	1.10	0.626	12 <sup>th</sup>

**Source: filed survey 2021**

Table 2 indicated that two pieces of information were evident. It can be seen that the RII of all the items clearly surpass the threshold of 0.5 as advised by Ojo (2002) and hence all these items can be said to be significant to performance appraisal. The study also confirms that the most prevalent performance appraisal method under study was published paper assessment (RII=0.725) and its ranked number 1, followed with the same figure of RII is teaching, closely followed by other methods of performance appraisal such as, research (RII=0.705), general performance appraisal (RII=0.698), community service (RII=0.685), research, teaching and community service (RII=0.681), project evaluation appraisal (0.676), employee self-assessment (0.671), advisory and counsel service (0.667), new curricula designed and developed (0.663), attraction of research grants (0.651) and success in general external funding to support research or other program (0.626).

**The challenges confronting performance appraisal methods**

**Table 3: Challenges confronting performance appraisal methods**

<b>challenges confronting performance appraisal</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mea n</b>	<b>Std. Dev</b>	<b>RII</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Community service	1011	2.87	0.75	0.716	1 <sup>st</sup>
Employee perception of the appraisal method	1011	2.86	0.79	0.714	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Challenges in measurement of teaching	1011	2.85	0.75	0.713	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Procedural	1011	2.84	0.76	0.709	4 <sup>th</sup>
Research and publication	1011	2.82	0.86	0.705	5 <sup>th</sup>
Favoritism	1011	2.73	0.80	0.682	6 <sup>th</sup>
Bias	1011	2.68	0.78	0.671	7 <sup>th</sup>

**Source: filed survey 2021**

Table 3 revealed that the RII of all the items clearly surpass the threshold of 0.5 and hence all these items can be said to be significant to the challenges confronting performance appraisal. Community service accounts for the highest RII of 0.716, followed closely by the remaining challenges which includes; employees’ perception of the appraisal method (0.714), challenges in measurement of teaching (0.713), procedural (0.709), research and publication (0.705), favoritism (0.682) and bias (0.671).

**Ho2: There is no significant relationship between performance appraisal and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria**

**Table 4 : correlation analysis showing the relationship between performance appraisal and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria**

		Teaching	Supervision of student	Research/ publications	Community student	Improved student academic performance	Skill acquisition and entrepreneurship
General performance appraisal	Correlation (r)	-.334**	-.304**	-.432**	-.279**	-.298**	-.355**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Project evaluation appraisal	Correlation (r)	-.374**	-.343**	-.312**	-.337**	-.336**	-.276**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Employee self-assessment appraisal	Correlation (r)	-.236**	-.267**	-.287**	-.282**	-.242**	-.118**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Published paper assessment	Correlation (r)	-.209**	-.158**	-.318**	-.161**	-.178**	-.208**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
teaching	Correlation (r)	-.484**	-.384**	-.300**	-.310**	-.366**	-.275**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Community Service	Correlation (r)	-.277**	-.200**	-.190**	-.281**	-.244**	-.142**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Research	Correlation (r)	-.409**	-.320**	-.320**	-.345**	-.299**	-.269**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Research, teaching and community service	Correlation (r)	-.350**	-.280**	-.370**	-.342**	-.391**	-.308**
	<b>p value</b>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
New curricula designed and developed	Correlation (r)	-.212**	-.186**	-.195**	-.211**	-.280**	-.149**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Advisory and counsel service	Correlation (r)	-.458**	-.376**	-.269**	-.301**	-.303**	-.211**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
success in general external funding to support research or other program	Correlation (r)	-.242**	-.277**	-.240**	-.299**	-.203**	-.103**
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001
Attraction of research grants	Correlation (r)	-.195**	-.169**	-.149**	-.212**	-.159**	-.079*
	p value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.012

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 revealed a significant correlation between all identified performance appraisal indices and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria. Indicating that; there is a significant relationship between the parameters of performance appraisal and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria. In all cases, the r scores were within the acceptable region while the p values surpasses the threshold of 0.5 level of significance.

## Conclusion

The outcome of this study indicated a high level of academic staff performance with regards to published paper assessment, teaching, research, general performance appraisal, community, research, teaching and community service, project evaluation appraisal, employee self-assessment, advisory and counsel service, new curricula designed and developed, attraction of research grants and success in general external funding to support research or other program (With regards to the challenges confronting performance appraisal methods, the study shows that Community service accounted for the highest, closely followed by the remaining challenges which includes; employees' perception of the appraisal method (0.714), challenges in measurement of teaching, procedural, research and publication, favoritism and bias. The study concluded that there is a significant relationship between the parameters of performance appraisal and academic staff productivity in universities in south-west, Nigeria.

## References

- Abba, H. D. and Mugizi, W. (2018). Performance of academic staff in polytechnics: an analysis of performance levels in North West geo-political zone of Nigeria. *Art Human Open Access Journal*, 2(3),198–203.
- Abdulkareem, R. L., Yusuf, A. B. and Ogbudinkpa, C. I. (2017). Relationship between performance appraisal criteria and lecturers' productivity in universities in south-west geo-political zone, Nigeria. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 4(2), 79–86.
- Ahmad, S. and Shahzad, K. (2011). HRM and employee performance: A case of university teachers of Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(13), 5249.
- Alagaraja, M. and Shuck, B. (2015). Exploring organizational Alignment-Employee Engagement linkages and impact on individual performance: A conceptual model. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(5), 1-20.
- Anitha, J. (2013). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-323.
- Aslam, H. D. (2011). Performance evaluation of teachers in universities: Contemporary issues and challenges. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 1(2), 11-30.
- Boeree (2006). "Abraham Maslow". <<http://webspaces.ship.edu/cgboer/maslow.html>>accessed 3rd June, 2014.
- Danielle, S. (1998). The evolution of the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Management History*, 4(3), 233–249.
- DeNisi, A. S. and Pritchard, R. D. (2006). The performance appraisal system. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(2), 253–277.
- Elnaga, A. and Imran A. (2013). The effect of training on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 137-148.
- Fapohunda, M. T. (2015). Dimensions of university academic staff performance appraisal in selected public universities in Nigeria. *Journal of Global Economics. Management and Business Research*, 3(3), 139–147.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4):473-487.

- Grappa, R. S. (2010). *Managing employee performance – design and implementation in organization*. Australia: Thompson Learning.
- Girma, Lodesso and Sorsa (2016). The effect of performance appraisal on employee performance: a survey on administrative staff of Hawassa University. *Journal of Business and Management*, 18(3), 36-44.
- Hafeez, U. and Akbar, W. (2015). Impact of training on employees' performance (evidence from pharmaceutical companies in Karachi, Pakistan). *Business Management and Strategy*, 6(1), 49-64.
- Hakala, D. (2008). 16 ways to measure employee performance. Available at <http://www.hrworld.com> Retrieved on June 2, 2011.
- Hsu, P. Y. (2005). The research of the influence of cross-cultural on the job performance: The case on Philippine and Thailand labour in high-tech industry. Unpublished Master's Thesis, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan.
- Idumange, J. and Major, B. N. (2006). Privatization of university education: Implications for quality control. *Journal of Qualitative Education*, 1(2), 158-168.
- Igbojekwe, P. A. and Ugo-Okoro, C. P. (2015). Performance evaluation of academic staff in universities and colleges in Nigeria: The missing criteria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(3), 1-19
- Ivancevich, J., Konopaske, R. and Matteson, M. T. (2007). *Organizational behavior and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Khan, H., Razi, A., Ali, S. A and Asghar, A. (2011). A study on relationship between organizational job commitment, and its determinants among CSRs and managerial level employees of Pakistan (telecommunication sector). *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(11), 269-284.
- Liao, C. W., Lu, C. Y., Huang, C. K. and Chiang, T. L. (2012). Work values, work attitude and job performance of green energy industry employees in Taiwan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(15), 5299-5318.
- Johari, J. and Yahya, K. K. (2009). Linking organizational structure, job characteristics, and job performance construct: A proposed framework. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3), 145-152.
- Malaolu, V. A. and Ogbuabor, J. E. (2013). Training and manpower development, employee productivity and organizational performance in Nigeria: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, 2(5), 163-177.
- Madukoma, E. and Popoola, S. O. (2012). The relationship between library use and work performance of senior non-academic staff in private universities in south western Nigeria. *Canadian Social Science*, 8(3), 70-82.
- Mani, B. (2002). *Performance appraisal systems, productivity, and motivation: A case study*. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(19), 141-159.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (2003). *Psychology applied to work*. 7th ed. Belmont, C.A: Wadsworth.
- Muchinsky, S. M. (2012). The effect of performance appraisal systems on employees in Kenya Tea Development Agency: A survey of selected tea factories in Meru County-Kenya. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 2(3): 16-34.
- Monga, M. L (1989). *Management of performance appraisal*. Bombay: Himalaya Publishing House.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2003) *Job Performance*. Handbook of Psychological Vol. 12. Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Hobokan, NJ: John Wiley & Sons

- Mullins, J. L. (2005). *Management and organizational behaviour*. (4th ed.). London: Pitman Publishing.
- Nakpodia, E. D. (2011). Training and utilization of staff and job performance in Post Primary Education Board in North Senatorial District of Delta State. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, 3(5), 279-288
- Odunayo P., Salau O., Fadugba O., Oyinlola C. O. and James O. A. (2014). *Modelling the relationship between performance appraisal and organizational productivity in Nigerian public sector*. *Economics Management Innovation*, 6(1), 2-16.
- Omojola I. O. (2019). Factors that Determine Academic Staff Job Performance in Nigeria. *African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 5(3), 1-22.
- Oslow, A. D. (2007). Performance management and academic workload in higher education. *African Journal for Higher Education*, 15(3):74–81.
- Peleyeju, J. O. and Ojebiyi, O. A. (2013). Lecturers' performance appraisal and total quality management of public universities in South-Western Nigeria. *British Journal of Education* 1(2), 41-47.
- Prasetya, A. and Kato, M. (2011). The effect of financial and nonfinancial compensation to the employee performance. The 2nd International Research Symposium in Service Management. Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Rao, T. V. (1985), *Performance Appraisal Theory and Practice*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House
- Robbins, S. P., Odendaal, A. and Roodt, G. (2007). *Organizational behaviour – Global and South African perspective*. South Africa: Pearson Education.
- Saetang, J., Sulumnad, K., Thampitak, P. and Sungkaew, T. (2008). Factors affecting perceived job performance among staff: A case study of Ban Karuna juvenile vocational training centre for boys. *The Journal of Behavioral Science*, 5(1), 33-45.
- Sanda, A. O. (ed) (2008). *Understanding higher education administration in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Fact Finders International.
- Shadare, O. A. and Hammed, T. A. (2009). Influence of work motivation, leadership effectiveness and time management on employees' performance in some selected industries in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 16(1), 1-19.
- Vroom, V. (2000). *Work and motivation*. 3rd ed. New York: Wiley
- Werner, J. M. and DeSimone, R. L. (2006). *Human resource development*. (4th ed.). Australia: Thomson South Western.