
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.53555/eijhss.v3i4.62>

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY IN CHUKWUEMEKA ODUMEGWU OJUKWU UNIVERSITY

Prof. B.O.G Nwanolue^{1*}, Dr. C.A.Obiora², Ifeoma Ethel Ezeabasili³

¹Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University

²Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University arinzeobiora2002@yahoo.com

³Department of Political Science, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University ifyezeabasili@yahoo.com

***Corresponding Author:-**

Email:-princenwanoluebog@yahoo.com

Abstract:-

Employees are the life wire of any organization and as such when effectively managed can contribute to productivity. The way and manner the issue of performance appraisal, reward and Feedback are treated goes a long way to determine the level of employee's output in the organization. This study examined performance management and employee productivity in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. The study employed descriptive survey design method while Vrooms Valence Expectancy theory was adopted as the theoretical framework of analysis, Pearson's product moment correlation was the analytical tool used. The major findings of the study were that performance appraisal had moderate positive relationship with productivity in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. It was also revealed that the reward system has a high significant positive correlation with employee productivity in the institution. The study also found out that feedback has a highly significant positive correlation with employee productivity in the university. The study concluded that effective and efficient performance management through appraisals and good reward system and feedback mechanism will lead to high employee productivity which will eventually lead to the attainment of organizational goals. Based on the foregoing, the study recommended that the university and other tertiary institutions should pay greater attention to the type of performance appraisal system used in evaluating their staff both Academic and Non-academic.

Keywords: - Performance Management, Performance Appraisal, Feedback, Reward System, Employee Productivity

INTRODUCTION

Performance management deals with all the activities that ensure the attainment of organizational goals in an efficient and effective method (Odhiambo, 2015). Performance management centres on employees inputs and organizational performance. It also entails the methods organizations adopt in building products and services and improving the critical areas that needed improvement (Homayounzadpanah & Baqerrkord, 2012). Modern organizations and administrative systems all times are confronted with the problem of how to maximize the potentials in her workers. Moreover, they are often faced with various levels of differences in the performance of their employees. This is because some can work at high levels without close supervision and as well have a passion for their job; while others carry out their duties at marginal levels with close supervision (Obiora, 2007). It is based on these attributes and behavioural patterns that sporadic and regular evaluation of employees are required in every organization.

Organizational performance and its resultant efficiency and effectiveness can only be achieved when individuals are continuously appraised and evaluated. Performance management is by this notion central in the whole business of ensuring employee productivity. Some organizations in the globalized world often fail to actualize their set objectives due to the inefficiency as well as ineffectiveness of their workers (Mollel-Eliphas & Molungo, 2017). This could be attributed to the environment of its operation which has continuously discouraged their zeal for achievement. Any management that does not take the welfare of their employees as utmost priority are bound to experience industrial labour turnover, low commitment to work, low morale, job dissatisfaction that will lead to low productivity of goods and services (Davis, 2005). As a result of this, most organizations institute attractive performance appraisal systems to help inspire their employees to make every effort towards the desired performance that will reflect on their productivity. The inability of some organizations to install an effective performance appraisal strategy has hindered them from achieving competitive advantage which they require more now than ever before. Appraisal processes are often characterized by personal influences occasioned by organization's preoccupation to use confidential appraisal system which hinders objectivity and fairness (Asamu, 2013). Okolocha (2005), stated that improper performance appraisal exercise often affects the productivity level of staff and in most cases may result to grudges, absenteeism, and lateness to work, petition writing, job attrition, job dissatisfaction and lack of commitment to work.

In recent years Chukwuemeka Ojukwu University have witnessed series of Industrial agitations, grudges and ill-feelings by members of staff in the university due to failure of Employers to review conditions of service, lack of transparent performance appraisal process, selective promotion and recognition system, inadequate performance feedback, harmonization of incentives by the university authority, other incentives such as promotion as and when due, manpower training through TETFund. Despite several efforts made towards resolving these industrial agitations in the university yet the problem still lingers and has resulted to labour turnover, undesirable labour management relations, negative work attitudes such as absenteeism, lateness to work and lack of commitment to the organisational objectives hence undermining administrative efficiency as well as productivity. The over lingered industrial agitations as well as unattended employee's demands questions the effectiveness of Performance Management and Employee Productivity in COOU. Indeed the University is yet to efficiently address employee commitment to duty through measures of Performance Appraisal, individuals rewarded and recognized through an accurate and constructive feedback.

Performance Appraisal and Employees Productivity

The thrust of performance appraisal has been based on the antecedents. Contrary to the subsisting approach, Dzinkowski, (2010), and Mone & London (2010), argue that the definition of development component shows that performance appraisal should not only be the assessment of the past, but the supervisor who is responsible for the appraisal should all concentrate on the future and on the enhancement of the outcomes. This definition proposes that operative appraisal can enhance workers output in the organization, which also connotes increased employee drive (Jackson & Schuler, 2012). Brown and Benson (2013), contends that performance appraisal should be connected to performance enhancement process and can also be used to locate training needs and potential, reach future goals, encourage career development and resolve problems already experienced. Performance appraisal can be true about all the items in the list by Brown and Benson (2013), except its ability to resolve problems already experienced. It will prevent future problems but being a solution to a problem that is already in existence is a misrepresentation.

Performance appraisal is a method in which the job performance of an employee is evaluated, in terms of quality, quantity, cost and time (Adeyanju & Odunlami, 2009). Performance appraisal as an aspect of performance management, measures the performance level of an employee against the established standards and it is useful for making decisions about promotion, compensation, additional training or termination of appointment (Monga, 1989). The main purpose of the appraisal is to help managers to closely monitor their subordinates to enable them to perform better on the job. If properly conducted, Performance Appraisal leads to the higher motivation of individuals towards better job performance. Rao (2005), opines that performance appraisal is a method of evaluating the behaviour of employees in the workplace and it normally includes both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the job performance of an individual employee.

Higher education has been globally driven by some forces such as increasing global competition and the struggle for survival, increasing costs, demand for accountability and rising customer expectation about quality, rapidly changing technology, and accountability by accrediting associations, funding agencies, and the public. Also, there is a growing International competition with regards to students' enrolment, faculty expertise, and research achievement (Akinsolu,

2010). With all these pressures, there is a need to consider the position of Performance Appraisal system in ensuring total quality management in our higher institutions of learning. Performance Appraisal in the university is the process of assessing, summarizing and developing the work performance of staff in the university. Every University lecturer in Nigeria especially Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University receives a written Performance Appraisal annually which provides a feedback on performance and justifies personnel decision such as promotion and compensation (Okafor, 2005). This official form includes a self- assessment page for the lecturer to fill out and it is in turn sent to the respective departmental heads who state their perception. The completed form is then forwarded to the appointment and promotions committee where it is reappraised and action recommended. This could be promotion, continuity with the system, termination or warning. The behaviour standards that form the core of the performance appraisal expected of university staff are set out in the staff handbook and these standards relate to tasks that determine academic excellence and output. Academic peers apply these standards through a collegial review of the course syllabus, research methods and professional publications. Evaluation of teaching and research is a tool for quality improvement.

According to Einstein and Lai Mere-Labonte (1989), two major functions which are broadly categorized as evaluative and developmental functions are performed by performance appraisal. However, Afolabi (2001) and Salami (2003), state that Appraiser does evaluate and carry out the work of superior. They went further to say that, one of the duties of a superior, is that an appraiser provides a basis for effective communication and dissemination of concrete and constructive educational advice and ideas designed to improve the quality of the teaching ability of the teachers.

Performance Appraisal can be an important tool for supporting and improving the quality of services provided by employees in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. Unfortunately, employee evaluation has been frequently viewed not as a vehicle for growth and improving employee productivity, but rather as a formality that must be endured (Stronge&Tucker, 2003). As such; Performance Appraisal has been observed as an important step to avoid making the exercise look like yearly ended system. In other words, Performance Appraisal has been seen as a tool with no objective to achieve set goals but to fulfil public service management policy which requires staff to fill forms every year with no evaluations. Thus, Open Performance Review and Appraisal System have to document the quality of employee's performance, by helping them improve and hold them accountable for what they produce. It was reported that evaluation of employees is an important exercise because, without capable, high-quality staff in the working environment, there will be no true public sector reform effort that can possibly succeed and bring the desired results (Decenzo, 2003).

MolleEliphas, Mulongo and Razia (2017), in a study, investigated the influence of performance appraisal practices on employee productivity: A case of Muheza District, Tanzania. They found out that recognition and feedback influence employee productivity in the organization. In a similar way, Peleyeju and Ojebiyi (2013), equally examined the influence of lecturers' performance appraisal on employee productivity of public universities in South-Western Nigeria. The study revealed a significant positive relationship between performance appraisal and employee productivity in public universities. In another study, Homayounizadpanah and Baqerrkord, (2012), examined performance appraisal and employee productivity, the result of the study indicates that performance appraisal is an integrated and strategic approach towards enhancing the employee and organizational productivity. In a related study, Marsor, (2011), analyzed the performance appraisal and employee productivity, the result of the study showed that well laid out structures can be replicated and still be effective in different regions in promoting employee's productivity

In a similar view, Odunayo, Olumuyiwa, Omoniyi, and Akinbode (2014), examined the modelling of the relationship between performance appraisal and organizational productivity in Nigerian public sector. The study indicated a positive significant relationship between performance appraisal and job performance. While Gichuhi, Agbaja, and Ochieng (2014), investigated the effects of performance appraisal on employees productivity: A Case study of supermarkets in Nkuru town, Kenya. The study observed that performance criteria, feedback, and frequency significantly influence employee's productivity. Again, Onyije (2015), conducted a study on the effect of performance appraisal on employee productivity in a Nigerian University. The study observed a significant positive relationship between performance appraisal and employees productivity. Hayford, Boakye-Yiadom, and Owusu (2016), examined, "Is performance appraisal Anachronistic in tertiary institutions in Ghana": Evidence from University of Cape Coast. The study revealed that staff of the university perceived the purpose of performance appraisal as either administrative or developmental.

Collaboratively, Omusuebe and Kimcnichege (2013), in a study, examined the effects of performance appraisal on employee's productivity: A Case Study of Mumias Sugar Company limited. The study revealed that there is a correlation between performance appraisal and employee productivity in Mumias Sugar Company limited. While Ajayi, Awolusi, Arogundade and Ekundayo (2011), examined the relationship between performance appraisal and employees productivity of academic staff in South West Nigerian Universities. The result of the study indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between the performance appraisal and employees productivity of academic staff in the universities. On his part Obiora (2002), in a study investigated the relationship between performance appraisal and employee's productivity in tertiary institutions using Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka as a case study. The study indicates that a relationship exist between performance appraisal and employees productivity within the period under review

In a related development Wurim (2012), examined the relationship between performance appraisal and employee productivity in public sector organizations of Nigeria. The result of the study indicates that the implementation of proper

performance appraisal practice in Nigeria public organizations significantly impacts on employee's productivity. However Kida, Mahmed, and Nahu (2015) did a study on how financial and nonfinancial incentives can be used as tools for motivating employees of libraries in tertiary institutions in Borno State, Nigeria. The result of the study showed that employees perform better when they are appraised and expect to be rewarded later either intrinsically or extrinsically. Owoyemi and George (2013), further analyzed the use of performance appraisal in enhancing employee's productivity in public sector agencies in Nigeria. The study found out that there is a significant relationship between performance appraisal and employees' productivity.

Contrarily performance appraisal has been criticized to have discrepancy between the theory and the practical implementation thus, Bernardin and Klatt (2005); Hall, Postner and Hardner (2009); Maroney and Buckley (2012), posits that there is a considerable gap between theory and practice and that human resources specialists do not make full use of the psychometric tools available. Counter argument maintained by line managers is that the process needs to be simple and easy to use; otherwise it becomes time consuming and cost ineffective. Again Mone and London (2010), further maintained that performance appraisal increases the dependency of the employees on their superiors. In a situation where the process is conducted by superiors who are not trained to be appraisers, the genuine feedback is obstructed because it includes subjectivity and bias of the raters, which leads to incorrect and unreliable data regarding the performance of the employee (Jackson & Schuller, 2012).

Reward System and Employee Productivity

Reward system refers to all the employer's available tools that may be used to attract, retain, motivate and satisfy employees (Armstrong, 2013). Thompson (2002) defined reward as appreciation in cash or in kind given to employees for their extra contributions to the organization. According to Armstrong (2009) total reward is a combination of financial and nonfinancial rewards in a given reward system, he further stressed that total reward has always been advocated for because it is still not yet clear which of the rewards (financial or non-financial) is more effective in motivating employees for high performance.

Organizations are established for realizing goals. It is expected thus, that whatever reward organization members receive must relate to the extent to which they are contributing, or have contributed towards the realization of the goals of the organization. Thus, Hasni and Nura (2014), while investigating the relationship between reward system and employee productivity of Academics in Nigerian universities, the mediating effect of e-HRM was equally investigated. As a quantitative research approach, the study found that reward system influence employee's productivity. Elaine, Hailey, and Kelliher (2010), in a related study carried out on high commitment performance management and the role of reward system on employee productivity. The findings showed that the link between reward system and employee productivity of high commitment performance management (HCPM) practices and their level of commitment is strongly mediated by related perceptions of organization justices.

On his part, Emesowum (2010), carried out a study on the impact of reward system on employee productivity in public companies using Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) in Anambra state as a case study. The study found out that employee productivity in an organization is a direct function of their reward system with regards. In a similar manner, Broady-Preston and Steel (2012), analyzed reward system and employee productivity, the result of the study established that linking rewards with performance leads to increase in employees productivity in an organization. Again, Carrol and Scheider (2012), further analyzed reward system and employee productivity, the result of the study indicates that reward system promotes employee productivity and performance in an organization. While Randell (2014), empirically investigated reward system and employee productivity, the findings of the study show that when good performance is observed and then rewarded, the chances of it being repeated are increased, while poor performance is discouraged or even punished to decrease the chances of it happening again.

Furthermore Mone and London (2010), accessed reward system and employee productivity, the study explains that the rewards given for creativity encourage generalized creativity in other tasks; reward systems support the new dynamics of team-based organizations and performance. In a related development Gichuhi, Abaja, and Ochieng (2014), reward system and employee productivity, the study observed that there is a relationship between reward and productivity. While Akeke, Akeke, and Awolusi (2015), examined the effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment among non-academic staffs of tertiary institutions in Ekiti state. The findings indicate that job satisfaction has a significant positive influence on both affective commitment and continuance commitment. Again, Sajjad, Ghanafer, and Ramzan (2013), investigated the impact of motivation on employee turnover in telecom sector of Pakistan. The study revealed that motivation is a significant predictor of decreasing employee' turnover.

Contrary to the above positions Gichuhi, Abaja and Ochieng (2014), contends that reward are associated with the problem of isolating individual performance over team efforts. On the other hand Moulder (2011), posits that employee rewards may actually serve to decrease productivity due to a lack of continued extrinsic incentives. He further explains that once an employee is rewarded to indicate that they have achieved the desired goal. In affirmation to this view Derven(2010), maintained that the likelihood of improved productivity may not be sustained once a goal is achieved. This is because there is little or no inspiration to continue improving on their productivity. This view was collaborated by Jackson and Schuller (2012), when they noted that factors such as employee personality and level of integrity play an important role in continued or improved productivity. For Erdogan (2012), situations may arise when the employee's lacks sense of

internal motivation, they may become unwilling to improve on their productivity. It is thus essential for employers to look for ways of motivating the employees to continually improve on their productivity.

In a similar view, Solmon and Podgursky (2010), maintained that performance-based compensation programs encourages competition rather than collaboration since everyone will be more concerned with securing individual success and thus personal gains, helping others to succeed is therefore not advantageous to oneself. A related point concerning the tendency to undermine teamwork is recognized by De Silva (2008), when he noted that individual performance is often difficult to measure objectively and an exclusively individual performance-related system can damage teamwork. Instead, he proposes team-based criteria in cases where individual performance is difficult to measure, or where there is a need for a corporate culture to promote team values and cooperation, or where the roles of individuals are more flexible, or where the expected performance depends more on team, rather than individual efforts.

Performance Feedbacks and Employee Productivity

Performance feedback is a critical component of all performance management systems (Aguinis, 2009; DeNisi & Kluger, 2000). Performance feedback can be defined as information about an employee's past behaviors with respect to established standards of employee behaviors and results. The goals of performance feedback are to improve individual and team performance, as well as employee engagement, motivation, and job satisfaction (Aguinis, 2009).

In his view, Mello (2015:10), asserts that "performance feedback as a kind of performance management is a powerful developmental method and is quite different compared to the traditional manager-subordinate appraisals". This method does not replace the traditional one-to-one process and can be used as a stand-alone developmental method. This method involves appraising receiving feedback from people whose views are considered helpful and relevant. The feedback is typically provided in a form showing job and skills criteria and scoring or value judgment system. Appraise should also assess himself or herself using the same feedback instrument or form (Gold, 2010). Mello (2015:12), posits that "Performance feedbacks is aimed at improving employee performance by providing a better awareness of strengths and weaknesses". The employee receives feedback, in an anonymous form, on performance ratings from peers, superiors, and subordinates (Kaplan & Palus, 1994 in Mello, 2015). Feedback from multiple sources, such as superiors, peers, subordinates, and others has a more powerful impact on people than information from a single source, such as their immediate supervisor. The performance feedbacks improves the quality of performance measures by using multi-raters providing a more balanced and comprehensive view. The information is more reliable, valid and credible because the providers interact regularly with the employee at work (Edwards & Ewen, 1996 in Mello, 2015).

The performance feedbacks appraisal, also known as multi-source assessment or full circle feedback, gathers evaluation data from all of those who work most closely with the employee being evaluated, regardless of position. "The collective intelligence these people provide gives the appraiser a clear understanding of personal strengths as well as areas that need further development" (Edwards & Ewen, 1996 in Mello, 2015). A prime advantage is that performance feedbacks provide a more comprehensive view of employee productivity. Not only does this method provide feedback from a variety of viewpoints, it also minimizes the bias problems that are inherent to evaluations. Parker, 1998 in Mello (2015:14), ascertain that "the more appraisers an employee has, the more likely the biases of the raters will tend to cancel one another out, and the more their perspectives will combine to give a complete, accurate and honest picture". Without careful planning, and strategic, performance feedbacks system can be detrimental to the company and the employee. Running an ineffective performance feedbacks system will inevitably impact the bottom-line for the company. When used incorrectly, the performance feedbacks systems will have a tendency to gather too much information which leads to wasted time (Mello, 2015).

Again, Igbojekwe and Ugo-Okoro, (2015), examined Performance feedbacks and employee Productivity of Academic Staff in Universities and Colleges in Nigeria: The Missing Criteria. The study indicates that the current Performance Feedbacks and employee productivity in Nigeria's tertiary institutions is a systematic process through which employees are given feedback on their performance and further reward and promotion. While Ejeh and Okoro (2016), carried out a study on the evaluation of staff personnel administration, performance feedback, and employee productivity in tertiary institutions in South Eastern Nigeria. The study revealed that performance feedbacks enhance employee's productivity in tertiary institutions. Again, Mohammed and Abdullahi (2011), conducted a study on staff motivation, dissatisfaction and performance feedbacks and employee productivity in an academic setting. The study revealed a significant positive relationship between staff motivation and employee's productivity.

Similarly, Wurim (2012), examined the relationship between performance management and employee productivity in public sector organizations of Nigeria. The result of the study indicates that the implementation of proper performance management practice in Nigeria public organizations significantly impacts on employee's productivity. In a study, Solmon and Podgursky (2010), investigated performance feedbacks and employee productivity, the study shows that regular feedback helps employees focus their work activities and promotes departmental, organizational and employee productivity. Furthermore, Jackson and Schuller, (2012), examined performance feedbacks and employee productivity, they observed that performance feedbacks enhance employee productivity in an organization within the period under review.

Theoretical Orientation

This study is anchored on Victor Vroom Valence Expectancy theory, which was propounded in 1964. The choice of the theory was informed by the fact that the issues in employee performance management can better be explained by this

theory. It is popularly called ValenceInstrumentality Expectancy (VIE). The theory posits that if one thing happens, it will lead to another and that the expectancy in the proposition is the likelihood that an action or attempt will lead to an outcome. Vroom clarifies thus: where an individual chooses between alternatives which involve uncertain outcomes he is not only moved by what he expects, but also by the degree to which he believes these outcomes to be possible. Expectancy is a temporary belief concerning the possibility that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome. According to Vroom, the model is based on the assumption that man is a rational being and will always try to maximize his pay-off. He will choose an alternative that would give him the most benefit. Hence, according to the theory, motivation to work is strongly determined by an individual perception that a certain type of behaviour will lead to the certain type of outcome and his personal preference for that type of outcome (Chandan, 1987).

This theory is relevant to this study on Performance management and employee productivity in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University in that, when workers in the institution are objectively appraised, adequately rewarded and proper feedback given after appraisal then the workers will be encouraged to put in their best for the actualization of the institutions goal and objectives. Similarly, when the welfare and the conditions of service of the employees are taken care of by the school management it will lead to increased productivity. When employees of Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University are treated with care, shown trust, listened to and are encouraged to do better, then they will reciprocate by being responsible and productive. On the contrary, if the employees of the institution are not adequately remunerated the result will be, labour turn over, absenteeism, lateness to work, lack of commitment to organizational objectives, sub-optimal performance and low productivity.

When Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University employees are adequately motivated, productivity is expected to increase, also if the performance of the employee is high, that is if the output of the work effort is impressive, it is expected that the school management will reward or compensate him/her adequately and this will, in turn, encourage the worker to work harder for high productivity. A situation where the worker's performance/output is high and no commensurate remuneration, productivity is bound to be low.

Methodology

This study adopted the descriptive survey method. The survey method is a means of collecting data from the field using a well-structured questionnaire. This is to enable the researcher to provide information to the research questions in order to make generalized inferences. The target population used in this study was the employees of Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University (COOU). The research population for this study includes 475(37%) academic and 807(63%) non-academic staff of COOU totalling 1282. For Onyeizugbe (2013:91 cited in Borg and Gall, 1973), for “population up to 1,000 use 20%; for 5000 use 10%; for up to 10,000 use 5%, in the case of this study the population was 1,282 and 20% of this is 256 (this is higher than 120) which was adopted as sample size. The questionnaire was used for primary data collection which was administered to both academic and non-academic staff in COOU.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Demographic profile of the Respondents

A total of 224 questionnaires were returned and analyzed out of which 224, 224, 221, 212, 214 and 222 responded for age, working experience, performance appraisal, reward system, feedback and productivity respectively. The first part of this section covers the demographic features of the respondents, while the second section presents the correlation analyses of the data gathered from the respondents (See Table 1).

Table I
Demographic Distribution of Respondents

Age			
Respondent's profile		Frequency	Percentage (%)
25-35		63	28.1
36-45		106	47.3
46-55		49	21.9
56 and above		6	2.7
Total		224	100.0
Working experience	Less than 5 yrs	61	27.7
	6-10yrs	101	45.1
	11-20yrs	54	24.1
	21yrs plus	8	3.6
Total		224	100.0

Marital Status		
Single	66	29.5
Married	157	67.9
Others	6	2.7
Total	224	100

Sex		
Male	97	43.3
Female	127	56.7
Total	224	100

Category	130	58
Academic Staff		
Non-Academic Staff	93	41.5
Others	1	.4
Total	224	100

Educational Qualification		
OND/NCE	23	10.3
B.Sc/HND	74	33
M.Sc/MBA	85	37.9
PhD	42	18.8
Total	224	100

Source: Field Survey, 2018

The table 1 above shows the demographic profile of the respondents which shows that 28% of the respondents were between the age brackets of 25 to 35 years 47% were within the age bracket of 36 to 45 years. On the same note, 21.9% of the respondents are within the age bracket of 46 to 55 Years, 2.7% of the respondents were of 56 years and above.

Table 1 further shows that 61, representing 27.2% were less than 5 years of working experience, 101 of the respondents representing 45.1 % have working experience of between 6 and 10 years, 54 respondents representing 24% were within 11 year and 20 years' experience, and 3.6% representing 8 of the respondents are of working experience beyond 21 years. Furthermore, the table reveals that out of the sampled population 66(29.5%) were single while 152 (67.9%) of the respondents are married, 6(2.7%) were others. Moreover, 97 (43.3%) are male while 127 (56.7%) are female. The academic staff profile shows that 130 (58%) were academic staff while 93 (41.5%) are non-academic staff. As seen in the table also the Educational qualification profile shows that 23 (10.3%) have OND/NCE, 74 (33%) have the B.Sc/HND qualifications, 85 (37.9%) have the M.Sc/MBA qualifications and then the remaining 42(18.8%) are PhD holders.

The analyses of the data were performed using SPSS Package Version 2 0. This involved descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. The correlation analysis was used in examining the relationships between the independent variables performance appraisal, reward system and the feedback system and the dependent variable productivity. Table 11 is the summary statistics shows that out of the 224 respondents in the sample, a total of 224, 224, 221, 214, 214 and 222 responded for age, working experience, performance appraisal, reward system, feedback and productivity with mean and standard deviations of 1.96 (.77), 2.07 (.81), 23.88 (3.12), 23.38 (4.11), 18.23 (3.80) and 19.07 (3.04) respectively.

Table II
Descriptive Statistics

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(x - \bar{x})^2}{N - 1}}$$

Where

S= Standard Deviation

X=Arithmetic Mean

X=Observation

n=Number of Observations

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Productivity	19.1532	2.93272
Performance APP	23.9272	3.13401
Reward System	23.5142	4.11963
Feedback	18.3271	3.70072

Source: Field study 2018

The table II above shows the summary of statistics used in the analysis. It provides information about the means and standard deviation of the variable used in the study. The mean values for productivity is 19.15 while the standard deviation is 2.93. The mean values for performance appraisal, reward system and feedback are 23.92, 23.51, and 18.32, with their respective standard deviation of 3.13, 4.11, and 3.70 respectively.

Table III
Result of Correlation Analysis and the Hypotheses Tested

Hypotheses	Pearson Correlation	Sig.	Rejected/Supported
H1 Performance Appraisal does not influence employees Productivity in COOU	.516	.000	Supported
H2 Rewards does not contribute to employee Productivity in COOU	.635	.000	Supported
H3 Performance Feedback does not undermine Employee Productivity in COOU	.683	.000	Supported

Source: Field Survey 2018.

Test of Hypotheses:

Here the three hypotheses were tested using Pearson’s *r* correlation coefficients. Cohen (1988, pp.79-81) as cited in Pallant (2011) stated that if $r = .10$ to $.29$ = which implies small (Low) correlation between the two variable under study. $r = .30$ to $.49$ = which implies medium (moderate) correlation between the two variable under study. $r = .50$ to 1.0 = implying that we have high correlation between the two variables under study.

Hypotheses one:

H1. Performance appraisal does not influence employee’s productivity in Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, (as measured by productivity scale) was investigated using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analysis were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. There was a high, positive correlation between the two variables [$r = .516$, $n = 221$, $p < 0.05$] with high level of performance appraisal associated with high level of productivity. Also, our results showed that we have a shared variance of (0.27) 27% between the two variables. Meaning that performance appraisal helped to explain nearly 27% of the shared variance in respondent’s scores on productivity. This is in line with MollelEliphas, Mulongo and Razia (2017); Peleyeju, and Ojebiyi (2013); Ajayi, Awosusi, Arogundade & Ekundayo (2011); Obiora (2002) which indicated that performance appraisal influence employee productivity in the organization.

Hypotheses Two:

H2. Reward System does not influence Employee’s Productivity in Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. The relationship between reward system (as measured by reward system scale) and productivity (as measured by productivity scale) was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analysis were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. There was a high, positive correlation between the two variables [$r = 0.64$, $n = 212$, $p < 0.05$] with high level of reward system associated with high level of productivity. Also, our results showed that we have a shared variance of (.403) 40% between the two variables. Meaning that reward system helps to explain nearly 40% of the shared variance in respondent’s scores on productivity.

In testing this hypotheses, the Pearson correlation(*r*) was used. As shown in table III above. Since the *r* value of is 0.635 and significant value is .000 ($p < 0.05$).we reject the null hypotheses and accept the alternative hypotheses which states that Reward System contributes to employees productivity in Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. From Cohen (1988: 79-81), *r* value of 0.635 we say that the reward system contributes to employees productivity in Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. This is in line with Hasni & Nura (2014), Eleine, Hailey & Kelliher (2010), Emesowum (2010) which posits that reward system has a high and significant correlation with employee productivity. Moreover, the *r* value is .635 and the r^2 (0.403), 40% shared variance. This means that 40% variation in productivity in Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University University can be explained by the reward system.

Hypotheses Three

H3. Feedback does not undermine Employee’s Productivity in Chukwemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. The relationship between feedback (as measured by feedback scale) and productivity (as measured by productivity scale) was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analysis were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. There was a high positive correlation between the two variables [$r = 0.68$, $n = 214$, $p < 0.05$] with high level of feedback associated with high level of productivity. Also, our results showed that we have a shared variance of (0.466) 47% between the two variables. Meaning that feedback helps to explain nearly 47% of the shared variance in respondent’s score on productivity.

In testing hypotheses three, the Pearson r correlation coefficient was used as shown in table III above. Since the r value is 0.683 and significant value is .000 we reject the null and accept the alternative hypotheses which states that performance feedback undermines employee's productivity in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. From Cohen (1988:79-81), and our r of 0.683 we say that Performance feedback undermines productivity in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. This agrees with the findings of Ejeh & Okoro (2016); Mohammed & Abdullahi (2011); Akeke, Akeke & Awolusi (2015) which posits that feedback has a high and significant correlation with employee productivity. Again with r value of 0.683 and r (0.466, this implies that 47% of the variation we experience in the productivity of Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University employees can be explained by the feedback.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined the relationship of performance management and employee productivity in Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University. The study found out that Performance Appraisal influences employee productivity. Performance Feedback undermines the productivity of staff, followed by the reward system.

Performance management has become an important instrument used by organizations to improve organizational efficiencies and effectiveness and also identify employee needs and encourage their commitment and loyalty in organizations. The study revealed that when employees are better appraised and well rewarded, it will increase their commitment to their jobs and loyalty to the organization. This will invariably lead to the attainment of organizational goals. When an employee is given feedback after appraisal on his/her areas of weakness and strength, the employee will put in more efforts to maintain his strength and also improve on his weaknesses.

When such happens, the organization will experience increased productivity. Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that:

1. Since Performance Appraisal positively influence employee productivity, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University should pay close attention to the type of performance appraisal systems they use in assessing their Academic staff and other non-academic personnel in their institutions.
2. In as much as the Reward system contribute to employee's productivity, it is recommended that COOU should adequately reward their staff without undermining the productive capacity of the personnel.

Since performance feedback undermines employee productivity, it is recommended that Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University and other tertiary institutions should establish consistent feedback mechanism in their respective institutions

References

- [1]. Agba, A.M. (2010). *Teachers' Perception on their Job performance. Unpublished Postgraduate Thesis on Education of the University of Calabar. Arusha Lutheran Medical Centre annual report (ALMC)*
- [2]. (2010) 24pp. Available at [www.almc.habari.co.tz/reports/2010_almc_annual_repo rt.pdf] accessed on 23rd October 2015
- [3]. Adeyanju, H. & Odunlami, I. (2009). *Performance and Potential Appraisal. In Akinsanya, O., Peleyeju, J., & Ajayi, K. (eds.) Personnel Administration. Ibadan: Bethel Prints.*
- [4]. Afolabi, A. (2001). *Essentials of Educational Management, Administration, Planning and Supervision. Abeokuta: Vantage Publishers.*
- [5]. Akinsolu, A. (2010). *Managing Higher Education System for Higher Productivity: The need for Total Quality Management. Education Periscope, 3:1-9.*
- [6]. Ajayi, I.A., Awolusi, O.O., Arogundade, B.B & Ekundayo, H.Y. (2011). *Work Environment as Correlate of Academic Staff Job Performance in South-West Nigerian Universities. European Journal of Educational Studies, 3(1).*
- [7]. Akeke, N. I; Akeke, A.R & Awolusi, O. D (2015). *The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organization Commitment among Non-Academic Staff of Tertiary Institutions in Ekiti State. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research Methods 2(1); 25-39.*
- [8]. Armstrong M. & Baron, A. (1998); *Performance Management: The New Realities. London: IPD*
- [9]. Aswathapa K (2005). *Human Resource Personnel Management. 4th Edition', New Delhi India: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited*
- [10]. Atif, J (2010). *Employee Retention Relationship to Training and Development: A Compensation Perspective. African Journal of Business Management 5(7): 2679-2685.*
- [11]. Bloom, W., Dorgan, F., Dowdy, V. & van Reenen, M. (2007). *Improving Employee Performance through Appraisal and Coaching (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: American Management Association.*
- [12]. Broady-Preston, C. & Steel, M. (2012). *Can Performance Appraisals Motivate Employees /7 to Improve Performance? A Mexican study. The International Journal of Human Resource Management 1 (22), 1-22. DOI:10.1050/09585192.2011.637069*
- [13]. Brown, M., & Benson, J. (2013). *Rated to Exhaustion? Reactions to Performance Appraisal Processes. Industrial Relations Journal 34(1), 67-81.*
- [14]. Carroll, S J. & Schneier, C. E. (2002). *Performance Appraisal and Review Systems: The Identification, Measurement and Development of Performance in Organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.*
- [15]. Caruth, C. & Humphreys, D. (2008). *Perfect Phrases Jar Performance Reviews: Hundreds of Ready-to-use Phrases that describe your Employees Performance (from unacceptable to outstanding). New York: McGraw-Hill.*

- [17]. Cascio, W.E. & B. Bailey, (1995). *International FIRM: The State of Research and Practice*. In: Shenkar, O., (Ed.)/ *Global Perspectives of Human Resource Management*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, NJ, pp: 15-36.
- [18]. Chen, Y. (2009). *Self-determination in Human Behavior*. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74(2), 580-590.
- [19]. Cole, G.A. (1997). *Personnel Management. Theory and Practice*: London: Letts Educational.
- [20]. Cook, J., & Crossman, A. (2004). *Satisfaction with Performance Appraisal Systems*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 19(5): p. 526-541
- [21]. Cook, S. & Crossman, M. (2014). *Performance Appraisal Reactions: Measurement, Modeling and Method bBas*. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85(5), 708-723.
- [22]. Davis, T. & Landa, M. (2009). *A Contrary Look at performance Appraisal*. *Canadian Manager/Manager Canadian* 3 (2), 18-28.
- [23]. De Silva, S. (2008). *Performance-Related and Skill-Based Pay: An Introduction*. International Labour Office. Geneva: Switzerland.
- [24]. Decenzo, D. A. & Robbins, S. P. (2007). *Personnel/Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- [25]. Denisi, G (2006) *the Social Context of Performance Appraisal: A Review and Framework*. New York, NY: Longman Publishers.
- [26]. Derven M. (2010). *The Paradox of Performance Appraisal*. *Personnel Journal* 69 (2), 12-17.
- [27]. Dewhurst, K., Hersey, C. & Blanchard, V. (2010). *Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal: Its Outcomes and Detriments in Pakistani Organizations*. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 10(3), 479-485.
- [28]. Dzinkowski, R. (2010). *The Value of Intellectual capital*. *The Journal of Business Strategy* 21(4), 3-4.
- [29]. Ejiogor, P.N.O (1984). *How can we motivate Nigerian Worker?* In Aniagoh, V.A (eds): *Managing the Nigerian Worker*. Ikeja: Longman Nigerian Limited.
- [30]. Eleine, F., Hailey, H.H. & Kelliher, C. (2010). *High Commitment Performance Management: The Roles of Justice and Trust*. *Personnel Review*, 40(1): 5 – 23.
- [31]. Emesowum, U. F. (2011). *‘The Impact of Performance Evaluation on Workers’ Productivity in Public Companies: A study of PHCN in Anambra state’*. An unpublished Msc Thesis, Department of Political Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- [32]. Engle, A., M. Festing & P. Dowling, (2008). *State of Origin: Research in Global Performance Management, a Proposed Research Domain and Emerging Implications*. *European Journal of International Management*, 2(2).
- [33]. Erdogan, B. (2012). *‘Antecedents and Consequences of Justice Perceptions in Performance Appraisals’*. *Human Resource Management Review* 12 (4), 555-578.
- [34]. Ejeh, E. I., & Okoro, P. (2016): *Evaluation of Staff Personal Administration in Tertiary Institutions in South Eastern Nigeria from 2007 to 2012 Greener Journal of Educational Research* vol. 6 (6). Pp. 213-222.
- [35]. Enistein, W., & Le Mere-Labonte, J. (1989). *Performance Appraisal: Dilemma or Desire?* *Advanced Management Journal*, 54(2), 26-30.
- [36]. Fletcher, C. (2011). *Performance Appraisal: How to Improve its Effectiveness*. A Master’s Thesis Submitted to the University of Twente, Enschede.
- [37]. Folorunso OO (2014). *Exploring the Effect of Organizational Commitment, Dimension on Employee Performance: An Empirical Evidence from Academic Staff of Oyo State Owned Tertiary institutions; Ibadan: The Nigerian Polytechnic for Human Resource Management (SHRM) journal*. Page 6. Accessed on March, 6 2018.
- [38]. Gichuhi, A.W., Abaja, P.O., & Ochieng, I. (2014). *Effect of Performance Appraisal on Employee Productivity: A Case Study of Supermarkets in Nakuru Town, Kenya*. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences* 2 (1)42-58.
- [39]. *Global Workforce Report (2012)*. *Engagement at risk: During Strong Performance in a volatile global environment*, New York: Towers Watson Publishers.
- [40]. Gundechea, M (2012). *Factors Affecting Labour Productivity a Building Construction Project in the U.S.A Welp Survey: U.S.A: North Dalcota State University*.
- [41]. Gupta, C. & Upadhyay, V. (2012). *The Impact of Human Resource Practices on Business unit Operating and Financial Performance*. *Human Resource Management Journal* 13(2), 21-36.
- [42]. Hall, M. (2002). *Aligning the Organization to Increase Performance Results; the Public Manager* Vol. 31(2).
- [43]. Hall, W., Postner, G. & Hardner, B. (2009). *The Practice of Management*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
- [44]. Harper S. & Vilkinas, T. (2005). *Determining the Impact of an Organization’s Performance Management System*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 43(1).
- [45]. Hasni, O.N. & Nura, A.A. (2014). *The Relationship between Separation and Performance Management System of Academics in Nigerian Universities: The Mediating Effect of e-HRM*. *Journal of Scientific Research and reports*, 3(7): 894 – 904.
- [46]. Haunstein, N.M.A. (1992). *AN Information Processing Approach to Leniency*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 77, 485 – 493.
- [47]. Hayford, C; Boakye, Y & Ovus, N.O (2016). *‘Is Performance Appraisal System Anachronistic in Tertiary Institutions in Ghana? Evidence from the University of Cape Coast*. *Journal of Business and Management*, 18(4); 55-62.
- [48]. Homayounizadpanah, V. & Baqerrkord, G. (2012). *Sorting and Incentive Effects of Pay-for-Performance: Summary of an experimental study*. *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (6), 387-405.

- [50]. Igbokwe, P. A & Ugo –Okoro, C. P (2015) *Performance Evaluation of Academic Staff in Universities and College in Nigeria: The Missing Criteria*. *International Journal of Education and Research*. Vol.3(3):627640 retrieve from www.ijen.com/journal/2018/march2015/53.pdf on 20th February 2018 at 2:pm
- [51]. Jackson, S. &Schuller, R. (2012). *Managing Human Resources through Strategic Partnership (8th ed.)*. Toronto, Canada: Thompson.
- [52]. Kanfer, B. (2010). *A Benchmarking Study of Experiences with Electronic Government*. *An International Journal of Benchmarking* 14 (2), 172-1 85.
- [53]. Kumar R (2005). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners (Second Edition)*. London: SAGE Publications.
- [54]. Lee, H. (2005). *Training Management in South Africa (2nded)*. Cape Town, SA: Oxford University Press.
- [55]. Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage*. Maiden, WA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [56]. Mackey, K., Johnson, G. (2000). *The Strategic Management of Human Resources in New Zealand*. Auckland: Irwin/McGraw Hill.
- [57]. Malcolm, M. & Jackson, T. (2002). *Personnel Practice (3rded)*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. *Manager/Manager Canadian* 3 (2), 18-28.
- [58]. Maroney, B. & Buckley, M. (2012). *Does Research in Performance Appraisal Influence the Practice of performance appraisal?* *Public Personnel Management* 21 (2), 5-1 0.
- [59]. Marsor, R. (2011). *Influence of Prior Acquaintance with the rate on rater Accuracy and halo*. *The Journal of Management Development* 26 (8), 790
- [60]. Mello, J. A (2015). *Strategic Human Resources Management 4th Ed, U.S.A: CT*
- [61]. Mgbemena, G.C; Mbah, S.I &Ejike, D.C (2015). *Impact of Effective Performance Management on Organizational Productivity: A Study of Anambra State Civil Service System, Nigeria*. *The International Journal of Business and Management*.
- [62]. Mohammed, A.M &Abdulahi, Y.B (2011). *An Evaluation of Staff Motivation, Dissatisfaction and Job Performance in an Academic setting*. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research* 1(9), 113.
- [63]. Mollel-Eliphaz, R; Mulongo, L.S &Razia, M (2017). *The Influence of Performance Appraisal Practices on Employee Productivity: A Case of Muheza District, Tanzania*. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 5(4), 45-59.
- [64]. Mone, F. M., & London, M. (2010). *Employee Engagement through Effective Performance Management: A Practical Guide for Managers*. New York, NY: Routledge
- [65]. Monga, M.L (1989). *Management of Performance Appraisal*. Bombay: Himalaya Publishing House
- [66]. Moorhead, V. & Griffin, C. (2012). *Innovative Management Model for Performance Appraisal: the case of the Palestinian Public Universities*. *Management Research News* 27(2), 56-73.
- [67]. Moulder, E. (2011). *Performance Appraisals for Local Government Employees: Programs and Practices*. Washington: D.C
- [68]. Mullins, L. (2009). *Management and Organizational Behaviour (5thed.)*. New Jersey, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [69]. Naser, S (2007). *Exploring Organizational Commitment and Leadership Frames within Indian and Iranian Higher Education Institutions*. *Bulletin of Education and Research*. 29(1):17 – 32.
- [70]. Neely, A., J. Mills, K. Platts, H. Richard & M. Bourne, (2000). *Performance Measurement System Design: Developing and Testing a Process-based Approach*. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 20(10): 1119-1145.
- [71]. Negin, M Omid, M. Ahmad BM (2013). *The Impact of Organizational Commitment on Employee's Job Performance: A study of Meli Bank; International J. Contemporary Res. Bus.* 5(5): 164-171.
- [72]. Obiora, C.A. (2002). *Employee Performance Management in Tertiary Institutions. A Case Study of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka*. An Unpublished M.Sc Thesis Submitted to Department of Political Science Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
- [73]. Odihiambo, E.O. (2015). *The Effect of Performance Management Practices on Employee Productivity: A Case Study of Schindler Limited: Unpublished Research Report on Executive Master of Science in Organizational Development (EMOD) School of Business United States International University Africa*.
- [74]. Okafor, T. (2005). *Performance Appraisal a Chore or Cute-A Review of Public Sector Approach in Nigerian Universities*, Conference on Trends in the Management of Human resources in Higher education. 25-26 August at OCED Headquarters, Paris.
- [75]. Omusebe J.S., Kimanichege, G. & Musiega D. (2013) *Effects of Performance Appraisal on Employee Productivity. A Case Study Of Mumias Sugar Company Limited International Journal Of Innovative Research & Development Vol 2 (9):5*
- [76]. Onyeizuigbo, C.U (2013) *Practical Approach to Research Methodology (2nd edition)*. Onitsha: Success Publisher.
- [77]. Onyije, O.C. (2015), *Effect of Performance Appraisal Employee Productivity in Nigerian University*. *Journal of Economics and Business Research*. 21(4): 65 – 81.
- [78]. Owoyemi, O, & George, O. (2013). *The use of Performance Appraisal system in Enhancing Employee's Performance in a Public Sector Agency in Nigeria*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* vol. 3, No. 10. pp. 240-249.
- [79]. Pallant, J (2011). *A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis using the SPSS Programme Software Manual, 4th Edition*. Crow's nest: Alleri and Unwin.

- [80]. Peleyeju J. O & Ojebiyi, O. A (2013) *Performance Appraisal and Total Quality Management of Public Universities in South Western Nigerian*. *British Journal of Education* vol. No. 2 pp. 41-47
- [81]. Petermode, V. F. (1991). *Educational Administration: Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspectives for Students and Practitioners*. Lagos: Jaja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.
- [82]. Raju, B. & Collins, Y. (2008). *Performance Appraisal Decision in Malaysian Public Service*. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 17 (1), 48-64.
- [83]. Ramzan, M; Chazanber, H, Sajjaid, A (2013). *Impact of Motivation on Employee Turnover in Telecom Sector in Pakistan*. *Journal of Business Studies Quality* 5(1); 76-92.
- [84]. Randell, F. (2014). *Issues and Challenges in the Practice of Performance Appraisal Activities in the 21st Century*. *International Journal of Education and Research* 1(4), 1-8.
- [85]. Rao, T.V (2005). *Performance Management and Appraisal Systems*. New Delhi: Response Books.
- [86]. Salau, O.P., Oludayo, F.O. & Omoniyi, O. C. (2014). *Modeling the Relationship between Performance Appraisal and Organizational Productivity in Nigerian Public Sector*. *Economic Management Innovation Journal* 6(2), 2-16
- [87]. Schraeder, M. Becton. J., & Portis, R. (2007). *A Critical Examination of Performance Appraisals*. *The Journal for Quality and Participation* 21(0), 20-25.
- [88]. Schuler, R. S. & Jackson, S. E. (2005). *The Growth in Importance on International Perspective Management Review*. *A Quarter-Century Review of Human Resource Management in the US* 16: 11-35.
- [89]. Sekaran U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business (4th Ed.)*. Hoboken, New Jew: John Wiley & Sons.
- [90]. Sinclair, R; Wright, C & Cullen, J (2008). *Performance Differences for Organizational Commitment Profiles*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6); 1280-1287
- [91]. Solmon, D. & Podgursky, C. (2010). *Employee Performance Appraisal Practices of World Vision: Ghana Rural Water Project (GRWP)*. A Thesis Submitted to the University of Cape Coast.
- [92]. *Vanguard* (2011, January 18). *Anambra Varsity ASUU calls off strike*. Accessed online from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2011/01/anambra-varsity-asuu-calls-off-strike>.
- [93]. Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- [94]. Wurim, B. P. (2012). *Talent Management and Employee Productivity in Public Sectors Organizations of Nigeria*. *Journal of Management and Corporate Governance*, 4 (3): 129 – 134