

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF
STAFF IN PUBLIC SERVICE (A CASE STUDY OF OFFICE OF THE
HEAD OF SERVICE OF THE FEDERATION)**

BY

**FELICIA ADAJI
NSU/MPA/GEN/0058/16/17**

**BEING A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY
KEFFI, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE AWARD OF MASTERS IN (MPA) IN PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI NIGERIA**

APRIL, 2018

DECLARATION

I FELICIA ADAJI, hereby declare that this research project “Performance Evaluation on the Productivity of Staff in Public Service (A Case Study of Office of the Head of Service of the Federation)” has been written by me and to the best of my knowledge has never been submitted to Nasarawa State University or any other institutions of higher learning for the award of any degree.

FELICIA ADAJI
NSU/MPA/GEN/0058/16/17

Date

CERTIFICATION

This research project “Performance Evaluation on the Productivity of Staff in Public Service (A Case Study of Office of the Head of Service of the federation)” has been read and approved by the undersigned as meeting the requirement for the ward in Public Administration (MPA).

Dr. Ishaya Habu
Project Supervisor

Date

Dr. Abdullahi Mohammed
Head of Department

Date

External Examiner
Date

Dean, PG School
Prof. S. A. S Aruwa

Date

DEDICATION

This project work is dedicated to God Almighty and all the lecturers in the department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All thanks goes to God Almighty for his wonderful guidance and protection throughout the period of this research work.

My gratitude goes to my family for their support and prayers.

My immerse gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. Ishaya Habu for his time and guidance and assistance. Thank you sir.

ABSTRACT

Every activity in an organization is directed towards the realization of goals and objectives. As a result, organizations get pre-occupied with effort to use the men and resources available to them to achieve the highest result. But man who is a technical factor in the organization is human subjective and changeable, qua I Hive and dynamic aspects that vary cultural and personal backgrounds, economic events and with the pass time. Therefore, to increase efficiency and effectiveness in the personnel system, without undermining the performance appraisal system. Performance evaluation is a review or appraisal the general corporate objectives of the organization. It is the secret of increased productivity, and plans or programme effectiveness in organization, be they private or public. The use of performance appi aisal cuts across sectoral demarcation is used both in private organizations, government and quash government establishments and agencies, educational institutions, social institution. E.t.c Performance appraisal reveals the strength, and weaknesses of employee and provides the guides for channeling or directing development effort. It provides basis for taking appropriate personnel actions in determining monetary rewards, merit awards, retention, reassignment, promotion or demotion and dismissal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| Title page | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | i |
| Declaration | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ii |
| Certification | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | iii |
| Dedication | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | iv |
| Acknowledgments | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | v |
| Abstract | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | vi |
| Table of Contents | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | vii |

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Background to the Study | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of the Study | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| 1.3 Research Question | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| 1.4 Objective of the study | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| 1.5 Significance of the study | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| 1.6 Scope of the study | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| 1.7 Definition of operational terms | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 2.1 Introduction | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 |
| 2.1 Overview of Performance Evaluation in an Organization | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 |
| 2.3 Definition of Performance Evaluation | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| 2.4 Performance Appraisal System in an Organization | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 |
| 2.5 Problems/Difficulties of Performance Appraisal some of the Pitfalls | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 14 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 2.6 | Benefits of Performance Appraisal in an Organization | - | - | - | | | | | 16 |
| 2.7 | Method of Performance Evaluation in an Organization | - | - | - | | | | | 16 |
| 2.8 | Obstacles to Performance Evaluation in an Organization | - | - | - | | | | | 22 |
| 2.9 | Overcoming Performance Evaluation in an Organization | - | - | - | | | | | 26 |
| 2.10 | Reasons for Measuring Performance Evaluation in an Organization . | - | | | | | | | 31 |
| 2.11 | Brief History of the Office of the Head of Civil Service of the Federation | - | | | | | | | 32 |
| 2.12 | Theoretical Framework | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 37 |

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 3.1 | Introduction. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 45 |
| 3.2 | Research Design . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 45 |
| 3.3 | Sources of Data Collection | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 46 |
| 3.4 | Method of Data Collection | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 47 |
| 3.5 | Population and Sample Size . | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 47 |
| 3.6 | Technique for Data Analysis | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 48 |

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 4.1 | Introduction. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 |
| 4.2 | Presentation and Analysis of Data | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50 |
| 4.3 | Test of Hypothesis. | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58 |

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 5.1 | Summary | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 63 |
| 5.2 | Conclusion | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 63 |
| 5.3 | Recommendation . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 65 |
| | References | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 67 |

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The decreasing incidence of workers productivity in public sector poses a question as to whether performance evaluations plays any significant role toward ensuring proper productivity in the public sectors.

Performance appraisal is the periodic evaluation of an employee's job performance measured against the jobs stated or presumed requirement, the ultimate purpose of performance appraisal is to maximize workers productivity in an organization (Beach, 1930).

Performance appraisal has been one of the weakest in public sectors; they do not practice performance appraisal on a regular basis. A number of medium sized and large organization have introduced structured performance appraisal schemes, but the reality tends to be very different from declared objectives and policies. We are likely to find that, even where regular performance appraisals take place, and performance reports are duly produced and signed, no conclusions are drawn and no use is made of the, appraisal in deciding on staff development, promotions, transfers, merit, increment and increase in productivity (Dalton E. McFarland, 1990)

In some organizations, annual appraisal have become formalities that must be carried out but, do not reflect real performance that will lead to workers productivity even though it is not hard to find out about the formalism and other weaknesses of performance appraisal.

Over the years, the global trend has been toward improving productivity in the public sector. The reason for this is obvious. There is no country in this world, no matter its level of

prosperity that would likely to be stagnant. In like manner, no poor country would like to remain poor forever. Hence, the reasons behind every country's struggle and likely public sectors which by its method of operation cut down unnecessary cost, and generally increase productivity. Productivity can therefore be described as the relationship between results achieved and resources used over a defined period of time. It is the ratio of output to input. (David E. Martin, 1998)

This bring us to the question of what public enterprises (sectors) are; their origin and the rationale for setting them up.

Public enterprises can be described as the aspect of production which the agency and the power to the state partakes directly in economic activities of the productions, distribution and exchange.

Hason (1960) defined public enterprises as "institution operating services of an economic and social character on behalf of government but, enjoying an independent legal entity. It is largely autonomous in its management though responsible to the public through government. It is equipped on the other hand with independent and separate find and legal attribute of commercial enterprises.

However public enterprises are regarded as state owned organizations with relevant legal instrument such as a military decree, a parliament enactment of bye-laws or an edict establishing it administration structure and defining its power and fuhction with policy. In essence, public enterprises are set up by government to proved monopoly of certain good and services for the benefit of the public in general. (Folayam, 1998)

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Usually every research work must have a problem (s). This is concerned with the matter that calls for research problem. The conventional performance evaluation system is more like on lottery than an objective observations process, it is distorted by evaluator bias and more often reflects the unpredictability and instability of the organizations system and those who promote these activities labor under the mistaken belief that they are achieving a true discernment of an employee's acquirement. Meanwhile, low-rate employees, sharing in this mistaken belief feel dishearten and bear undesired personal credits many employees are skeptical of the competence of those managers who indulge in such activities. The research problems include the following:-

- a) Problems of the central tendency; some refers, appraise all the employees around the middle point of the rating scale and the avoid rating the people higher or lower.
- b) No motivational technique employed by the management (office of the head of service)
- c) Problem of computing the appraisal result by the office in-charge in the office of the head of service.
- d) Problem of not providing equitable measurement of an employee's contribution to the work force in the office of the head of sendee.
- e) Problem of proper guidelines for feedback in the office of the head of service.
- f) Lack of standardized evaluation form, performance measures, and disciplinary procedures.
- g) Lack of close supervision by the management office of the head of service.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- a) To examine the performance evaluation procedures in the office of the head of service of the federation.
- b) To identify performance evaluation as problems in the office of the head of service of the federation.
- c) To provide tentative suggestions that can be used to intensify productivity.

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

- a) To make positive change in organizational performance evaluation.
- b) To future researchers as a reference for their work.
- c) To help the management in identifying the best method of performance valuation which will lead to productivity.
- d) To serve as a resource material for the general public.

1.5 RESEACH HYPOTHESIS

Hypothesis is statement of assumption to be proof right or wrong. In this study the following hypothesis were consider;

Ho: Performance evaluation in public sector does not increase workers productivity.

- a. H1: Performance evaluation in public sector does increase productivity.

1.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Specific attention will be placed on the role of performance evaluation to workers productivity in public sector with reference to the office of the head of the head of service (2004-2014) period of the study.

Owing to the nature of the study, time factor, economic condition of the researcher constituted a major set- back in the course of writing this project work hence it was not possible to investigate all the performance evaluation and workers productivity in every public sector in the country. However, emphasis was placed on the remote problems which

include nonavailability of related literature, scarcity statistic and secrecy on the respondents.

1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS

- a) **Public Enterprises:** enterprises is defined as an incorporated or large unincorporated enterprises in which public authorities hold a majority of the shares and / or can exercise control over management decisions.
- b) **Organization:** an organization can be described as ordered manner: orderliness by virtue of being methodical and well organized. It can also be seen as an entity comprising multiple people, such as an institution or an association, that has a collective goal and is linked to an external environment.
- c) **Evaluation:** evaluation is the systematic determination of merit, worth and significance of job using criteria against a set of standards in an organization and can also be seen as a tool for reviewing the performance of employees by employer.
- d) **Productivity:** Productivity is a measure of output from production process per unit of output, for instance, labor productivity as typically measured as a ratio of output per labor hour, it also measures how resources are gathered together in an organization and utilized to accomplished a set of goal.
- e) **Incentive:** incentive this is a reward offered to employee to boost response in workers. They are motivational in nature with main focus on individual intended to increase productivity.
- f) **Motivators:** They are factors leading to job satisfaction and high employee morale highlighted. Motivation are important in job achievement programmers' stated in theory of motivation.
- g) **Performance:** can be seen as the result of activities of an organization or investment over a given period of time.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the views expressed by some authors of books, papers and related literature on the study area were covered and reviewed.

2.2 Overview of Performance Evaluation in an Organisation

One of the key responsibilities of the manager is to evaluate the performance of his subordinates, the essence of the evaluation is to assess their character, attitude, potential; and past performance on the job employee evaluation has often called performance appraisal, performance rating of performance evaluation, whatever name it is called, the essence of the rating is to evaluate the employee's strength and weaknesses.

One of the major reasons for employee appraisal is to obtain information for promotion, demotion, transfer, pay increases, framing and development and discharge. For the employee, an appraisal gives him a feedback as to how management perceives his contribution to the organization, if an employee perceives that he is poorly evaluated, it could affect his morale; increase his absenteeism rate and tardiness and consequently, his overall production, this is why employee evaluation is expected to be done in the spirit of objectivity, honesty, and fair play. When an official evaluates, he is in effect passing judgment that he has competence to evaluate; he knows the employee and has observed him at work negative feelings about it.

Every day in an organization, employees informally evaluate one another; even the supervisor is not left out.

When the official evaluation comes out, employees compare opinions they hold with the formal evaluation result from their supervisors. A supervisor is said to be fair or unfair based

on employee's preconceived opinion of themselves and one another.

According to Jean Phillips and Stanley Gulley (Strategic Staffing) Stated 5 reasons why appraise performance is conducted in an organization:

1. Most employers still base pay, promotion and retention decision on their employee's appraisal.

2. Performance appraisal play a pivotal role in performance management.

It is about continues improvement, goal-directed, and revaluation that how well an employee's and team's performance conforms to the organizational overall goals.

3. Helps correct any weak links and make you capitalize on things done well.

4. Career planning becomes easier. One can mould their career path in accordance to his or her exhibited strengths and weaknesses.

5. Helps identify employee's training and development (cause and remedy) needs if there exists a "performance gap"

2.3 DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Performance evaluation or appraisal is the systematic assessment of individual with respect to his performance on the job and his potential for development (Beach 1980) By far the most common evaluation is done by the for a long time. Many employees are afraid of evaluation and have individual's immediate supervisor in an organization who in turn is assessed by his supervisor.

performance appraisal is the process by which a manager or consultant examines and evaluates an employee's work behavior by comparing it with preset standards, and document the results of the comparison and uses the results to provide feedback to the employee to show where improvements are needed and why.

Randall S. Schuler defined "Performance appraisal as a formal, structured system of

measuring and evaluating an employee's job, related behavior and outcomes to discover how and why the employee is presently performing on the job and how the employee can perform more effectively in the future so that the employee, organization and society all benefit.

Heyel sees it performance evaluation as the process of evaluating the performance and qualifications of the employees in terms of the requirements of the job for which he is employed, for purposes of administration including placement, selection for promotions, providing financial rewards and other actions which require differential treatment among the members of a group as distinguished from actions affecting all members equally.

Dale Yoder said, Performance appraisal includes all formal procedures used to evaluate personalities and contributions and potentials of group members in a working organization. It is a continuous process to secure information necessary for making correct and objective decisions on employees performance appraisals are employed to determine who needs what training, and who will be promoted, demoted, reta To generate confidence in management decision-making, the manager's performance evaluation needs to be systematic, objective, fair and contain well designed procedures which will ensure thorough training of managers in their skill acquisition. This will go a long way to ensure they attain their aims and objectives (Dalton; 1990).

Performance evaluation may be defined from (2) standpoint

- i. The instructional standpoint
- ii. A broader and general sense.

From the instructional standpoint, performance evaluation may be defined as a systematic process of determining the extent to which instructional objectives are achieved by the learner. (Groundund 1976) this definition ensures the following aspects of evaluation:

- a) Evaluation involves a systematic process, it therefore provides a controlled, observation of the learner.
- b) Evaluation assumes that the learner have exposed to some content before determining through measurement, the extent of learning that has taken place.
- c) Evaluation involves judgment and decision making.

In a broader and general sense, performance evaluation is a process of collecting and using information to make decision about a work (Croubach 1963).

The information may be collected using measurement or **non-measurement** techniques. This indicates term than measurement, it is both quantitative and, qualitative description of learners behavior plus value judgment concerning the desirability of that behavior.

Evaluation implies both the process of getting the information, the qualitative information and then the value judgment or decision made of the information obtained.

In other hands performance evaluation (Appraisal) is a system which provides organization with a means of identifying not what people's performance levels are but in which level does new improvement needs to be made if maximum benefit is to be made of human resources.

At the same time, the system ensure that every individual is clearly aware of what his function and responsibilities are; the process of appraisal lets

each staff (including the manager) know he is viewed by his superior, what have been the significant achievements in the period under review, how his performance may be improved in the future and if area of relative weakness are identified. What training or development might be put in place to strengthen them.

Appraisal provides the tools to determine the strengths and weaknesses of our subordinates. It is essential information on which action for continued service in the same job, training,

promotion, transfer or redeployment should be based.

2.4 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN AN ORGANIZATION

The major concept in this research included among others the following:

- a) Performance.
- b) Efficiency.
- c) Effectiveness.

It should be noted the performance evaluation cannot be really divulged/separated from efficiency and effective an organization is, that is how well an organization performs and achieves its statutory objectives, and satisfies its social responsibility, it can therefore be said that performance refers to how well organization is doing in relation to intended purposes or objectives.

According to Balogun (1980) performance relates to whether the services intended have delivered or intended outcomes to be accomplished or whether the target problems or situation has experienced desired changes. Hence, performance answers the question of how the organization has fared in its relationship with the environment, the same as those requirements for performance of the ultimate task. In other words, it is relevant to address the following questions:

- a) To what degree does the criterion represent the characteristics of the job; its purpose to measure same. The relevance of a particular criterion Visually must be estimated as rationale for professional judgment.
- b) Freedom from bias: This requires that each person be provided with an equal opportunity and each worker must be provided equally with machine of the same quality.
- c) Reliability: This refers to the productivity or result reliability which answers the questions of

how consistently the criterion measures the performance.

- d) Finally, availability: The criterion measure must be reasonably convenient and available.

2.5 Problems/Difficulties of Performance Appraisal Some of the pitfalls

in performance appraisal are:

- a) It places the manager in the position of judge and the employee in the position of defendants.
- b) Held Effect: This refers allows one outstanding negative or positive incident or influence his rating of the employee.
- c) Rating the man and not the job: subjective evaluation of the employee based on the referer's likes and dislikes or whether he gets along with the subordinate or not, or whether he likes his tribe, religion or language
- d) Rating every employee average: This is the error of central tendency where the referer sees every employee as average. This problem often is an escapist attitude. He believes it is the most convenient and least contestable way out.
- e) Not sharing the result: Here the referer refuses to discuss the rating with subordinate.
- f) Recency: Tendency to rate one positively or negatively because of latest events that took place before the rating.
- g) Pressure of time: This is associated with the lack of time that includes management rushing the appraisal.

2.6 Benefit of Performance Appraisal in an Organization

An Organizational Performance Evaluation provides your organization with the following benefits:

1. Exploration of major issues that might impact on the overall performance of your organization's systems and processes.
2. Recommendations and a subsequent action plan to address priority

opportunities.

3. Independent review of the findings from various data sources to allow for greater objectivity and comparison against employee perceptions.
4. Item by item comparison against benchmarked organizations (Feedback report includes scoring profile and comparison with best known practice).
5. Enables progress to be measured against previous evaluations (internal benchmark) or against similar organizations (external benchmark).
6. Provides an indication of an organization's readiness to apply for an Australian Business Excellence Award

2.7 Method of Performance Evaluation in an Organization

Numerous methods have been devised to measure the quality and quantity of performance appraisals. Each of the methods is effective for some purposes.

Broadly all methods of appraisals can be divided into two (2) different categories:

- a) Past Oriented Methods
- b) Future Oriented Methods

Past Oriented Methods includes

1. **The Rating Method:** Here the supervisor ranks all employees from best to worst on the scale using various traits or factors.

Advantage of Rating methods.

- It is easy to use
- Every type of job can be evaluated using rating method.
- It covers large number of employees.
- No formal training required in rating method.
- It is very easy to be adaptable.

Disadvantages of Rating methods » Rater's biases.

- Rater's biases

2. Graphic Rating Method: It is also known as personal traits, behavior scales, chart method, rating scale technique or graphic scales. The technique is the oldest and most widely used of all appraisal methods, hence it is also called the conventional rating method, most commonly, the rater or appraisal is applied with a printed evaluation form. An example is the annual performance form usually completed by each employee to be appraised. The form contains several different qualities and characteristics or traits to be rated according to various degree of merit.

3. Fared Comparison Method: This method is usually use for large groups, the technique implies that it is easier to judge which of two persons is superior and it means that employees are arranged in order of excellence. For each trait to be considered, every subordinate is compared with every other subordinate, hence the method is also known as 'man comparison' "The final ranking of each employee is determined by the number of times he was judged better than the others. The usual techniques used in this methods are; Ranking methods or paired comparison methods.

4. Force Choke Method: The method is aimed at preventing supervisor form clustering their employees at the high end of the scale or around the midpoint. Individuals rated are distributed along one of more scale and fixed percentages of employees are assigned to the best (excellent) and worst (unsatisfactory) ends of the scale and to the middle bracket.

Advantage of Forced Choice Method

- Absence of personal biases because of forced choice.

Disadvantage of Forced Choice methods

- Statement may be wrongly framed.

5. Critical Incident Technologies: In this method, the rate is expected to

show incidents in the work situated in which the employee being evaluated had shown positive or negative influence in work situations, factor such as initiative, judgment creativity, etc are to be shown

6. Critical Incident Method: In this method the rate is expected to show incident in the work situated in which the employee being evaluated had show positive or negative influence in work situations. Factors such as initiative, judgment, creativity etc are to be shown.

Advantage of Critical Incident methods

- Evaluation are based on actual job behaviors
- Rating are supported by descriptions
- Feedback is easy
- Reduces recency biases
- Chances of subordinate improvement are high.

Disadvantages of Critical Incident methods

- Negative incidents can be prioritized
- Forgetting incidents

® Over close supervision

- Feedback may be too much and may appear to be punishment

7. Peer Review Technique: The method allows outside specialist to evaluate the employee.

Because of the cost involved, this technique is use very economical. One of its setbacks is that the outside specialist does not know the employee's capabilities which includes peer

rating where the employee's coworkers evaluate his performance. Surprisingly, peer rating does not differ a great deal from an objective supervisor' rating. An employee can also evaluate himself, bring out his strengths and weaknesses and even suggest way of improvement,

c) Future Oriented Methods:

1. Management by Objective (MBO): This is the process of identifying goals and objectives, defining managerial responsibility in terms of expected results, and measuring performance and achievement against those goals and objectives. It unites the goals and targets of the organization with those of managers. In this approach, the superior and subordinate managers in the organization identify objectives in the major areas of responsibility in which the man will work. They design an action plan to achieve expected results in those areas, and set performance standards for acceptable work. They are then in a good position to measure actual results achieved against those projected plans and standards.

2. Psychological Appraisals: These appraisals are more directed to assess employees potential for future performance rather than the past one. It is done in the form of in-depth interviews, psychological tests, and discussion with supervisors and review of other evaluations. It is more focused on employees emotional, intellectual, and motivational and other personal characteristics affecting his performance. This approach is slow and costly and may be useful for bright young members who may have considerable potential, however quality of these appraisals largely depend upon the skills of psychologists who perform the evaluation.

3. Assessment Centers: is a central location where managers may come together to have their participation in job related exercises evaluated by trained observers. It is more focused

on observation of behaviors across a series of select exercises or work samples.

Assesses are requested to participate in in-basket exercises, work groups, computer simulations, role playing and other similar activities which require the attributes for successful performance in actual job. The characteristic assessed in assessment center can be assertiveness, persuasive ability, communicating ability, planning and organizational ability, self confidence, resistance to stress, energy level, decision making, sensitivity to feeling administrative ability, creativity and mental alertness etc.

4. 360-Degree Feedback: It is a technique which is systematic collection of performance data on an individual group, derived from a number of stakeholders like immediate supervisors, team members, customers, peers and self. In fact anyone who has useful information on how an employee does a job may be one of the appraisers. This technique is highly useful in terms of broader perspective, greater self development and multi-source feedback is useful. 360-degree appraisals are useful to measure inter-personal skills, customer satisfaction and team building skills. However on the negative side, receiving feedback from multiple sources can be intimidating, threatening etc. Multiple raters may be less adept at providing balanced and objective feedback. Rue and Boyers (1979) (management and application) defined performance as the degree of accomplishment of tasks that make up individual jobs. Performance is often confused with effort which refers to energy expended; performance is measured in terms of results. For example, a student may exert a great deal of effort in preparing for an examination and still makes a poor grade. In such cases, the effort expended was high, yet the performance was low.

2.8 Obstacles to Performance Evaluation in an Organization

There are several obstacles common to most employee evaluation process. By coming

familiar with the obstacles, the supervisor will be equipped to overcome identified barriers.

These barriers include the following:

- a) Supervisor do not receive adequate training on the techniques of evaluating employee performance. Supervisors may lack the techniques necessary to handle the evaluation interview effectively, as these techniques are quite different from other day to day contacts with the employee,
- b) The formal evaluation interview is uncomfortable for both the supervisor and the employee. There is a tendency for a supervisor to avoid confronting an employee with information regarding poor performance and justifying the criticism. The supervisor may also feel uncomfortable in discussing employee's strengths, likewise, the employee may be uncomfortable with and find it difficult to accept praise or become defensive when areas of poor performance are discussed. This is why evaluation must be objective and job related. There is a certain degree of subjectivity inherent in the evaluation process because each individual brings his/her individual bias to the evaluation process. Eliminate bias, even if you can't delimit all personal judgment from the evaluation process.

Some common subjective errors in the evaluation process include;

1. **Halo Effect:** The tendency to allow extremely positive or negative rating certain performance categories. To overcome the halo effect, the supervisor should review the employee's entire performance.
2. **Leniency/ Severity:** Evaluation which occur in the extreme range of the performance scale reflect on the supervisor as being too hard (severity) or too easy (leniency) in rating the performance of most 23 employees. To overcome leniency/ severity then supervisor should consider more measurable, observable and determinable criteria.

3. **Central tendency:** This error happens when a supervisor does not want to give high or low ratings, with the result that most employees receive evaluation ranked in the middle of the performance.
4. **Assimilation/ Differential effects:** Supervisors unconsciously commit the error referred to as the "similar- to me effect" in which they tend to rank employees they perceive to be similar to themselves higher than those they perceive to be different. To overcome assimilation/ differentiation effects, the supervisor should review each employee's performance on his/ her own merits. As rated, this may result.
5. **Top Heavy Rating:** Some supervisor have a rating of good as their lowers rate, this may result in employees being rated higher then is justified.
6. **Pitch Fort Effect:** This is exactly the opposite of Halo effect, it occurs when an employee who has performed well during the period of review is given low grading because of his substandard performance in the past. Similarly because of poor performance in one grading in other aspects as well.
7. **Recency Error:** Appraiser is supposed to honestly appraise performance of the employee for the entire period of appraisal. However, at times, instead of giving equal weight age to performance over the entire period, appraisal is influenced by happenings/ occurrences in the recent past.
8. **Competitive Appraiser:** Some appraisers compete with other appraisers in the organization in giving higher rating than others leading to excessively inflated appraisals.
9. **Length of Service Bias:** It occurs when the appraiser think that employees having more experience or longer service are better an irrespective of their performance tends to rate them higher.

10. Biased Appraisal: It occurs when appraisal is influenced by individual differences like age, sex, caste, race, personal likings/ relations etc.

To overcome heavy rating effects supervisors should accurately rate the employees according to his/ her performance.

Some of more common potential obstacles include a

- Lack of time or conflicting demands on the subordinate in time;
- inadequate work facilities and equipment,
- Restrictive policies that affect the job,
- Lack of co-operation from other type of supervision,
- Timing and even luck.

A skillful and motivated machine operator cannot be productive without machinery and proper raw materials. A sales person's performance may be hindered by overly restrictive and out dated policies.

Also a research and development may be fruitless because a competitor perfects the ideals.

First it is thus obvious that an individual worker does not have total control over performance in this situation.

The dynamics of work group can also inhabit performance. This occurs wh[^]n informal group norms are countered productive to organizational goals. In such instances, the performance of individuals is influence by their attraction to the group.

2.8 Overcoming Performance Evaluation Obstacles

One of the great truisms that apply to managing people is. No one comes to work with the desire to fail. Although at times it appears that employees try to perform poorly but mostly everyone actually wants to do a good or at least adequate job. so why is it that people

sometimes do fail at work? The causes of workplace failure are many and varied, but some of the few of the more common reasons that employees do not perform up-to-standard are:-

- a) They do not know how or what they should do: Employees sometimes fail because they simply don't know what is expected of them. Managers frequently make false assumptions about employees' understanding of both their jobs and the expectations of the workplace. Attributing many of the more basic expectations of the workplace- things such as work attendance, promptness, willingness to help others etc - to common sense is not so common anymore. The only way to be certain an employee understands what is expected is to expressly tell he or her.
- b) They fear a negative consequence. The impact of peer pressure can be as significant in the workplace as it was in school. Many employees succumb to concerns about being ostracized by others in the work group if they perform too well. Their general view is that an employee who works quickly and efficiently will raise the standards for everyone else, and co-workers can exert lots of pressure to make sure that doesn't happen.
- c) They are allowed not to do what they should do. Sometimes, they are even rewarded for not doing what they should do. In some cases, managers are unaware that an employee is performing poorly. More often though, managers are aware of the performance problem but choose not to address it. This creates a "snowball effect" and the performance of the overall work group gradually declines as others realize there is no penalty for poor performance. Managers' reluctance to confront performance issues may stem from a variety of causes, one of which does not want to change the rules in the middle of the game. In other words, if the manager has let employees get away with certain behaviors in the past it may seem unfair to "raise the bar" now. Standards and expectations are subject to change, and allowing sub-par

performance in the past should not preclude addressing it in the future.

27

- d) They think they are doing just fine. Most of us operate on the belief that "no news is good news". Thus, employees who are not told that their performance is unacceptable generally don't realize that it is and will continue performing poorly.
- e) They have obstacles limiting their performance, for equipment, outdated technology, or a lack of training can prevent an employee from succeeding at his or her job. Sometimes we simply have a round peg in a square hole, which results from a hiring mistake. Placing an employee who for whatever reason, is not suited for the job is a ticket to that employee's failure.

The implication of all this for managers is that they must carefully examine their influence. Strangely enough, managers generally underestimate the impact of what they do (or don't do) on their employees' performance. Managers' influence exists on both the input side (what is done to get performance started) and the consequence side (what is done or is not done after performance has happened).

Key question for managers to ask of themselves on the input side are.

- Do employees know what to do?
- How to do their work?
- When to do their work?

Keeping in mind that some people are more self-motivated than others, things such as requests, directions, policies, procedures, training, goal setting and schedules should be considered here.

Logic tells us to expect positive, or pleasant, consequences to result from good performance and negative consequences to result from poor performance. Managers who apply

consequences in this manner are most effective in shaping their employees' performance. Items in the manager's tool box in this area are: feedback, praise, criticism, bonuses, raises, recognition, rewards, discipline and inattention.

Managers play a key role in directing the future of the organization by shaping the performance of its employees. By exercising their influence thoughtfully and carefully, managers can make the difference between an employee's success and failure.

2.9.1 Recognition of the fact that these obstacles exist

It's very important that the management of any organization recognize the existence of the performance obstacles, as problem recognized is half solved and by recognizing these obstacle a well designed plan could be established.

2.9.2 Following organizational principles

After recognizing these obstacles, it is the duty management to find out if the principles of the organization have been strictly adhered to. Also the management must ascertain if it will be important to redefine the job requirements to keep up with the current job system.

2.9.3 Environmental factor

The management should not view environmental factors as direct determinant of individual performance but as modifying of efforts, ability and direction. For example: poor ventilation or worn-out equipment might easily affect exerted efforts by an individual. Also unclean policies or poor supervision can easily misdirect effort. Hence, it is one of management's great working conditions and supportive environment in order to eliminate or minimize performance obstacles.

ACTIVITY TRAP: Another major problem in most organizations today is that managers tend to focus on the effort component of performance rather than on performance itself. This

observed by George Odioré as "Activity Trap" He says further: "Most people get taught in the activity trap! They become so enmeshed in activity, they lose sight of why they are doing it and the activity becomes a false goal and end in itself, successful people never lose sight of their goals, they hoped for output" Odioré (Activity Trap).

By this description of activity, Odioré may duplicate the effort of performance. As an activity becomes entrenched, it becomes more meaningful than actual performance. This can be summarized on the

premise than looking busy and generating activity rather than performance.

2.10 Reasons for Measuring Performance Evaluation in an Organization

Measuring performance may serve as the following purpose:

1. Can be used as a basic for setting objective and planning work schedule.
2. It can be used as a basic for rewarding workers.
3. It can be used as a basic for promotions, separation and transfers.
4. It can be used as a basis for estimating and allocating costs.
5. As a means for evaluating different work method, different tools and equipment and different condition of work,
6. As a means of determining when and a problem arises.

Hence it is generally believed that, job performance methods are needed in most phases of management. It must be stated that one of the most difficult aspect of a management job is locating in establishing satisfactory measure of job needs mostly referred to as called criteria.

The difficulties of obtaining satisfactory such as the following.

- a) There are job that not readily avail itself to objective measurement.
- b) Influence on job performance on many factors outside individual control.

Robert Thorndike and Elizabeth Flagen listed four (4) qualities that should be sought when

selecting job criteria which are:-

- i. Validity of relevance
- ii. Freedom from bias
- iii. Reliability
- iv. availability

2.11 Brief History of the Office of the Head of Civil Service of the Federation

Before the first Nigeria Military intervention of January 1966, the Head of the Civil Service of the Federation was called Secretary of the cabinet. His main function then was to ensure orderly and quick implementation of the decision of parliament. All that dispensation the position of both the Head of Civil Service of the Federation and the secretary of the Government of the Federation was not defined. While Sections 90 and 143 of the Nigeria Constitution was clear on the appointment and function of permanent Secretaries, there was absolutely no provision for the position of the Head of Service and secretary to the government.

In 1966, a new nomenclature in the civil service was approved. The former secretary of cabinet was re-designed secretary to the military government and head of civil service. Decree no 17 of 1974 provided the legal backing to this administrative innovation. The arrowed functions imposed on the secretary to the federal military government the headship of civil service of the federation. This situation was maintained until 1979.

Section 152(2) and 188(2) and (a & b) of the 1979 constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria eliminated the inherent dualism, as a result, the office was split into two, that is, the office of the head of civil service of the federation and that of the secretary to the government of the federation.

Thereafter, the first head of service of the federation was appointed. By virtue of the suspension and modification Decree No 1 1984, the two offices were once again fused into one. The incumbent head of services, at that time was appointed, secretary to the military government and head of service. That measure was adopted in all the states of the federation. In 1986, the two offices were once again separated. The action received commendation nation - wide. However, the euphoria did not last long. In 1988, the presidential task force on the implementation of the civil service reform recommended that the office of head of civil service should be abolished. The armed forces ruling council endorsed the recommendation. Thus, when Decree No. 43 of 1988 On the reorganization of the civil service was eventually promulgated, no mention was made on the office of head of service and of the office of the secretary to the government both at federal and state level as documented in section 196(2) and 206(2) (a).

Following persistent yearning for the head of the civil service review panel headed by Mr A.A Ayida, one time secretary to the government and head of service of the federation. The panels recommended amongst other is restoration of the head of the civil service to make the service more accountable and proactive. This recommendation was approved by the government however, it was not implemented until the coming of civilian government in 1999.

Within the last two weeks of the civilian administration, the president and commander in chief of the armed forces of the federal republic of Nigeria acting in accordance with the provision of the 1999 constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria retired the office of the head of service and appointed of head of service in June 1999, the head of the civil service of the federation ones again become separated from the offices of the secretary to the

government of the federation.

2.11.1 Function of the head of civil service

The cabinet secretary of the presidency published in 1997 "Guidelines of Administrative Procedures of the Federal Government" The guideline listed the functions of the Head of Service to include the following amongst others:-

1. Advising the Head of Government on the appointment and deployment of Directors-General (now Permanent Secretaries).
2. Maintaining high morale and esprit-de-corps and favorable image of the service.
3. Responsible for overall management leadership, planning, training and motivation of civil servants. In-charge of personnel records and statistics of the civil service.
4. Responsible for career development of all senior management staff (GL. 14 and above) and fashioning-out training programmers for them.

2.11.2 Problems of the civil service of the federation

Despite its contributions to national development and democratic stability, the civil service over the years has been plagued by numerous problems which include:

1. Politicization: the Nigeria civil service has been polarized to the extent that most top officials openly support the government of the day. The introduction of the quota system of recruitment and promotion, adherence to the federal-character principle, and the constant interference of the government in the day-to-day operation of the civil service especially through frequent changes in top officials and massive purges, that political factors rather than merit alone played a major role in the civil service (Eme and Ugwu 2011)
2. High level of corruption:- corrupt practices occur in nearly all ministries, departments and agencies where virtually all members of the upper and lower levels of the bureaucracy are

involved. (Okotoni 2003; Expo 1979) and (Ogunrotifa 2012).

3. Lack of measurable objectives:- these include inadequate evaluations, mismanagement of time, inadequate facilities, disorganization, personnel mismanagement and over centralization (Easterly 2002)

2.11.3 Civil service reforms in nigeria since independence

Since the independence era, the Nigeria Civil Service has undergone series of reforms aimed at tackling the problems of the institution and repositions it to meet the development challenges of the 21st century. From 1960 to date, the table below summarizes the successive reforms civil service in Nigeria had underwent.

TABLE OF THE REFORMS

| Name of the reforms commission/panel | Year of the reform |
|--|--------------------|
| Morgan Commission | 1963 |
| Eldwood Commission | 1966 |
| Adebo Commission | 1971 |
| Udoji Commission | 1972 |
| Dotun Phillips Commission | 1985 |
| Decree No. 43 | 1988 |
| Ayida Review Panel | 1994 |
| Civil Service reform under Olusegun Obasanjo | 1999-2007 |
| Steven Oronsaye Panel | 2010-2012 |

Source: Ikejiani-Clark 1997, Williams 1997, Salisu 2001

2.11.2 Structure of the office of the head of the civil service of the federation

For the effective performance of the functions of the Head of the Civil Service of the Federation, the civil review panel recommended that the office be structured into five (5) extra-ministerial Departments, each to be headed by Permanent Secretary. The five extra-ministerial Departments are:

1. Establishment of Pensions Office (E & PO)
2. Manpower Development Office (MDO)
3. Public Service Office (PSO)
4. Management Service Office (MSO)
5. Service Welfare Office (SWO)

2.12 Theoretical Framework

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Efficiency is often times confused with effectiveness as both of them are used interchangeably. However, over the years some writers have stated the analysis of the difference between these factors to important management concepts. Hence, this research thesis intends to bring out the differences which are analyzed/perceived.

a) EFFICIENCY

Wolf in his book defines efficiency as " good organization and effective management practices of streamlined procedures, etc aimed at reducing reform under President 1999-2007 organizational expenses, eliminating waste and extravagance, and speeding up service to the public. Also, the dictionary defines efficiency as " the state or quality of people to work well. There are some concepts of efficiency which include the following:-

- i. Standard time
- ii. Actual time in. Normal time.

STANDARD TIME (IIS)

This is the period required by an operation work executed at 100% efficiency and without avoidable or unavoidable delays.

NORMAL TIME (HN)

This is the time required by an operation with all resources experiencing unavoidable delays.

No avoidable delays are experienced however.

ACTUAL TIME (HA)

This is the real time spent on job, that is, the time elapsing in the job. it takes account of ail constraints and limitations and also affects the total environment of the operation.

It is also perceived that the description of efficiency stated above relates to resources with their utilization to any given goals thus, given an identified goal. It is conceivable that a given combination of resources would lead to the realization of the goal within a standard time. Many factors can be impediment to the realization of the standard time. These factors thus depend on the nature of job being performed, also on the nature of the

38

people involved and /or the method of operation employed by the management. It must be noted however, that whatever the nature of job people engage in, they all point in one direction, which is that they result in non-agreement of the actual time and the regarded standard time. (Afolabi 1982) and (Balogun 1989).

2.12.1 Basic content of required standard

- 1 . Work content aided by methods of operations.
- 2 . Will content aided by defects in design of operations.

3 . Ineffective time due to shortcomings.

4 . Ineffective time due to labour faults.

The basic work content above defines the irreducible minimum amount of work to be accomplished and resource that are required. This however defines the standard. The total work content therefore is a function of the four classes of problems identified above as adding to the basic operational content and hence to the standard. The inverse of the work content is measure of efficiency as shown above. Therefore, the efficiency can be defined with reference to intended goal. Thus, such goal may be consciously or sub-consciously pursued unwittingly,. When a goal is pursued unwittingly, the operation can be carried out with less or more efficiency. Thus, what defines the effectiveness is the difference made with reference to the quality of the goal intended.

Efficiency is the ability to do things right, that is, an input-output concept, an efficient manager is the one who achieves outputs or results, which measures up to the input (labour, material and time) used to achieve them. Managers who are able to minimize the cost of the resources needed to achieve goals more acting than efficiency.

Effectiveness (Stoner, 1952) in contrast involves choosing the right goals. For example, a manager who selects an inappropriate goal say producing mainly larger cars when demand for small cars are produced with maximum efficiency. It should be noted that no amount of efficiency could make up for lack of effectiveness.

In fact, Drucker says, "Effectiveness is the key to an organization's success thus, before focus can be efficient, there is need to be sure we have formed the right thing to do.

(Simon, 1976) opined that the term "efficiency" was acquired during the past generation; a

number of unfortunate connotations, which associates with a mechanistic profit directed- step with theory of administration. Until the end of the late century, the term "efficiency" and "effectiveness" were considered synonymous.

The Oxford Dictionary defines "efficiency " as fitness or poor to accomplishing the purpose intended adequate power, effectiveness, and efficacy.

In recent years, efficiency has acquired another meaning, which is in th words of the Encyclopedia of the social sciences, Vol.5:437, is the ratio between input and output, effort and results, expenditure and income, cost and the resulting pleasure, is a relatively recent term.

In this specific sense, it become current in engineering only during the late half of the Nineteenth Century and in business and economics only since the beginning of the Twentieth Century and in addition, among some leaders of scientific management (Encyclopedia of the social science Vol. 5:437)

F.M.Taylor in his paper, "A piece rate system" scribed his pioneer method of establishing standard of job performance at the moderate steel plant. When such standard were set, it become customary to refer to the ratio of actual performance to the standard of performance as the efficiency of labour, a use of some different form other than that of the mechanical engineers, who apply the term of the ratio actual input.

In other words, organizations are here regarded having internal goals, which may be formally documental or implicitly understood and shared by the member, as well as, other goals whose attainment requires the cooperation of forces outside the organization itself. Silence among the internal goals is the goal of higher productivity.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter gives a picture of sources of data such as population size, sample size and the research instrument used. The chapter also deals with the method of data analysis for the study.

3.2 Research Design

A research is basically an enquiry in to the unknown, which involves the search for solutions to problems or answers to questions. Therefore a research design is a plan which specifies how data concerning a given problem should be collected and analyzed, it provides the procedure outline for the conduct of any given investigation.

3.3 Sources of Data Collection

The reliability and validity of any research and survey depends on number of factors. This include among others the methods use in gathering the research information, both Primary and Secondary sets of data were used in this study.

The Primary data used were obtained through response to questionnaires. Questionnaire was adopted in order to get the real situation as it exists that is an objective position from the sources.

Secondary data were obtained from various business journal, quarterly and seminar, workshop, papers and text books.

3.4 Method of Data Collection

The following were the methods of collection information

1. Questionnaires

Questionnaires consist of a set of questions designed to gather information/ data for analysis, the results of which are used to answer the research questions or used for the test of relevant hypotheses.

Questionnaires are one of the most widely used administrative and indeed social research techniques for data collection. The questionnaire takes the form of a list of questions, aimed at soliciting or eliciting response from respondents. The structure and nature of these questions are either open or close meaning that respondents are expected to choose from list of options provide by marking or ticking against the right one and ignoring others as applicable in the questionnaire or are required to suggest their variant view if otherwise in writing.

The questionnaire is regarded as one of the simplified means of gathering objective views of respondents as it is done without any supervision or expected to disclose one's personal identity.

2. Interviews

In interviews information is obtained through inquiry and recorded by enumerators. Structure interview are performed by using survey forms, whereas open interviews are notes taken while talking with respondents.

3. Direct Observations

Direct observations are methods usually use in making direct measurements on the fishing vessels, at landing sites, processing plants or in markets, the variables collected include catch (landing and discards), environmental variables, biological variables etc.

3.5 Population and Sample Size

3.5.1 Population

The population size is the total number of staff of the Office of Head of Service of the Federation which is about 3,814. The total population has been stratified into cadres, that is, the senior and junior. The total number of senior staff is about 954 while that of the junior is 2,860.

3.5.2 Sample size

The population size has been divided into ratio 1:24 of the total number of staff which is 153 selected by random sampling.

3.5.3 Random sampling technique

Was used to select sample, that is, fair representative of the population as there was no bias mind in arriving at the specified sample and that represent one-fourth of the total population.

The sample size drawn was staff of the Office of the Head of Service of the Federation in the three levels of management for better representation.

3.6 Technique for Data Analysis

The study uses the Chi-square method, of analysis. Responses of respondents to questions in the research questionnaire were looked into based on impact of performance evaluation in public sectors and tables were also drawn from the information given for explicit analysis.

i. Chi-square

Chi-square analysis were used to test the hypothesis stated which led to the accept a measure of the discrepancy existing between the observed and expected frequency supplied by the statistics, it is a Greek work denoted by.

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(F_o - F_e)^2}{F_e}$$

Where χ = is the Greek Letter 'Chi'

χ^2 = is the Chi-square

F_o = is the observed frequency

F_e = is the expected frequency

- ii. The-frequency hypothesis was subjected to a significance test to see if the data will lead to an acceptance rejection of either the null or alternative hypothesis respectively as used in the research study.
- iii. The hypotheses were tested at 5% level of significance. Observed frequency is those data gathered directly from the questionnaire.

- iv. Expected frequency was derived from the following calculation;
 $E_i = \frac{(\text{Row total})(\text{Column total})}{\text{Total frequency}}$

Total frequency

The degree of freedom $df = (C - 1)(r - 1)$

Where C = Column number

R == Row number.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the results, interpretation of finding of the study. An attempt was made to classify the respondents according to their characteristics such as sex, age, educational qualification, work status and working experience.

The method of data analysis used in the report was the descriptive method, which involves the use of tables and charts, while the quantitative method involves the use of Chi-square in testing the hypothesis.

The hypothesis was tested to determine which was acceptable or rejectable. One hundred and fifty-three questionnaires were distributed to the staff of the Office of the Head of Service of the Federation out of which only One hundred and forty-six questionnaires were successfully returned.

TABLE 4.2.1

GENDER DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Male | 82 | 56.2% |
| Female | 64 | 43.8% |
| Total | 146 | 100 |

4.2 Presentation and Analysis of Data

According to the table 4.1, out of 146 questionnaires returned, 82 were answered by male and 64 by female representing 56.2% and 43.8% respectively.

TABLE 4.2.2
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 21-30 | 73 | 50% |
| 31-40 | 51 | 34.9% |
| 41-50 | 22 | 15.9% |
| Total | 146 | 100 |

Source; Field Survey (2015)

As indicated in table 4.2.2, 50% of the number of respondents falls between the ages of 21-30. 34.9% represents the bracket of 31-40 while the age group of 41-50 and above represents 15.1% of the total number of the respondents. The structure of respondents reveals that they were mostly matured adults capable of making good judgment based on the topic of this research.

TABLE 4.2.3
BASIC EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| WASC/GCE | 31 | 21.2% |
| OND/NCE | 20 | 13.7% |
| FIND | 28 | 19.2% |
| B.SC | 67 | 45% |
| Total | 146 | 100 |

From table 4.3.3, it could be observed that 67 of the respondents were University graduates representing 45.9%, 31 persons representing 21.2% were WASC/GCE and 28 respondents fell into HN1) holders while 20 respondents were OND/NCE holders representing 19.2% and 13.7% respectively. This shows that the respondents were literate with the majority having University education.

TABLE 4.2.4**CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS BASED ON MANAGEMENT LEVEL.**

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| TOP Mgt | 27 | 18.5% |
| Middle Mgt | 49 | 33.6% |
| Low Mgt | 70 | 47.9% |
| Total | 146 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

From table 4.2.4, it could be seen that 33.6% of the respondents were middle management staff, 18.5% represented top management staff while the remaining 47.9% of the respondents were low management staff. This structure reveals that the majority of the staff represented by the researcher is responsible for the implementation of the parastatal plans and programmers'.

TABLE 4.2.5**CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENT ACCORDING TO YEAR OF WORKING**

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| 1-5 | 42 | 28.8% |
| 6-10 | 63 | 43.2% |
| 11 and above | 41 | 28.09% |
| Total | 146 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

From table 4.2.5, it shows that 28.8% have working experience of between 1 and 5 years. This is a satisfactory distribution as it indicated that for the period under study, most of the respondents were part of the parastatal and have spent long years to have acquired fair knowledge of the parastatal situation.

TABLE 4.2.6
CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENT BASED ON
DEPARTMENTS

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Operation | 27 | 18.5% |
| Administration | 56 | 38.4% |
| Account/Audit | 37 | 25.3% |
| Planning, Research & Statistics | 26 | 17.8% |
| Total | 146 | 100 |

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION LEADS TO EFFICIENCY AND
Source: Field Survey (2015)
EFFECTIVENESS IN AN ORGANIZATION

Table 4.2.6 indicates that 38.4% were from Administrative department while the remaining percentage of respondents from the departments of operation, Research and Statistic and Account/ Audit staff fell below 56% on individual basis. This structure reveals that majority of the staff repiesenting by the research were responsible for the implementation of administrative plans and programmers.

Table 4.2.7

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | | PERCENTAGE |
|------------------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | YES | NO | |
| TOP Mgt | 27 | NO | 0 % |
| MIDDLE Mgt | 49 | NO | 0 % |
| LOW Mgt | 70 | NO | 0 % |
| Total | 146 | NO | 100 |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

Shows that 146 or 100% of the respondents agreed that performance evaluation lead to efficiency and effectiveness in their organization while 0% disagreed with this considering the above table

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IS ENOUGH REQUIREMENT FOR PROMOTION, TRANSFER, PAY INCREASE, TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT.

TABLE 4.2.8

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | |
|------------|-----------|------|
| | YES | NO |
| TOP Mgt | 27 | 0 |
| MIDDLE Mgt | 47 | 2 |
| LOW Mgt | 63 | 7 |
| Total | 137 | 9 |
| Percentage | 93.8% | 6.2% |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

As illustrated in the table 4.9, 93.8% of the responses agreed that evaluation obtain information for promotion, demotion, transfer, pay increase, training and development, while 10.3% disagreed.

**TABLE 4.2.9
SUPERVISING OFFICERS FACE PROBLEMS WHEN APPRAISING**

| RESPONDENTS | FREQUENCY | |
|-------------|-----------|-------|
| | YES | NO |
| TOP Mgt | 27 | 0 |
| MIDDLE Mgt | 45 | 4 |
| LOW Mgt | 59 | 11 |
| Total | 131 | 15 |
| Percentage | 89.7% | 10.3% |

From the above table 4.2.10 89.7% believed that supervisors face problems when appraising the employees and 10.3% disagreed with the opinion.

TABLE 4.2.10

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IS ESSENTIAL TOWARDS
ACHIEVING AN ORGANIZATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

| RESPONDENTS | FREQUENCY | |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------|
| | YES | NO |
| TOP Mgt | 27 | 0 |
| MIDDLE Mgt | 45 | 4 |
| LOW Mgt | 59 | 11 |
| Total | 131 | 15 |
| Percentage | 89.7% | 10.3% |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

From the above table 4.2.10 89.7% or the majority of the respondents agreed with the opinion that evaluation is essential towards achieving organizational objective while 10.3% of respondents disagreed.

TABLE 4.2.11

**ACCESSING THE QUALIFICATION OF SUPERIOR OFFICERS
DURING EVALUATION**

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Very Efficient | 23 | 15.8% |
| Not Efficient | 123 | 84.2% |
| Total | 146 | 100% |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

The above table 4.2.11 shows that 84.2% of the respondents are not efficient with the performance of the superiors who appraised their efficient.

| RESPONDENTS | FREQUENCY | |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| | YES | NO |
| TOP Mgt | 26 | 1 |
| MIDDLE Mgt | 43 | 4 |
| LOW Mgt | 60 | 10 |
| Total | 129 | 15 |
| Percentage | 89.4% | 11.6% ----- |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

As illustrated in table 4.2.12, 11.6% of the respondents disagreed that evaluation result to maximize productivity while 88.4% of the respondents agreed that evaluation result do maximize productivity.

TABLE 4.2.13

**SATISFACTION THAT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RESULT
MAXIMIZES**

| RESPONDENTS | FREQUENCY | |
|-------------|-----------|-------|
| | YES | NO |
| TOP Mgt | 23 | 4 |
| MIDDLE Mgt | 45 | 4 |
| LOW Mgt | 50 | 20 |
| Total | 118 | 28 |
| Percentage | 80.8% | 19.2% |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

From the above table, it can be realized that 80.8% of the respondents are satisfied with the manner in which supervisors conduct appraisal in the organization while 19.2% of the respondents are not satisfied within such statement.

TABLE 4.2.14

| VARIABLES | FREQUENCY | PERCENTAGE |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| REASONS FOR LOW PRODUCTIVITY | | |
| Lack of promotion | 47 | 32.2% |
| Poor Remuneration | 11 | 7.5% |
| Poor working Environment | 23 | 15.8% |
| Lack of motivation | 32 | 21.9% |
| All of the above | 33 | 22.6% |
| Total | 146 | 100% |

Source: Field Survey (2015)

The above responses show that 32.2% made up of 47 respondents attributed low productivity to the reason of lack of promotion while 11 respondents represented by 7.5% agreed on poor remuneration, poor working environment is a reason as to why there is low productivity while lack of motivation is accepted by 32 respondents who make up 21.9% of the total respondents. Those who agreed that all the aforementioned reasons are root causes of low productivity in an organization are 33 represented by 22.6%.

4.3 Test of Hypothesis

From the information obtained from the questionnaires administered, the hypotheses were analyzed based on the opinion expressed by the respondents regarding performance evaluation and workers productivity in an organization.

4.4 Decision Rule

Accept null hypothesis and reject alternative hypothesis when tabulated value is less than calculated value, that is, Table value > calculated value. Accept alternative hypothesis and

reject null hypothesis when tabulated value is less than calculated value, that is, Table value

< calculated value. **TABLE 4.2.15**

CONTINGENCY TABLE

| VARIABLES | YES | NO | TOTAL |
|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| Performance evaluation leads to efficiency and effectiveness in an organization | 146 | 0 | 146 |
| Performance evaluation is enough requirement for promotion, demotion, transfer, pay increase, training and development. | 137 | 9 | 146 |
| Performance evaluation is essential towards achieving organizational objective | 131 | 15 | 146 |
| Evaluation result maximizes productivity | 129 | 28 | 146 |
| Satisfaction that performance result maximizes productivity | 118 | 28 | 146 |
| Supervising officers face problems when appraising | 131 | 15 | 146 |
| Total | 792 | 83 | 875 |

This contingency table is an account for all combinations of the factors being investigated.

This data was tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Ho: • Performance evaluation in public sector does not increase workers productivity.

Hi: Performance evaluation in public sector does increase workers productivity.

Chi-square calculation

| Actual frequency | Expected | Fa-Fe | <F _o - Fe> ² | (Fa-JST Fe) |
|------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 146 | 792 x 146 = 875 132.15 | 13.85 | 191.82 | 1.45 |
| 0 | 83 x 146 = 13.85 875 | -13.85 | 191.82 | 13.85 |
| 137 | 792 x 146 = 875 13.85 | 4.85 | 23.52 | 0.18 |
| 9 | 83 x 146 = 13.85 875 | -4.85 | 23.52 | 1.70 |
| 131 | 792 x 146 = 875 132.15 | -1.15 | 2.13 | 0.02 |
| 15 | 83 x 146 = 13.85 875 | 1.15 | 2.13 | 0.15 |
| 129 | 792 x 146 = 875 132.15 | -3.15 | 9.92 | 0.08 |
| 16 | 83 x 146 = 13.85 875 | 2.15 | 4.62 | 0.33 |
| 118 | 792 x 146 = 875 132.15 | -14.15 | 200.22 | 1.52 |
| 28 | 83 x 146 = 13.85 875 | 14.15 | 200.22 | 14746..... |
| 131 | 792 x 146 = 875 132.15 | -1.15 | 2.13 | 0.02 |
| 15 | 83 x 146 = 13.85 875 | 1.15 | 2.13 | 0.15 |
| TOTAL | 875 | | | X²=33.9T |

The calculation for the critical value of the Chi-square which is through calculating the degree of freedom giving as follow:-

R = no. of rows C = no. of columns From the above contingency table The degree of freedom (df) - (6-1)(2-1) = 5df

Using the following parameters Df= 5 and level of significance = 0.05 The Chi-square distribution table below show that the intersection of df of 5 with level of significance

0. 05 gives the value of 11.07

CM-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION

| Degrees of freedom (df) | Probability (p) | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
| | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.001 |
| 1 | 0.004 | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.15 | 0.46 | 1.07 | 1.64 | 2.71 | 3.84 | 6.64 | 10.83 |
| 2 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.45 | 0.71 | 1.39 | 2.41 | 3.22 | 4.60 | 5.99 | 9.21 | 13.82 |
| 3 | 0.35 | 0.58 | 1.01 | 1.42 | 2.37 | 3.66 | 4.64 | 6.25 | 7.82 | 11.34 | 16.27 |
| 4 | 0.71 | 1.06 | 1.65 | 2.20 | 3.36 | 4.88 | 5.99 | 7.78 | 9.49 | 13.28 | 18.47 |
| 5 | 1.14 | 1.61 | 2.34 | 3.00 | 4.35 | 6.06 | 7.29 | 9.24 | 11.07 | 15.09 | 20.52 |
| 6 | 1.63 | 2.20 | 3.07 | 3.83 | 5.35 | 7.23 | 8.56 | 10.64 | 12.59 | 16.81 | 22.46 |
| 7 | 2.17 | 2.83 | 3.87 | 4.67 | 6.35 | 8.38 | 9.80 | 12.02 | 14.07 | 18.48 | 24.32 |
| 8 | 2.73 | 3.49 | 4.59 | 5.53 | 7.34 | 9.52 | 11.03 | 13.36 | 15.51 | 20.00 | 26.12 |
| 9 | 3.32 | 4.17 | 5.38 | 6.39 | 8.34 | 10.66 | 12.24 | 14.68 | 16.92 | 21.67 | 27.88 |
| 10 | 3.94 | 4.86 | 6.18 | 7.27 | 9.34 | 11.78 | 13.44 | 15.99 | 18.31 | 23.21 | 29.59 |
| | Non significant | | | | | | | | Significant | | |

The chi-square method of analysis was used to test the hypothesis at a =0.05 significance level from the table. We find that X^2 of 0.05 = 11.070 for 5df. For decision to be taken, the acceptance and rejection region are shown below:

4.5 Summary of Findings

Base on the above analyses, these findings were made:-

- i. The workers of the office of the head of civil service of the federation accepted that performance evaluation lead to efficiency and effectiveness.
- ii. 139 people of out 146 agreed that performance evaluation is enough requirements for

promotion, demotion, transfer, pay increase, training and development.

- iii. 131 workers out of 146 respondents agreed that performance evaluation is essential towards achieving their organizational objectives.
- iv. 16 out of 146 respondents/ people disagreed that evaluation result do not maximize productivity in an organization.
- v. 118 respondents out of 146 are satisfied with the manner in which supervisors conduct appraisal in an organization.
- vi. In conclusion, a greater number of respondents believed that supervisors face problems when appraising their staff, ductivity.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary

After data analysis, the following are hereby analyzed performance evaluation helps in increasing productivity in public sector and even though there are dissatisfaction with the way appraisal is evaluated by most organizations. So also, from the findings, there is an opinion that low productivity is caused by poor remuneration.

However, the performance evaluation of workers was good, meanwhile From the finding it is shown that performance evaluation is very essential towards achieving organizational objectives. One of the major reasons for employee appraisal is to obtain information for promotion, demotion, transfer, pay increase, training and development and discharge. For the employee, an appraisal gives him/her a feedback as to how management perceives his/her contribution to the organization. If an employee perceives that he/she is poorly evaluated, it could affect his/ her morale; increase his/her absenteeism rate and tardiness and consequently, his/her overall productive capacity or performance.

5.2 Conclusion

The following conclusions are made on the basis of the above findings:- Performance evaluation is important and crucial to organization and so there is a need to practice it constantly, to determine its effectiveness with respect to internal supervisor, government parastatals are to place appropriate control measure to deal with the appraisal of workers.

The problems of insufficient statistical data required for the measuring productivity in organization constituted a hurdle and still remain a serious constraint to the measurement of productivity.

Lack of recognition of the need for rationalization (or constant search for perfection) has helped in no small measure in retarding efforts toward evolving appropriate techniques for measuring productivity in public sector.

Inability to identify in precise terms what is to be measured in the bureaucratic public has remained a problem. The problem that usually arises in this regard is whether bureaucratic efficiency or effectiveness should be the main emphasis of bureaucratic public service.

Efficiency concept lays emphasis on quantitative measurement of productivity in terms of input-output relationship and cost factors.

The concepts of effectiveness on the other hand relate more directly to organizational goals and objectives or ends. In the public services organizations like schools, hospitals, security services, etc. the goal is to serve or contribute some values to the public at large. The effectiveness of these objectives could therefore be easier to determine by reference to the client's perception or feedback.'

Thus, emphasis on effectiveness of public service is an indirect emphasis on an agreement as to what the right values for the society should be. In other words, an effective public service is ultimately one that identifies and satisfactory meets all the values in the society in which it exists and operates.

Performance evaluation is a system of measuring workers output or productivity or efficiency either quantitatively or qualitatively. Its main objective is to bring- out the strength and weaknesses of a worker on his job. The management is therefore saddled with the responsibility of utilizing information in planning on how to help the workers improve his/her performance on the job.

If the management goes ahead to ignore the vital information in its planning, the whole effort

of the evaluation becomes wasted. Every good evaluation system rewards excellence in performance and counsels employees with low performance on how to improve their performance.

5.3 Recommendation

Based on the conclusion reached, the following recommendations are made.

1. Creation of a healthy working atmosphere by the organization. An atmosphere of unity and co-operation will help the workers see themselves as a family in achieving the goals of the organization, proper welfare system should also be enhanced as regards the employee's remuneration, training, health care system, fringe benefits etc. All this will foster interest and motivation to work, will lead to increase in production.
2. Workers representatives must be actively involved in job evaluation and its translation into productivity.
3. Every job must have a comprehensive job description and specifications, thereby exposing the value of such a job, hence appropriate production.
4. The public sector labour union should be reactivated and made more relevant to the yearning and aspiration of the workers.
5. The employment of workers should be widely based on merit and less on god-fathers, tribalism, ethnicity or rationalization.
6. The national salaries, incomes and wages commission should be alive to its responsibility in terms of harmonizing and unifying wages and salaries within the public service.
7. Government should implement the new pay structure in the civil service without further delay, so as to ginger the moral of the workers thereby increasing productivity.

In the final analysis it is the view of the present researcher that efficiency and effectiveness

should both exist within the continuum of performance measurement. However, the level of leverage of each should be based on the nature, circumstances and level of individual performance of measurement or measurement sub-goal.

If these recommendations are seriously addressed by the appropriate authorities, the public sector will once again take its enviable position.

REFERENCES

- Balogun, M. J (1980) Managerial Efficiency in the Public Sector Pattern & Problems in Nigeria. Conceptual Framework for Analysis. Ibadan: Spectrum Book.
- I Cowie, A.P (1993): Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary; Oxford University press.
- Davis K (1981): Modern Business Administration, John Wiley and Sons pp.80.
- Fodio, I.M (1998) Measurement of productivity in the Public Service:
- Gboyega A. (1998) Nigeria since independence. Public Administration. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Harold Mayfield (1960): Defense of Performance Appraisal, March- April No. 60206 pp.26.
- Loan et al- (1968): Context of performance Appraisal, London PD. Publication Ltd 2th Edition, pp.76-90.
- Rogers meyer (1981): Personnel Administration, McGraw Hill Ltd, 8 Edition pp290 Concept.
- Wapmuk L. S (1990) The Federal Civil Service Commission: Its place in the Machinery of government, Lagos (Unpublished).

**NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE
STUSIES MASTER IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (MPA) RESEARCH
QUESTIONNAIRE ON EFFECT OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION ON THE
PRODUCTIVITY OF THE STAFF OF THE OFFICE OF THE HEAD OF SERVICE
OF THE
FEDERATION.**

SECTION "A"

1. Gender
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
2. Years of working experiences
 - a. under one year
 - b. 1-5 years
 - c. 6 - 10 years
 - d. 11 years above

What: level of Management do you belong to?

- a. Top management level
- b. Middle management level
- c. Lower management level Which department do you belong to?
 - a. Account/Internal Audit
 - b. Operations / Administration
 - c. Planning, Research and Statistics
 - d. Others (specify)

SECTION "B"

4. Has Performance evaluation led to efficiency and effectiveness in your organization?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No
5. Is Performance evaluation enough requirement for promotion, demotion, transfer,

increment, training and development in your organization?

- a. Yes.
- b. No

6. Performance evaluation essential towards achieving organizational objectives?

Is

- a. Yes.

- b. No

7. Are you satisfied that performance evaluation result do maximise productivity in your organization?

- a. Yes.
- b. No

8. Are you satisfied with the manner your organization conduct appraisal? ;;;u

A

- a. Yes.
- b. No

9. Which of these

do you think account for low productivity?

lack of promotion.

- a. poor working environment.
- b. lack of motivation.
- c. all of the above.

10. How do you assess the qualification of your superior officers during evaluation?

- a. efficient
- b. Very efficient
- c. Not efficient

11. Do your superior officers face problems when appraising?

- a. Yes.
- b. No