

---

## Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm

**BANKOLE Oluwole Adeniyi<sup>1</sup>, FALEYE Olubunmi Christianah<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration, Bamidele Olumilua University of Education, Science and Technology, Ikere-Ekiti, Nigeria

---

**ABSTRACT:** The study examined performance management indices as a stimulant of employee productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firms. Specifically, the study investigated the effect of performance feedback; evaluated the effect of performance appraisal; examined the effect of training and development and determined the effect of reward system on employee productivity. A descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study comprised the selected telecommunication firm (MTN, Glo) staff in Edo State, Nigeria. The sample size was 334. Primary data used for the study were gathered through the administration of a structured questionnaire. Data gathered were analyzed using multiple regression. The result showed that performance appraisal has a significant effect on employee productivity; Moreso, performance appraisal has a significant effect on employee productivity; it further showed that training and development have a significant effect on employee productivity; Finally, it showed that the reward system has a significant effect on employee productivity. The study concluded that all the constructs of the explanatory variables were significantly related to employee productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firms.

**KEYWORDS:** Appraisal, Feedback, Reward, Training and Development

---

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Telecommunication firms have become one of the most competitive businesses in recent times, particularly among developing nations due to their contributions to economic growth. In the same vein, the need for coordination of employee performance through talent development, innovativeness and creativity, commitment, effectiveness and efficiency, work quality, absenteeism reduction, waste reduction, and turnover reduction is mandatory and imperative as a result of changes in technology, individual interest, business structure, and environmental factors. The effectiveness of firms in any nation tends to reduce unemployment, poverty, generate revenue for the governmental purse, increase the nation's ability and transform the economy respectively. Therefore, managing employee performance is key to improving productivity and efficiency.

Performance management has become a crucial firm process, increasing pressure to achieve high performance levels, and raising the bar for various work practices (Armstrong, 2009). A motivated work force also assists in the reduction of turnover rate and improves the productivity in the firm. Hence successful performance management has an essential part in human resources. Organization's human resource practitioners are being forced to rethink the appropriate model to adopt to build sustainable employee productivity and meet the institution's demand. This does not come easy as the organizations are forced to embrace and develop the capacities of its workforce, to retain a competitive edge over competitors. A key consideration of employee management entails defining performance agreements, appraisals, performance feedback, rewards, training and growth (Ogolla & Oluoch, 2019).

For productivity to be achieved, performance management must be well-arranged and properly coordinated by the management of the organisation in line with the rules and regulations of the organisation. It is believed that low productivity rate in Nigeria and other developing countries is due to improper performance management which includes feedback, reward packages and other motivational factors. This is supported by the submission of Milkovich, Newman and Gerhart (2010) that the decline level of employee productivity in organizations could be credited to poor performance management strategies put in place by telecommunication firms and their management teams.

Assessment of employee's performance is one of the common practices in almost every organization, a necessary phenomenon for the better performance of employees and the organizations. For better performance of the organizations satisfied employees play a vital role (Karimi, Malik & Hussain, 2011). In view of this, managers of every business organization are charged with the responsibility to motivate their employees to achieve organizational goals. Dzinkowski (2000) utilized employee productivity to be

## **Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm**

one of the evaluating items for human capital. In addition, employee productivity could estimate the extent of contribution from an employee. Therefore, this study shall investigate the relationship between performance management and employee productivity.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

The crucial human resources management obstacles of recruiting the right staff, redundancies, retaining talent, staff development, salary inflation and other threats that are external as well as the varying working conditions and re-skilling have raised concern among telecommunication firms in Nigeria (Hudson, 2004 & Jyothi, 2007). Therefore, employee productivity is one of the crucial factors leading to organizational competitiveness and this has partly led to increased research on how it can be improved (Bankert, Coberley, Pope & Wells, 2015). Thus performance management process is momentarily valuable to all organizations as it is likely to give a hand in ensuring employees are working hard towards the attainment of the organization's mission and objectives, hence, productivity (Omusebe, Kimani & Musiega, 2013).

Studies in this area tend to emphasis on establishing factors that drive employee productivity and how it can be improved. Some of these factors include provision of challenging job designs, motivation, training and development, incentives, rewards and recognition, appreciation, salary, bonus, remuneration, participation, autonomy, promotion, and the suitability of the organizational culture among other factors (Gilfedder, 2014). However, from Nigeria telecommunication sector perspective, most of these companies are faced with different environmental factors, job security, work structure or job demand, poor employee motivation systems just to mention a few. This has left a vacuum for studies to fill on the causes of poor productivity and the need to improve productivity among telecommunication firms in a developing nation like Nigeria. To this end, one is forced to explore the link between performance management and employee productivity concerning telecommunication firms in Nigeria being one of the most competitive sectors through adopting performance feedback, performance appraisal, training, development, and reward systems as the technique of performance management.

### **1.2 Objectives of the Research**

Specifically, the following objectives are to:

- i. examine the influence of performance feedback on employee productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firms;
- ii. evaluate the influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firms;
- iii. investigate the influence of training on employee productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firms; and
- iv. determine the influence of reward system on employee productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firms.

### **1.3 Significance of the Study**

The findings of the current study are expected to show the nexus between performance management and employee productivity, and would help telecommunication managers in identifying the gap that needs to be bridged and also in their decision making and other concerned body and stakeholders of the organization. Hence, the expected output of the study is believed to motivate and guide managers of the organization under study in particular on the identified need gaps on a consistent way so as to ensure their survival and sustainable success of their interventions. Besides this, the result of the study is also expected to enhance the need for further investigations on the subject, and in turn provide the initial information required for conducting more comprehensive and inclusive studies on the issue under consideration and those other related aspects of performance management in other telecommunication firm. Finally, the outcome of the study will add to the body of knowledge particularly in the field of human resources management.

## **2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Performance Management**

Performance management concept is derived from management principle either by agreement or contract rather than management by command. It stresses development and the introduction of self-managed learning process plans as well as the combination of individual and company objectives. It is a constant and flexible process that involves both managers and their subordinates within a framework that sets out how they can best work together to achieve the necessary results. Performance Management is the process through which managers ensure employee's activities outputs contributes to the organization's goal. This process requires understanding what activities are desired, observing whether they occur, and providing feedback, managers and employees meet expectations. In the course of giving feedback, managers and employees may identify performance and establish ways of resolving those problems (Bagul, 2014). Hitu (2017) asserted that performance management is the same as managing business organisation). Performance management is the process of directing and supporting employees to work effectively and efficiently aligned with the organizational needs.

Performance management is the broad range of trial, policy, dealings, and interventions deliberately put in place to help workers improve their performance and productivity in an organisation (Denisi & Murphy, 2017). Putting into practice, performance management includes constant methods of finding, measuring and increasing the performance of individuals and groups in organizations (Aguinis & Pierce, 2008). In the same vein, Selden and Sowa (2011) added that this system will be in practice as long

## **Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm**

since performances related information to employees are essential to the achievement of organisational objectives. Performance management aims at improving organisational accountability, performance, communication, efficiency and employee productivity. Employees are considered as the most important organisational assets and to this end organizations must understand the strategies for identifying, encouraging, measuring, evaluating, improving and rewarding their performance at work. To achieve the set goals or tasks of an organisation, performance management has to be strengthened by the management teams of the organisation. Performance management necessity can not be underestimated in helping organizations to achieve their goals and increasing performance through productivity of their employees (Stevens & Joyce, 2000).

Performance management practices are systematic ways of communicating to employees on what performance and productivity parameters are expected of them (Mansor, Chakraborty, Yin & Mahitapoglu, 2011). Beadwell (2017) depicts performance management as activities for instance understanding what goals are and how they should be measured, performance evaluation, performance feedback, incentive-based performance, planning of career, motivation, training and development. The attributes of defining measurable individual goals for employees, performance appraisal, feedback, incentives tagged to performance, planning as well as motivation and training and development. They are put in place so as to offer better outcome through having a better knowledge and management of a variety of performances by employees as compared to the set goals.

### **2.2 Dimensions of Performance Management**

For the purpose of this study, four dimensions of performance were discussed which are: performance feedback, performance appraisal, training and development, reward system and their relationship with employee productivity.

#### **Performance Feedback**

The nature of responding to performance feedback between the organizational supervisors and the employees has an important effect on the firm's productivity and employee performance. However, the periodic outcome on the work activities or employee periodic evaluation outcome should be communicated in time by the manager or supervisors to ensure way forward and areas of adjustment which helps to bring teamwork in the organization setup. Performance feedback greatly suggests discussions that help to understand employee improvement, gain learning and response, clarify vision and career growth (Brown & Benson, 2013). Enhancing employee productivity through performance feedback is considered in the concept of having clear specification and flow of information from top to downward communication mostly when management staff are setting rules, delegating tasks, passing message that needs clarification. According to Caruth (2018), the need for performance feedback to the employees must have a workflow for tracing on the feedback sessions. This is very germane in identifying mistakes and timely setting up corrective steps with fewer impacts on the organization. Providing employees with the right and vital feedback is regarded as a crucial opportunity towards fulfilling the organization objectives (Baruch, 2016). Evidently, successful performance feedback depends on how the employees will accept process and the reactions generated in the guide when intending to have such critical issues to whether those in the process are satisfied or dissatisfied with the feedback they receive.

#### **Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal system has become one of the most valuable management tool in which organization members use to achieve collective goals. In order to ensure that the results of the performance appraisals are useful and reasonable to the superior when evaluating their subordinates, it is important for the performance appraisal system to consistently produce reliable and valid results for the management of an organization Performance (Yee & Chen, 2009). The manager's role is to evaluate subordinates' performance, which leads to managers making compensation recommendations for employees. When supervisors identify the weak areas and the training needs of the employee, this informs the employees of what skills to develop and work out the developmental plans to reinforce individual behaviour. Performance appraisal as one of the most crucial human resource management functions is concerned with identifying, measuring, influencing and developing employee job performance in line with the set norms and standards for a particular period of time in order to attain a variety of purposes. Employees are expected to be totally commitment to desired standards of improved job performance to maintain profitable growth for the business organization and durable value establishment for the customers (Singh, Kochar & Yuksel, 2010). Performance appraisal entails employing best available knowledge, skills and abilities in the workers to enhance employee productivity and improves organizational competitive advantage. Therefore, appraisal system can be in three forms as highlighted by Obisi (2011), to be confidential or secret appraisal, open appraisal and semi open or semisecret appraisal system.

#### **Training and Development**

Currently, training has become the most significant factor in business globally because of its positive influence on employee efficiency and effectiveness and also the organization. The performance of employees depends on various factors but the most important of the factors is training. Training increases employee potential and employees who train more on the job have better experience and performance as a result of an increase in both skills and competencies which emanate from more on the job experience (Khan, Khan & Khan, 2011). Consequently, Jagero, Komba and Mlingi (2012) posited that on the job training plays a significant role in the development of organizations enhancing performance as well as increasing productivity and ultimately shaping

## Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm

a company's best position in the face of competitiveness and having a competitive edge over other companies. Training and development is defined as the planned learning experiences that educate employees on how to execute current and future jobs particularly in these technological time where organizations needs to be vast and follow trends in carrying out daily operations (Tahir, yousafzai, Jan & Hashim, 2014). Therefore, engaging in periodic training will help in improving the effectiveness of employees which in turn improves performance and productivity at large. Therefore, training and development of employees contribute directly in the success of an organization for better performance.

### Reward System

In the real world, it is very imperative to reward high performance levels because this motivates and controls the performance. Indeed, reward strategies consider the level and the combination of non-financial and financial rewards required to attract, maintain and inspire skillful, competent and capable employees to make the organization successful. Although some of these benefits are monetary forms, such as options for salary sacrificing and competitive pay, there are many non-financial benefits that organisations can give their employees. Some factors may encourage the staff, therefore, for a manager, it is essential to know what really inspires employees and perhaps they are not the same things that encourage other employees (Gohari, Kamkar, Hosseinipour & Zohoori, 2013). Rewarding employees is a great way to improve their performance. Recently, employee's mentality or attitude toward benefits or rewards affected their work. Rewards are an important motivational factor for everyone which is basically to motivate the behaviours of employees towards their job. Businesses utilize rewards like salary, promotion and other types of bonuses to persuade employees towards better performance (Irshad, 2016). In view of this, Salah (2016) defines rewards as encouraging outcomes that are received for the performance of employees and these rewards are associated with organizational goals. Reward frequently follows when an employee assists an organization in the realization of one of its goals. In contrast, employees expect the organization to provide a fair salary, a better and safer working environment (Preatheepkanth 2011).

### Employee Productivity

The productivity of an employee is normally as a result of their effort, character, diligence and hard work. Organizations though can improve and influence positive employee productivity through motivation, creating a conducive working atmosphere, better wages and salaries and rewarding good performance (Mugunti & Kanyanjua, 2017). Productivity can be defined as the output per unit of time. There are numerous measures of output for example the services, money or units of production. However, in most cases, employee performance is determined by the level of motivation, the environment and the abilities (Elliott, 2015). However, this study sees employee productivity from the context of work quality, commitment, effectiveness and efficiency which are all subsets of productivity.

### 2.3 Theoretical framework

For this study, expectancy theory will form the bedrock for this study because motivation is driven by an individual's expectancy of the preferred outcome and the strength of the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual. Considering what they expect to gain from a given situation, what effort they will need to expend, and whether it is worth it to themselves depending on their personal goals.

## 3.0 METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out among two telecommunication firm workers in Edo State. The research design chosen for this study is the survey. The questionnaire was self-administered to the respondents in order to generate data for the study. Sourcing for these data, therefore, a structured questionnaire was employed. The population for this study is made up of the selected telecommunication staff. The employees, lower, middle and top-level management staff of Mobile Telecommunication Network MTN and Globacom Telecommunication GLO constituted the study respondents. These staff members are found in various departments. However, the listed telecommunication firms were employed based on staff strength and market share in Edo State, Nigeria. The target population consisted of one hundred and ninety-one (191) respondents from MTN and one hundred and forty three (103) respondents from Globacom bringing the total population to three hundred and thirty-four (334), as revealed by each telecommunication records of Edo State Head Office. These firms were targeted because they are the main household telecommunication networks providers in Edo State. Therefore, a sample of three hundred and thirty-four (334) respondents which is the total number of the study population using census sampling. The data collected were analyzed with the use of descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics such as percentage values and frequency distribution were considered appropriate for the description of variables. The inferential statistical technique employed is a multiple regression analysis that was to be used to understand the relationship existing among the identified variables. The data analysis was carried out with the support of SPSS version 20.0. The multiple regression model is stated as:

$$EPDT = f^*(PM) \dots \dots \dots (3.1)$$

$$EPDT = \beta_0 + \beta_1PAF + \beta_2PAP + \beta_3TAD + \beta_4RWS + E \dots \dots \dots (3.2)$$

Since PAF, PAP, TAD and RWS is an element of (PM)

## Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm

$$EPDT = f^* (PAF, PAP, TAD, RWS) \dots \dots \dots (3.3)$$

PM= Performance Management

EPDT = Employee Productivity

PAF = Performance Feedback

PAP = Performance Appraisal

TAD = Training and Development

RWS = Reward System

$\beta_0$  = Intercept/ Constant

### 4.0 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 Presentation of Respondents' Demographic Data

Based on the study sample size, three hundred and thirty-four (334) questionnaires were administered while three hundred and five (305) were retrieved from the field representing 91% response rate. Hence, the analysis of the study was strictly based on the retrieved questionnaires. Therefore, simple percentage and frequency table was employed in analyzing and interpreting the respondent's demographic characteristics as depicted in table 1.

**Table 1: Respondents Demographic Distribution**

| S/N | Demographic variable      | Grouping           | Frequency  | Percentage |
|-----|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| 1.  | Sex                       | Male               | 195        | 63.9       |
|     |                           | Female             | 110        | 36.1       |
|     |                           | <b>Total</b>       | <b>305</b> | <b>100</b> |
| 2.  | Age                       | Below 30           | 84         | 27.6       |
|     |                           | 31-40              | 102        | 33.4       |
|     |                           | 41-50              | 61         | 20.0       |
|     |                           | 51 years and Above | 58         | 19.0       |
|     |                           | <b>Total</b>       | <b>305</b> | <b>100</b> |
| 3.  | Marital Status            | Single             | 78         | 25.6       |
|     |                           | Married            | 227        | 74.4       |
|     |                           | <b>Total</b>       | <b>305</b> | <b>100</b> |
| 4.  | Educational Qualification | GCE/SSCE/NECO      | 23         | 7.5        |
|     |                           | OND/NCE/Diploma    | 84         | 27.6       |
|     |                           | HND/B.Sc           | 157        | 51.5       |
|     |                           | MA/MSC/MBA         | 41         | 13.4       |
|     |                           | <b>Total</b>       | <b>305</b> | <b>100</b> |
| 5   | Work Experience           | Below 5 Years      | 34         | 11.2       |
|     |                           | 6-10 Years         | 139        | 45.6       |
|     |                           | 11-15 Years        | 73         | 23.9       |
|     |                           | 16 Years Above     | 59         | 19.3       |
|     |                           | <b>Total</b>       | <b>305</b> | <b>100</b> |
| 6.  | Position Status           | Employee           | 91         | 29.8       |
|     |                           | Lower Management   | 101        | 33.1       |
|     |                           | Middle Management  | 78         | 25.6       |
|     |                           | Top Management     | 35         | 11.5       |
|     |                           | <b>Total</b>       | <b>305</b> | <b>100</b> |

Source: Field Survey Report 2024

The analysis in table 1 showed that out of the total respondents in the study, 195 male respondents were accounted for 63.9% while the remaining 110 female respondents represented 36.1%. This implies that male participants are greater than female participants from the telecommunication firms in Nigeria. More so, 84 (27.6%) of the total respondents are below 30 years of age, 102 (33.4%) were between the age category of 31-40 years, 61 (20%) are between the age of 41-50 years and the remaining 58 (19%) were 51 years and above. In view of this, respondents under age category 31-40 years of age are higher than other category thus implied the respondents are old enough to understand performance management. Considering the marital status, 78 (25.6) of the total respondents were single while the remaining 227 (74.4) of the total respondents were married thus implied that most of the respondents under survey were married. Furthermore, 28 respondents representing 7.5% were secondary school degree holder, 84 (27.6%) have OND/NCE/Diploma degree certificates, 157 (51.5%) of them have first degree (HND/B.Sc.) certificate and 41 of them representing (13.4%) are postgraduates (MA/M.ScMBA) degree holders. Based on the work experience, 34 respondents representing 11.2% have below 5 years of experience, 139 (45.6%) have between 6-10 years working experience, 73 (23.9%) have between 11-15 years working experience and the remaining 59 (19.3%) have above 16 years working experience. Lastly, on

## Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm

demographic distribution, 91 (29.8%) of the respondents are employees, 101 (33.1%) of the respondents are low level managers, 78 (25.6%) of the respondents belong to middle level management while the remaining 35 (11.5%) are Top level managers. Hence, first degree holders are many in the telecommunication firms and have being with the industries for like six to ten years leaving them to have gained lengthy working experience. Based on the work experience on the job, many of them have been promoted to the managerial position in the industries. This thereby implies that demographical factors affect individual productivity Nigeria telecommunication firms.

### 4.2 Interpretation of Results

#### Objective One: Performance Feedback on Employee Productivity

Table 2 revealed that the regression coefficient of performance feedback on employee productivity shows a positive figure of 0.591, this depicts a strong effect of performance feedback on employee productivity which implies that the explanatory variable has a significant effect on employee's productivity. The co-efficient of multiple determinant ( $R^2$ ) with a co-efficient of 0.349 shows that the explanatory variable can explain 34.9% of the behaviour of employee's productivity while the remaining 65.1% can be explained by the stochastic variable or other variables that were not put into consideration. The adjusted  $R^2$  further confirms the result of the  $R^2$  with a co-efficient of 0.340, which shows 34% explanation of the behavior of the employee's productivity by the explanatory variables after adjustment while the remaining 66% is clarified by the error term. Table 2 gives coefficients of the regression result of the ordinal least square using SPSS 20.0 software. From the table it can be deduced that the value of constant parameter is given as 2.126 and performance feedback are 0.451 respectively. The regression result above shows that the employee's productivity is constant at 2.126; this implies that if the explanatory variable is held constant, the employee's productivity will increase by 2.126%. The co-efficient of performance feedback is given as 0.451, this shows that the performance feedback is positively related to employee productivity and therefore implies that an increase in performance feedback will result in to 45.1% at 0.05 level of significance increases on employee productivity. As depicted on the coefficient table, P values for performance feedback is 0.000. This means performance feedback is significant. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis was accepted while null hypothesis was rejected.

Therefore, the regression model is stated below:

$$Y = 2.126 + 0.451Paf$$

**Table 2: Performance Feedback and Employee Productivity**

| Model                | R     | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj R <sup>2</sup> | B     | Std Error | T value | P Value |
|----------------------|-------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|
|                      | 0.591 | 0.349          | 0.340              |       |           |         |         |
| Performance Feedback |       |                |                    | .451  | .043      | 10.580  | .000    |
| Constant             |       |                |                    | 2.126 | .359      | 5.930   | .000    |
| F cal= 38.074        |       |                |                    |       |           |         |         |

Source: Field Survey, (2024)

#### Objective Two: Performance Appraisal on Employee Productivity

Table 3 revealed that the regression coefficient of performance appraisal on employee's productivity shows a positive figure of 0.686, the value proved that there is a strong effect of performance appraisal on employee's productivity which implies that the explanatory variable positively affects employee's productivity. The co-efficient of multiple determinant ( $R^2$ ) with a co-efficient of 0.470 shows that the explanatory variable can explain 47% of the behavior of employee's productivity while the remaining 53% can be explained by the stochastic variable or other variables that were not put into consideration. The adjusted  $R^2$  further confirms the result of the  $R^2$  with a co-efficient of 0.449, which shows 44.9% explanation of the behavior of the employee's productivity by the explanatory variables after adjustment while the remaining 55.1% is clarified by the error term. Table 3 gives coefficients of the regression result of the ordinal least square using SPSS 20.0 software. From the table it can be deduced that the value of constant parameter is given as 2.306 and performance appraisals 0.562 respectively. The regression result above shows that employee's productivity is constant at 2.306; this implies that if the explanatory variable is held constant, employee's productivity will increase by 2.306%. The co-efficient of performance appraisals given as 0.562, this shows that the performance appraisal is positively related to employee's productivity and therefore implies that an increase in performance appraisal will result in to 56.2% at 0.05 level of significance increases on employee's productivity. As shown on the coefficient table, P values for performance appraisal is 0.000. This means performance appraisal is significant. Therefore, alternate hypothesis was accepted while null hypothesis was rejected.

Therefore, the regression line is stated below:

$$Y = 2.306 + 0.562Pap$$

**Table 3: Performance Appraisal and Employee Productivity**

| Model                 | R     | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj R <sup>2</sup> | B     | Std Error | T value | P Value |
|-----------------------|-------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|
|                       | 0.686 | 0.470          | 0.449              |       |           |         |         |
| Performance Appraisal |       |                |                    | .562  | .083      | 6.765   | .000    |
| Constant              |       |                |                    | 2.306 | .480      | 4.803   | .000    |
| F cal= 22.484         |       |                |                    |       |           |         |         |

Source: Field Survey, (2024)

**Objective Three: Training and Development on Employee Productivity**

Table 4 revealed that the regression analysis of training and development on employee’s productivity shows a positive figure of 0.716, the figure depicted a very strong effect of training and development on employee’s productivity which implies that the explanatory variable has a positive effect on employee productivity. The co-efficient of multiple determinant (R<sup>2</sup>) with a co-efficient of 0.513 shows that the explanatory variable can explain 51.3% of the behavior of employee’s productivity while the remaining 48.7% can be explained by the stochastic variable or other variables that were not put into consideration. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> further confirms the result of the R<sup>2</sup> with a co-efficient of 0.494, which shows 49.4% explanation of the behavior of the employee’s productivity by the explanatory variables after adjustment while the remaining 50.6% is clarified by the error term. Table 4 gives coefficients of the regression result of the ordinal least square using SPSS 20.0 software. From the table it can be deduced that the value of constant parameter is given as 1.506 and training and development are 0.765 respectively. The regression result above shows that employee’s productivity is constant at 1.506; this implies that if the explanatory variable is held constant, employee’s productivity will increase by 1.506%. The co-efficient of training and development is given as 0.765, this shows that the training and development is positively related to employee’s productivity and therefore implies that an increase in training and development will result in to 76.5% at 0.05 level of significance increases on employee’s productivity. As revealed on the coefficient table, P values for training and development is 0.000. This means training and development is significant. Therefore, alternate hypothesis was accepted while null hypothesis was rejected.

Therefore, the regression model is stated below:

$$Epd = 1.506 + 0.765Tad$$

**Table 4: Training and Development and Employee Productivity**

| Model                    | R     | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj R <sup>2</sup> | B     | Std Error | T value | P Value |
|--------------------------|-------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|
|                          | 0.716 | 0.513          | 0.494              |       |           |         |         |
| Training and Development |       |                |                    | .765  | .094      | 8.140   | .000    |
| Constant                 |       |                |                    | 1.506 | .441      | 3.414   | .001    |
| F cal= 26.700            |       |                |                    |       |           |         |         |

Source: Field Survey, (2024)

**Objective Four: Reward System on Employee Productivity**

Table 5 revealed that the regression analysis of reward system on employee’s productivity shows a positive figure of 0.857, this indicates that there is a very strong effect of reward system on employee’s productivity which implies that the explanatory variable has a positive effect on employee productivity. The co-efficient of multiple determinant (R<sup>2</sup>) with a co-efficient of 0.735 shows that the explanatory variable can explain 73.5% of the behavior of employee’s productivity while the remaining 26.5% can be explained by the stochastic variable or other variables that were not put into consideration. The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> further confirms the result of the R<sup>2</sup> with a co-efficient of 0.724, which shows 72.4% explanation of the behavior of the employee’s productivity by the explanatory variables after adjustment while the remaining 27.6% is explained by the error term. Table 5 gives coefficients of the regression result of the ordinal least square using SPSS 20.0 software. From the table it can be deduced that the value of constant parameter is given as 1.868 and reward system are 0.578 respectively. The regression result above shows that employee’s productivity is constant at 1.868; this implies that if the explanatory variable is held constant, employee’s productivity will increase by 1.868%. The co-efficient of reward system is given as 0.578, this shows that the reward system is positively related to employee’s productivity and therefore implies that an increase in reward system will result in to 57.8% at 0.05 level of significance increases on employee’s productivity. As revealed on the coefficient table, P values for reward system is 0.000. This means reward system is significant. Therefore, alternate hypothesis was accepted while null hypothesis was rejected.

Therefore, the regression model is stated below:

$$Epd = 1.868 + 0.578Rws$$

Table 5: Reward System and Employee’s Productivity

| Model         | R     | R <sup>2</sup> | Adj R <sup>2</sup> | B     | Std Error | T value | P Value |
|---------------|-------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|
|               | 0.857 | 0.735          | 0.724              |       |           |         |         |
| Reward System |       |                |                    | .578  | .057      | 10.181  | .000    |
| Constant      |       |                |                    | 1.868 | .401      | 4.664   | .000    |
| F cal= 70.147 |       |                |                    |       |           |         |         |

Source: Field Survey, (2024)

4.3 Discussion of Findings

Table 6 revealed the unstandardized β co-efficient of performance feedback gives a positive value of 0.451 with t= 10.580 and (P= 0.000< 0.05). This result showed that performance feedback has a great significant effect on employee productivity, therefore, it was found significant. This means that respondents’ reason for employee productivity is strongly and positively influenced by performance feedback. However, the positivity of the result showed that performance feedback is positively related to employee productivity and that through performance feedback, employees are well informed and aware of present individual status due to the timely evaluation.

Considering performance appraisal, the unstandardized β co-efficient of performance appraisal gives a positive figure of 0.562 with t= 6.765 and (P= 0.000< 0.05). This result proved that performance appraisal significantly affects employee productivity, therefore, it was found significant. This means that respondents’ reason for employee productivity is strongly and positively influenced by performance appraisal. However, the positivity of the figure indicated that performance appraisal is positively related to employee productivity. Maintaining and enhancing higher performance has to do with organizational periodic evaluation of staff as to identify the area of strength and weakness of employees and also the likely solutions to the gap identified to increase employee’s level of productivity and performance at large.

Similarly, Table 6 revealed the unstandardized β co-efficient of training and development gives a positive figure of 0.765 with t= 8.140 and (P= 0.000< 0.05). This result showed that training and development has a great significant effect on employee’s productivity, therefore, it was found significant. This means that respondents’ reason for employee’s productivity is strongly and positively influenced by training and development. However, the positivity of the values indicated that training and development is positively related to employee’s productivity. Therefore, training and development becomes imperative for any organization aspiring to be a global business or competitive due to regular changes in this complex environment where performance and technology necessary. However, training and developing employees have a positive implication on their productivity.

Furthermore, and considering the reward system, the unstandardized β co-efficient of reward system gives a positive value of 0.578 with t= 10.181 and (P= 0.000< 0.05). This result showed that system has a great significant effect on employee productivity, therefore, it was found significant. This means that respondents’ reason for employee productivity is strongly and positively influenced by reward system. However, the positivity of the result showed that reward system is positively related to employee productivity. In view of the above, the study found that reward system mostly dictates employee job satisfaction and for employees to be committed or effective, proper reward structure has to be considered to encourage or boost their morale on the job.

In view of the above, performance management was measured with four variables (performance feedback, performance appraisal, training and development, reward system) and each variable was subjected to linear regression thus indicated that all the measures were found significant on employee’s productivity. Alternate hypothesis was accepted for each variable while null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the findings demonstrated that performance management significantly affects employee productivity. The result of the study is in accordance with the study of Kibichii, Kiptumand, Chege (2016), the study explored the effect of the performance management process on employee productivity of commercial banks in Kenya. The outcome of the study demonstrated a significant effect of the performance appraisal system, training and development and reward system on employee productivity.

Table 6: Summary of Test of Hypotheses

|                 | Independent variable     | Dependent variable    | t-value | p < 0.05 | Decision              |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------|-----------------------|
| H <sub>01</sub> | Performance Feedback     | Employee Productivity | 10.580  | .000     | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |
| H <sub>02</sub> | Performance Appraisal    | Employee Productivity | 6.765   | .000     | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |
| H <sub>03</sub> | Training and Development | Employee Productivity | 8.140   | .000     | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |
| H <sub>04</sub> | Reward System            | Employee Productivity | 10.181  | .000     | Reject H <sub>0</sub> |

Source: Author’s Computation, (2024).



### 5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The study empirically considered the relationship between performance management and employee productivity in telecommunication firms particularly in Nigeria. To properly align the study, four objectives were set following the same research questions and hypotheses. However, the performance management measures were subjected to linear regression to answer the research questions that emanated from the statement of problem. Interestingly, the result disclosed that all the performance management indicators (performance feedback, performance appraisal, training and development, reward system) positively contributed to employee productivity in telecommunication firms. This implies that if telecommunication companies can apply all these indices to their businesses, they will reap the benefit of enhancing greater commitment and effectiveness, work quality, increased profitability and fostering more cooperation or industrial harmony. To this end, alternate hypotheses were accepted and they study rejected otherwise. The study concluded that performance management positively and significantly affects employee productivity of telecommunication firms.

### 5.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommends that:

- i. The study recommended as shown in the findings that performance appraisal should be effectively employed to evaluate and identify employees who require more training and also prepare them for deployment, and transfers on new assignments. Management needs to clarify the performance criteria used in evaluating the employees which must be objective and transparent.
- ii. Furthermore, feedback should be done periodically (annually or half yearly) so that the employees can understand what is expected from them to avoid divulging the strategic goal. Therefore, there should be prompt performance feedback to the employees either positive or negative to checkmate employee's productivity level.
- iii. telecommunication owners or management should prioritize periodic training for the employees based on environmental change or global trends in the telecommunication sector where more machines or technology germane for production purposes to boost employee productivity. However, developmental programs should not be left out, particularly among management staff for strategic policy reasons.
- iv. Management should put in place a good reward structure for positive and outstanding results as well as training for negative results to empower the employees. It is also good to involve employees in the decision that has to do with the reward system to reduce organization disharmony which may inhibit the success or progress of the organization.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Aguinis, H., & Pierce, C. A. (2008). Enhancing the relevance of organizational behaviour by embracing performance management research. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 29, 139– 145.
- 2) Bagul, D. B. (2014). A research paper on study of employee's performance management system. *Scholarly Research Journal for Humanity Science and English Language*, 1(3), 424-429.
- 3) Bankert, B., Coberley, C., Pope, J. E., & Wells, A. (2015). Regional economic activity and absenteeism: A new approach to estimating the indirect costs of employee productivity loss. *Population Health Management*, 18(1), 47-53.
- 4) Baruch, Y. (2016). Self performance appraisal vs direct-management appraisal: A case of congruence. *Journal of Psychology*, 2(10), 7-14.
- 5) Beadwell, D. (2017). *Creating a Performance Culture*. Thousand Oaks: CA Sage.
- 6) Brown, M., & Benson, J. (2013). Rated to exhaustion? Reactions to performance appraisal processes. *Industrial Relations Journal* 34(1), 67-81.
- 7) Caruth, C. & Humphreys, D. (2018). *Perfect phrases for performance reviews: hundreds of ready-to-use phrases that describe your employees' performance (from unacceptable to outstanding)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 8) Denisi, A. S. & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421-433.
- 9) Elliott, K. (2015). Teacher performance appraisal: More about performance or development. *Australian Journal of teacher education*, 40(9), 9.
- 10) Gilfedder, S. (2014) Leveraging Financial Wellness to Enhance Employee Productivity and Empower Human Resource Executives. *Employment Relations Today*, 41(3), 33-37.
- 11) Gohari, P., Kamkar, A., Hosseinipour, S. J., & Zohoori, M. (2013). Relationship between rewards and employee performance: A mediating role of job satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(3), 571-597.
- 12) Hudson. (2004). *Report on Employment and Human resource Trends*.
- 13) Irshad, A. (2016). Impact of extrinsic rewards on employees' performance. *Journal of Global Economics*, 4(3), 1-4.

## Performance Management Indices as A Stimulant of Employee Productivity in Nigerian Telecommunication Firm

- 14) Jagero, N., Komba, H. V., & Mlingi, M. N. (2012). Relationship between on the job training and employee's performance in courier companies in Dares Salaam, Tanzania. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(22), 114-115
- 15) Jyothi, P. (2007). *Journal of HR Management Research*. (24-33) University of Hyderabad, Kayode, M. O. (1989). *Nigeria since independence: The first 25 years*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Heinemann Books Ltd.
- 16) Karimi, R., Malik, M. I., & Hussain, S. (2011). Examining the relationship of performance appraisal system and employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(22), 243-247.
- 17) Khan, R. A. G., Khan, F. A., & Khan. M. A. (2011). Impact of training and development on organizational performance. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(7), 62-68.
- 18) Kibichii, K. E., Kiptum, K. G., & Chege, K. (2016). Effects of performance management process on employee productivity: a survey of commercial banks in Turkana county. *Journal of Business and Management* 18(11), 52-64.
- 19) Mansor, N. N. A., Chakraborty, A.R., Yin, T. K., & Mahitapoglu, Z. (2011). Determinants of performance management system in South East Asia. *Inter-Disciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(2), 43-56.
- 20) Milkovich, G. T., Newman, J. M., Gerhart, B. (2010). *Compensation* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). United States: Mc Graw Hill. California: Sage.
- 21) Munguti, B. K., & Kanyanjua, D. (2017). Performance appraisals practices and employee productivity in Kenya: A case study of savannah cement ltd. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2(4), 82-96.
- 22) Obisi, C. (2011). Employee performance appraisal and its implication for individual and organizational growth. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 92-97.
- 23) Ogolla, C., & Oluoch, M. F. (2019). Performance management practices and employee productivity at State Department of Labour, Kenya. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 4(9), 20-30
- 24) Omusebe, P., & Musiega, J. (2013). Performance management: A strategy for improving performance and productivity. *Journal of managerial psychology*. 2(9). 5
- 25) Pratheepkanth, P. (2011). Reward system and its impact on employee motivation in commercial bank of sri-lanka plc, in Jaffna District. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(4), 85-92.
- 26) Salah, M. R. M. (2016). The influence of rewards on employee performance. *British Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, 13(4), 1-25.
- 27) Selden, S., & Sowa, J. E. (2011). Performance management and appraisal in human service organizations: Management and staff perspective. *Public Personnel Management*. 40. 251-264.
- 28) Singh, V. K., Kochar, B., & Yuksel, S. (2010). An empirical of the efficiency of performance appraisal system in oil and natural gas commission, India. *Isletme Arastirmalari Dergisi*, 2(2), 65-78.
- 29) Tahir, N., Yousafzai, I. K., Jan, S., & Hashim, M. (2014). The impact of training and development on employees performance and productivity: A case study of United Bank Limited Peshawar City, KPK, Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(4) 86-98.
- 30) Yee, C. C., & Chen, Y. Y. (2009). Performance appraisal system using multifactorial evaluation model. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 53, 231-235.