



Determinants of Academic Staff Job Performance: Further Evidence from University of Lagos, Nigeria

Maruff Akinwale OLADEJO

Department of Educational Management,
University of Lagos, Akoka.

ABSTRACT

Academic staff job performance will continue to receive serious attention in view of its impacts on both the organisational performance and students' academic achievement. The main thrust of this study therefore is to provide further evidence from University of Lagos, Nigeria, regarding the determinants of academic staff job performance. The descriptive research design of correlational type was used for the study. The study was guided by four null hypotheses that were tested at .05 level of significance. The population of the study consisted of all 1,740 members of academic staff in the 12 Faculties at the University, out of which a total number of 200 participants from five randomly selected Faculties using Stratified disproportionate random sampling technique constituted the sample size. Two self-designed, validated, and reliable instruments entitled "Determinants of Academic Staff Job Performance (DASJPQ) and Academic Staff Job Performance Assessment Scale (ASJPAS) were used for data collection. Data collection was carried out using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The study established a significant relationship between academic staff job effectiveness and each of the studied determinants namely job satisfaction (.670; $df=198$; $p<.05$), staff motivation (.424; $df=198$; $p<.05$), employee engagement (.619; $df=198$; $p<.05$) and workplace environment (.682; $df=198$; $p<.05$) respectively. It was recommended that all the selected factors should be given serious attention, especially staff motivation that had weak relationship with job performance among academic staff.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: December, 2021

Received in revised form: February, 2022

Accepted: February, 2022

Published online: March, 2022

KEYWORDS

Job satisfaction, Staff motivation, Employee engagement, Workplace environment

INTRODUCTION

Universities over the years have served as training ground of high-level manpower development for the various sectors of the economy. They also engage in systematic discourse and research activities, all aimed at ensuring proper human development. Universities are therefore expected to be agency saddled with the task of extending the frontier of knowledge for the overall benefits of the society (Oyekan, 2014).

However, the success of university system depends upon the involvement, effort, and contribution of the academic staff of their professional expertise (Uche, Fiberesima, & Christiana, 2011). This is because the university system in Nigeria, as in any other country, cannot achieve its goals and objectives without effective and efficient academic staff. The issue of

academic staff job performance in Nigerian university has therefore been attracting the attention of public educators and stakeholders in education (Akpan, 2013).

Job performance refers to how well someone performs at his or her work. Job performance has been defined as work performance in terms of quality and quantity expected from each employee (Khan et al., 2009). Performance is defined as behaviour that leads to the attainment of the desired results or whether an employee is doing well at his job or not (Okeleke & Oladejo, 2021; Oladejo, 2019). According to Oluseyi and Ayo (2009), job performance is related to the willingness and openness to try and achieve new aspects of the job which in turn will bring about an increase in the individual's productivity. Job



performance is defined as accomplishment of work related tasks or skill by an employee.

Employee performance is influenced by lots of determinants. Several contributing factors have been found to impact academic staff job performance. However, Folami and Jacobs (2015) used a job context model that classified the determinants into four groups, the individual factors, the task characteristics, the economic factors, and the organizational context. How satisfied an employee is, is capable of influencing the performance of such employee. In other words, job satisfaction seems to be a determinant of job performance. Job satisfaction can be defined like feeling that reflects whether employee needs are or not fulfill by the individual job. Skibba (as cited in Alromaihi, Alshomali, & George, 2017) stated that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is one of the most researched areas in organizational psychology sector. There are lots of researches tested the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance. Most of them indicated that there is an impact of job satisfaction on employee performance and there is an impact of employee performance on job satisfaction (Aziri, 2011). Indermun and Bayat (2013) and Funmilola, Sola, and Olusola (2013) also agreed that there is an undeniable correlation between job satisfaction and employee performance. But, rarely of them emphasize on whether the impact is direct or indirect. In his own study, Mahfood, Pollock, and Longmire (2012) reported that the regression coefficient of job satisfaction of 0.673 shows the magnitude of the influence of job satisfaction toward performance, which means any increase in job satisfaction will lead to increased job performance of 0.673 units. In addition, Kappagoda (2012) established that the job satisfaction is one of the factors that affects the improvement of the task performance and conceptual performance.

Further, Funmilola, et al., (2013) identified motivation as a determinant of job performance. They contended that motivation enable employees to work hard, to pay more time and to encourage organizations to engage their employees in work to attain a common organizational and employee goal. I also strongly contend that motivation plays an important role in the organization because it

increases the productivity of employees and the goals can be achieved in an efficient way. We already argued that managers need to motivate employees to perform better in the firm (Oluseyi & Ayo, 2009). Chaudhary and Sharma (2012) opined that motivated employees are more productive and perform better than non-motivated employees. If employee is satisfied and happy, then he/she will do his/her work in the best amazing manner.

The word „motivation” was first time used by P.T. Young’s in his book “Motivation and Behavior” (Heckhausen & Heckhausen, 2008). According to Robbins (2003), motivation is “the willingness to exert high levels of effort towards organizational goals, conditioned by the effort’s ability to satisfy some individual need” (p.187). Mustafa and Othman (2010) examined the perceptions of high school teachers about the effects of motivation on their performance at work. They found out that there was a positive relation between motivation and working performance of teachers, that is, the greater the level of motivation the higher will be the teacher’s job performance or if provide a high level of motivation to a teachers then their job performance will be increase. Adelabu (2015) found out in Nigeria that teacher’s motivation is very poor and teachers are also dissatisfied with their working environment and salary conditions. The reason behind the poor motivation of teachers is that they having low salaries as compared to other professionals, poor work environment, no decision making authority, and also not giving them opportunity of develop their career. However, in their separate studies, Oluseyi and Ayo (2009) and Moynihan and Pandey (2007) reported insignificant relationship between staff motivation and job performance.

The way we engage employees in the work organisation also goes a long way at influencing how ell they perform on the job. In other words, employee engagement is a vital factor to consider when investigating job performance (Oladejo, Kareem, & Ghanni, 2019). The academic community also sees the problem of low employee engagement and its negative impact on business outcomes (Motyka, 2018). Employee engagement involves fostering a work culture

that makes the employee feel valued and aligned with the organization such that they put in the maximum effort they can to work for the organisation, thus improving employee performance. According to Kim and Koo (2017), 48 studies they reviewed established a statistically significant relationship between employee engagement and task performance, although one study concluded that only organizational engagement (one of the engagement dimensions) is related to the individual level of task performance. But Halbesleben and Wheeler (2008) revealed that engagement was not significantly related to turnover intention and eventual task performance.

Another equally important factor while investigating job performance is workplace environment. According to Oluseyi and Ayo (2009), workplace environment plays an important role in an organization. Most of the problems faced by employees are related to working environment. The level of productivity can be increased through developing a conducive working environment in the organization. Workplace environment plays a crucial role in ensuring employee's job performance since it may impact employee morale and productivity (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013). Thus, when the workplace environment is inappropriate, employee productivity and performance will also decrease. Chandrasekar (2011) examined that the workplace environment impacts on employee morale, productivity and job performance both positively and negatively.

From the background presented, it could be seen that no single study has captured all the factors investigated here as one. It is equally important to find out if those factors still play critical roles in the determination of job performance especially among academic staff. This study therefore investigated the relationship between some determinants such as job satisfaction, staff motivation, employee engagement, and workplace environment and academic staff job effectiveness at the University of Lagos, Akoka.

In Nigeria, the university system faces a lot of problems that may not allow the system to make expected contribution to social, political and economic development of

the nation. Among the numerous problems confronting university system in Nigeria is perceived poor job performance of some academic staff. Understanding job performance for each employee is essential as organizational decisions are based on individual performance (Sonntag, Volmer, & Spychala, 2008) leading to an organizational success.

Academic staff job performance is an issue that has not only bothered various stakeholders in Nigerian university system but also fuelled a great deal of researching in the fields of management, occupational health, work and organizational psychology. Thus, academic staff job performance is one of the most important yet problematic in the most universities in Nigeria, because it seems to have negative effect on the quality of graduates produced into the labour market. This may be a threat to the survival of the universities, since ineffective staff members cannot enable the actualisation of the national goals and objectives of education. This study therefore investigated the relationship between some determinants such as job satisfaction, staff motivation, employee engagement, and workplace environment and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos, Akoka.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study was to provide further evidence regarding the relationship between some determinants (namely job satisfaction, staff motivation, employee engagement, and workplace environment) and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos, Akoka. In specific terms, the objectives are to:

- i. Determine the relationship between job satisfaction and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.
- ii. Explore the relationship between staff motivation and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.
- iii. Find out the relationship between employee engagement and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.
- iv. Examine the relationship between workplace environment and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.5 level of significance.

- HO₁:** There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.
- HO₂:** Staff motivation does not significantly relate to academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.
- HO₃:** Employee engagement and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos are not significantly related.
- HO₄:** Workplace environments does not significantly relate to academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.

METHODOLOGY

This study is a descriptive survey design, of correlational type. It was used because the study involves gathering data from the respondents, using questionnaire with a view describing the existing situation regarding the variables under study (Oladejo, 2019). The surveys design studies large and small population by selecting and studying samples in order to discover the relative, incidence, distribution and interactions of variables.

The population of the study was all academic staff in the University of Lagos. The University currently has 12 Faculties, namely, Arts, Basic Medical Sciences, Clinical Sciences, Dental Sciences, Education, Engineering, Environmental Sciences, Law, Management Sciences, Pharmacy, Science, and Social Sciences. There are 1,740 academic staff as at the time of conducting this study.

The sample for this study was 200 subjects, comprising of lecturers selected from the Faculties of Arts, Management Sciences, Education, Environmental Sciences and Social Sciences, University of Lagos. The entire population was stratified into Faculties, from where five were randomly selected. Disproportionate stratified random sampling technique was used to select 40 members of academic staff from each of the sampled Faculties, resulting in 200 participants.

Two self-designed, validated, and reliable instruments entitled "Determinants of

Academic Staff Job Performance (DASJPQ) and Academic Staff Job Performance Assessment Scale (ASJPAS) were used in the study to elicit information from the lecturers. The first survey, that is, DASJPQ was divided into six Sections A, B, C, D, E and F containing items eliciting information on the study. Section A contains bio-data of the respondents, Section B measures information on job satisfaction, Section C measures information on staff motivation, Section D measures information on employee engagement, and Section E measures information on workplace environment. The questionnaire was scored on a modified Likert 4-point rating scales of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD) with weights 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively.

In measuring academic staff job performance, Breaugh (as cited in Oladejo, 2019) stated in his research that there are four different performance dimensions on which employees are measured, named: *quality, quantity, dependability and job knowledge*. These dimensions form the basis for the instrument designed and used in this study, entitled "Academic Staff Job Performance Assessment Scale (ASJPAS)". It was measured on a modified Likert type four-point scales of Most Like Me (MLM), Like Me (LM), Least Like me (LLM), Not Like Me (NLM) with weights 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. All negative items were reverse coded.

Both face and content validity of the instrument was established by experts, whose opinions were used in coming up with the final items raised in the instrument. In order to estimate the reliability of the instruments, the two instruments were pilot tested, using 50 academic staff who were not part of the main study. The Cronbach Alpha method was used and the obtained r values were .89 and .86 for DASJPQ and ASJPAS respectively. These figures were good enough to guarantee the reliability of the instruments in yielding the desired results.

Inferential statistics, specifically Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used for analysis. All the four null hypotheses were tested at .05 level of significance.



RESULTS

The results from the analysis of data carried out were highlighted and presented in this section.

HO₁: There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.

Table 1: Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Academic Staff Job Performance at the University of Lagos.

Variable	X	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
Job Performance	48.15	5.88	200	198	.670	.001	Significant	H ₀₂ Rejected
Job Satisfaction	17.33	2.00						

The $p < .05$ level.

Table 1, it is revealed that the relationship between job satisfaction and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos is positive, moderate and significant ($r = .670$; $Df = 198$; $P < .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction

and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos is hereby rejected.

HO₂: Staff motivation does not significantly relate to academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.

Table 2: Correlation Between Staff Motivation and Academic Staff Job Performance at the University of Lagos.

Variable	X	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
Job Performance	48.15	5.88	200	198	.424	.001	Significant	H ₀₂ Rejected
Staff Motivation	16.07	2.15						

The $p < .05$ level.

Table 2 revealed that the relationship between staff motivation and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos is positive, moderate and significant ($r = .424$; $Df = 198$; $P < .05$). Thus, the null hypothesis which states that staff motivation does not significantly relate to academic staff job

performance at the University of Lagos is rejected.

HO₃: Employee Engagement and Academic Staff Job Performance are not significantly related at the University of Lagos.

Table 3: Correlation between Employee Engagement and Academic Staff Job Performance at the University of Lagos.

Variable	X	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
Job Performance	48.15	5.88	200	198	.619	.001	Significant	H ₀₂ Rejected
Employee Engagement	15.01	1.74						

The $p < .05$ level.

Table 3, revealed that the relationship between employee engagement and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos is positive, moderate and significant ($r = .619$; $Df = 198$; $P < .05$). Thus,

the null hypothesis which states that employee engagement and academic staff job performance are not significantly related at the University of Lagos is hereby rejected.



HO₄: Workplace environments does not significantly relate to academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos.

Table 4: Correlation between Workplace Environment and Academic Staff Job Performance at the University of Lagos.

Variable	X	SD	N	df	r	P	Remark	Decision
Job Performance	48.15	5.88	200	198	.673	.001	Significant	H ₀₂ Rejected
Workplace Environment	18.02	2.02						

The $p < .05$ level.

Table 4 revealed that the relationship between workplace environment and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos was positive, moderate and significant ($r = .673$; $Df = 198$; $P < 0.5$). Thus, the null hypothesis which states that workplace environment does not significantly relate to academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos is hereby rejected.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The first hypothesis, which states that, there is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos was rejected because the result from the analysis showed that there was significant correlation between the two variables. This finding is in agreement with Lazear (2016)'s study which has linked job performance to job satisfaction and compensation. Finding from this study also confirmed the assertion that most of previous related studies indicated that there was an impact of job satisfaction on employee performance and there is an impact of employee performance on job satisfaction (Aziri, 2011). Indermun and Bayat (2013) and Funmilola, Sola, and Olusola (2013) also agreed that there was an undeniable correlation between job satisfaction and employee performance.

The second hypothesis which postulated that staff motivation does not significantly relate to academic staff job performance was also rejected, the implication of which is the acceptance of the fact that there was a strong significant correlation between staff motivation and academic staff job performance at the University of Lagos. This finding agrees to the assertion of Chaudhary

and Sharma (2012) who submitted that motivated employees are more productive and perform better than non-motivated employees. If employee is satisfied and happy, then he/she will do his/her work in the best amazing manner. Also, finding from this study corroborated that of Mustafa and Othman (2010) who examined the perceptions of high school teachers about the effects of motivation on their performance at work. They found out that there was a positive relation between motivation and working performance of teachers, that is, the greater the level of motivation the higher will be the teacher's job performance or if provide a high level of motivation to a teachers then their job performance will be increase. However, finding from this study contradicted those reported in Alvesson (2002) and Moynihan and Pandey (2007). These researchers established insignificant relationship between staff motivation and job performance.

The third hypothesis which was formulated that employee engagement and academic staff job performance are not significantly related at the University of Lagos was not accepted. This is because in this study, a strong significant correlation between employee engagement and academic staff job performance was established. This finding is in agreement to the study conducted by Uche et al., (2011) who established that there was a strong significant relationship between the level of teachers' engagement and their performance on the job. Kim and Koo (2017), 48 studies they reviewed established a statistically significant relationship between employee engagement and task performance, although one study concluded that only organizational engagement (one of the engagement dimensions) is related to the

individual level of task performance. But this finding contradicted the finding reported by Halbesleben and Wheeler (2008) who revealed that engagement was not significantly related to turnover intention and eventual task performance.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis which stated that workplace environment does not significantly relate to job performance among academic staff at the University of Lagos was also rejected, due to the fact that there was a strong significant correlation between workplace environment and job performance among academic staff at the University of Lagos. This finding is similar to that of a study by Chevalier (2014) where he revealed that when workplace environmental supports are sound, individuals are better equipped to do what is expected of them. Moreover, if the environmental support is unstable, it is difficult to determine appropriately whether individual factors or environmental factors affect job performance. Dessler (2013) also suggested that institutions must pay attention to employees' perceptions of the environment because employees will behave as if those perceptions were reality especially along generational lines. In addition, workplace environment plays a crucial role in ensuring employee's job performance since it may impact employee morale and productivity (Naharuddin & Sadegi, 2013). However, Chandrasekar (2011) examined that the workplace environment impacts on employee morale, productivity and job performance both positively and negatively.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusively, it can be submitted that the work environment of the universities was good, while the academic staff lived up to expectation on their job. Moreover, job satisfaction, staff motivation, employee engagement, and workplace environment of the universities were fundamental determinants of academic staff job performance. It is wholesomely agreed that serious attention should be given to the university work environment. This would create an endearing intellectual atmosphere which fosters attitude to teaching and learning. Managers can motivate employers by setting in motion the conditions required for motivation, such as

confidence, trust and satisfaction and creating an environment that reinforces these conditions.

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made.

1. University management should develop a system for ensuring job satisfaction among the academic staff. Regular promotion to deserving staff, career advancement, and good welfare package can make staff more satisfied with the job
2. University management and the government should improve upon existing motivational strategies to ensure job performance of academic staff. They should provide for better conditions of service, improved working conditions, improved earned allowances, recognition and advancement. All these are capable of motivating academic staff to improve on their job.
3. Effective employee engagement strategies such as provision of information services, authority-staff relationship, and staff development should be put in place and adopted in order to improve academic staff job performance.
4. The management of the universities should give more attention to work environment of the universities in order to make it more favourable while the academic should continue to improve on their job effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- Adelabu, J. A. (2015). Teacher motivation and incentives in Nigeria. Nigeria. *Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies*, 2(6), 83-91.
- Ajetunmobi, F. G., Oladejo, M. A., & Oladejo, M.A. (2020). Participatory management, professional development, and teachers' job performance in public secondary schools in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Learning for Development. A Publication of Commonwealth of Learning, COL*, 7(2), 17-35.
- Akpan, C. P. (2013). Job security and job satisfaction as determinant of organizational committed among university teachers in Cross Rivers



- State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Education*, 1(2). Pp.82 -93.
- Alromaihi, M. A., Alshomaly, Z. A., & George, S. (2017). Job satisfaction and employee performance: A theoretical review of the relationship between the two variables. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 6(1), pp. 1-20.
- Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A literature review. *Management Research and Practice*, 3(4), 77- 86. Retrieved 10 11, 2016
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Chevalier, M. (2014). *High Performance standards with a congenial working environment*. Laura Miller: Washington DC.
- Dessler, G. (2013). *Human Resource Management* (9th Ed.). New Delhi: Pearson
- Folami, L. & Jacobs, F. (2015). The joint effect of task characteristics and organizational context on job performance: A test using SEM.
- Funmilola, O., Sola, K., & Olusola, A. (2013). Impact of job satisfaction dimensions on job performance in a small and medium enterprise in Ibadan, South Western Nigeria. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(11), 509-521. Retrieved 10 11, 2016
- Heckhausen, J. & Heckhausen, H. (2018). *Motivation and action*. Cambridge University Press, USA
- Indermun, V., & Bayat, M. (2013). The job satisfaction-employee performance relationship: A theoretical perspective. *International journal of Innovative Research in Management*, 11(2), 1-9.
- Kappagoda, S. (2012). Job satisfaction and its impact on task and contextual performance in the banking sector in Sri Lanka. 1st International Conference on Management and Economics 2012.
- Khan, I., Shahid, M., Nawab, S. & Wali, S. S. (2013). Influence of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards on employee performance: The banking sector of Pakistan. *Academic Research International*, 4(1), 282-292.
- Lazear E. (2016) *Performance, pay, and productivity*, NBER Working Paper 5672.
- Mahfood, W.V., Pollock, W., & Longmire, D. (2012). Leave it at the gate: Job stress and satisfaction on correctional staff. *A Journal of Criminal Studies*, 26(3), 308-325.
- Motyka, B. (2018). Employee engagement and performance: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Management and Economics* 2018; 54(3): 227-244. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ijme-2018-0018>
- Moynihan, D.P. & Pandey, S.K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation: comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Administration and Society*, 39(7):803-832.
- Mustafa, M., & Othman, N. (2010). The effect of work motivation on teacher's work performance in pekanbaru senior high schools, Riau Province, Indonesia. *Sosiohumanika*, 3(2), 259-272.
- Naharuddin, N. M. & Sadegi, M. (2013). Factors of workplace environment that affect employees' performance: A case study of Miyazu Malaysia. *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies*, 2 (2), 66-78.
- Okeleke, O.Q. & Oladejo, M.A. (2021). Employee information sharing and job performance in public colleges of education in South-West, Nigeria. *Jurnal Penyelidikan Pendidikan (Journal of Educational Research)*, 39 (1), 2021, pp. 107-117.
- Oladejo, M.A. (2019). Academic-administrators' decision-making styles and institutional goal attainment: A descriptive research in



- the university context". *International Journal of Educational Excellence (IJEE)*, Universidad Ana G. Méndez (UAGM), Puerto Rico, Spain, 5(2), 29-45.
- Oladejo, M.A., Kareem, A.T., & Ghanni, M.O. (2019). Job concern factors and employee engagement among academic staff in public universities, Lagos State, Nigeria. *The Educational Planning. Journal of International Society of Educational Planning (ISEP)*, Washington DC, USA, 24(4), 57-70.
- Oluseyi, S., & Ayo, H. T., (2009). Influence of work motivation, leadership effectiveness and time management on employees' performance in some selected industries in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. *European journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 16, 7-17.
- Oyekan. O.A, (2014). Resource situation as determinants of academic staff productivity in Nigerian University. *European Journal of Globalization and Development Research*, 9 (4), Pp545-550.
- Robbins, P. S. (2003). *Organizational behavior* 10th Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. O., (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-16.
- Uche, A., Fiberesima, D., & Christiana, O. (2011). Relationship between motivational factors and teachers' performance on the job in Ogba/Egbema/Ndoni local government area, of Rivers State. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(5), 23-26.