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# **Abstract**

*The study examined the appraisal system and engagement as correlates of job effectiveness of academic staff. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. A descriptive design of survey type was used. The population of this study comprised academic staff of Federal Colleges of Education, Lagos and Ogun States. The total population of the study is 637 lecturers.**Simple random sampling technique was used in selecting a total of 300 lecturers from Federal Colleges of Education, Lagos State and Ogun State .Two researcher instruments tagged: Appraisal System Questionnaire (ASQ) and Engagement and Job Effectiveness Questionnaire (EJEQ) with 0.78 and 0.81 respectively were used for data collection. Regression analysis was used in answering and testing the research questions and hypotheses. The findings of the study revealed that there was significant joint contribution of the independent variables (appraisal system and engagement) on the dependent variable (job effectiveness of academic staff); R = 0.687, P< .05. About 44% of the variance in job effectiveness of academic staff was accounted for by the linear combination of the independent variables. The study recommended among others that appraisal system should provide accurate and relevant ratings of a lecturers’ job effectiveness as compared to pre-established criteria.*
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**1.Introduction**

The lecturer is a crucial element of the tertiary institution system. Its success or failure depends on an individual lecturer's effectiveness, which affects the institution's performance positively or negatively. The issue of lecturers' effectiveness in Nigerian institutions has been a burning one for some time, especially regarding quality teaching, research, and community service activities. This is because apart from the quality of graduates, which parents are allegedly challenging, employers, other stakeholders and in the international labour and many foreign institutions; Oyaziwo (2019) said that majority of the institutions are not making any impact on the socio-economic and political development of the country that is yearning for development. Academic staff effectiveness is the commitment of workers to their duties, leading to high productivity to realise the desired goals and objectives of the institution (Usoro, Effiong, & Ekpenyong, 2020).

The job effectiveness of lecturers in tertiary institutions cannot be ignored if the goal actualisation of the higher institutions is attained. Lecturer job effectiveness reflects the involvement and psychological attachment towards the institution and work assigned to him. Pare and Tremblay (2017) believe that lecturer effectiveness is associated with behaviours of high involvement, reduced intention of opting out of the institution, going the extra mile to accomplish duties and tasks, and willingness to help and uplift others at work and corporate citizenship. It has been observed that some lecturers in Nigeria institutions showed a lackadaisical attitude to their work in terms of poor teaching, lateness to class and absenteeism from the class and in terms of research, some did not devote much time to a depth of good research work (Ekundayo & Oluyeye, 2020). Lecturer job effectiveness refers to the degree to which a lecturer identifies with his/her work institution and its goals and the willingness to maintain membership in the organisation (Levy, 2019). Lecturer job effectiveness refers to loyalty and attachment to the institution. In the tertiary institution, such loyalty is seen in lecturers' feelings of attachment that develop as they share values in common with co-workers.

It appears some lecturers are not interested in breaking new grounds in research but only publish to get their promotion as and when due (Ekundayo & Oluyeye, 2020). This is also a pointer to the attitude of some lecturers about research and academic work. The spirit of participating in community services seems very low. Talks and lectures to community members have become a thing of the past because people are de-motivated. This non-commitment of lecturers might result from inadequate welfare packages that can help them meet their ends. According to Akpan (2019), these welfare packages include remuneration, recognition, job security, engagement, and lecturers' relationship with authority.

Lecturer’s work effectiveness can be affected by so many factors including work engagement and appraisal systems. Lecturers' engagement could be seen as a situation that commits their intellectually and physical attributes to the course of the institution, which three elements of behaviours can judge - Say, Stay, and Strive (Agbionu, Anyalor & Nwali, 2018). This concept (engagement) originated from two major concepts in Human Resource Management – Commitment and Organization Citizenship Behaviour, with employee engagement indicating a higher positive predictor of organisational performance (Markos & Sandhya, 2016). According to Robinson, Perryman and Hayday (2014), this is associated with a two-way relationship between employer and employee as against the three earlier contrasts – job satisfaction, employee commitment and organisational citizenship. There is this feeling of excitement, interest and attachment to the organisation's cause when an employee is meaningfully engaged. These burning desires will propel the employees to perform exceedingly well even beyond the contractual agreement in the form of extra hours or energy (Armstrong, 2012). In an attempt to get employers to succeed, employees get involved in investing their efforts beyond mere job satisfaction or contractual loyalty to the employer.

In this case, lecturers' engagement is the dynamics of their positive attitude towards the organisation and its values. An engaged lecturer fully understands the business context and cooperates with colleagues to ensure the institution's success. The institution must work to nurture, maintain and grow engagement which requires a two-way relationship between the employer (institution) and employee (lecturer). The engagement has to do with how lecturers employed themselves and cognitively in their job performance. Lecturer attitude cannot be isolated from their engagement with institution performance because of its positive role (Agbionu, Anyalor & Nwali, 2018). Previous observations have shown that employee (lecturer) engagement positively impacts individual component outcomes (job effectiveness) as well as organisational level outcomes (Hayday, 2014; Umosen & Oleforo, 2019).

In engagement, lecturers employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances. Engagement is about an employee doing his job with passion, commitment, willingness and using his discretionary efforts to ensure the organisation succeeds (Oyeh & Ukaigwe, 2018). Engaged lecturers' are innovative, passionate, and highly productive and harness resources at their disposal towards goal attainment; they do not work just for pay or fringe benefits but for the love of their job, to which they accord priority attention. Highly engaged lecturers' are not motivated because of money but have the interest of their job at heart. Researchers have shown that organisations with high employee engagement perform higher than those with low employee engagement. Getting employees (lecturers) engaged has been a great challenge facing

modern-day organisations like tertiary institutions, as most organisations do not know what it takes to engage their employees. Measuring the engagement level of a worker depends on how fit the effectiveness of such worker is well appraised (Caruth & Humphreys, 2008).

An Appraisal system is a systematic process of determining an employee's performance level (Obasi & Ohia, 2014). It identifies the individual's areas of strength and weakness. The Appraisal system measures skills and accomplishments with reasonable accuracy and uniformity. It provides a way to help identify areas for performance enhancement and to help promote professional growth. The process is to recognise achievement, evaluate job progress and then design training for further development of skills and strength appraisal system is the process of evaluating how well employers perform their jobs as compared to a set of standards and then communicating that information to those employees (Obasi & Ohia, 2014). Specifically, it identifies the gap between the expected and actual performance levels. Santiago and Benavides (2016) maintained that the appraisal system can be interlinked with institution arrangements to improve the teaching process. They added that results from the performance appraisal system could be used to identify teaching needs and contribute to the definition of the school plan to improve the teaching process in the school.

The Appraisal system is an essential constituent of the whole human resource management function in institutions of higher learning (Aloo, Ajowi & Aloka, 2017). The appraisal system is based on setting agreed performance targets, work planning, reporting, and feedback. The general objective of the appraisal system is to improve and manage the workers' performance. Improving and managing the performance of workers/employees would enable an advanced level of staff involvement and participation in the delivery, evaluation, and planning of work performance. Aloo, Ajowi and Aloka (2017) reiterated that the appraisal system should consist of the following: performance targets, work planning, values, and monitoring, competency assessment, evaluation, and end-of-year appraisal. Likewise, they noted that a lecturer should improve his organisation's professionalism and performance standards to the extent appropriate for his office.

According to Igbojekwe and Ugo-Okoro (2015), appraisal system can be described as a management practice that is used to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of workers and their potential for advancement and growth in a firm. The appraisal’s processes do start with setting of standards and communicating such standards to the workers involved. Furthermore, the measurement of the appraisee’s real performance must be initiated. This measured actual performance must be compared with the set standards and discussing the result of the appraisal with the appraisee to instigate corrective actions (Odunayo, Salau, Fadugba, Oyinlola & James, 2014). According to Agyare, Yuhui, Mensah, Aidoo and Ansah (2016), an effective appraisals system ensures

success is achieved when issues concerning workers selection, development and motivational practices are considered. It also gives workers the opportunity of setting goals that will leads to their personal growth, whereas, an ineffective appraisal system can leads to deprived enthusiasm that will affect the achievement of the firms anticipated goals (Aslam, 2011). For appraisal system to yield a good expected outcome, it must be able to replicate, assess and estimate personnel’s behavior (Girma, Lodesso & Sorsa, 2016). It is based on this premise that this study sought to examine the appraisal system and engagement as correlates of job effectiveness of academic staff in Federal College of Education in Lagos and Ogun states, Nigeria.

**2.Statement of the Problem**

The role of tertiary institutions in the nation's economic, social and political development cannot be over-emphasised. This is because nations worldwide depend on ideas, knowledge and sound academic research for societal development. However, the accomplishment of any higher institution's objectives depends mainly on its staff's effectiveness. To achieve effectiveness and high turnover in higher institutions, motivation and workers' wellness issues must be prioritised. The role of lecturers in tertiary institutions is central to actualising higher educational objectives. This is why lecturers are often held accountable when things go wrong within the system. However, the problem that necessitated the present study is the issue of ineffectiveness on the part of lecturers as regards their job performance. For some time now, lecturers' performance has generated much public concern. These concerns are current issues in tertiary institutions, which include lateness to class, absenteeism, sexual abuse, extortion, examination malpractice, absconding from duties, and unethical practices that have been highly prevalent among lecturers in higher institutions of learning. Although tertiary institution management has put in efforts through its various control measures, these efforts seem not to yield enough success as things continue to get out of hand. Thus, this study sought to examine the appraisal system and engagement as correlates of job effectiveness of academic staff.

**2.1. The objective of the study**

The study's main objective was to examine the appraisal system and engagement as correlates of job effectiveness of academic staff. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. assess the influence of appraisal system on job effectiveness of academic staff.
2. determine the influence of engagement in job effectiveness of academic staff.
3. examine the influence of the joint contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff.

iv.examine the influence of the relative contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff.

**2.2. Research Questions**

1. To what extent can the appraisal system influence the job effectiveness of academic staff?
2. To what extent can engagement influence the job effectiveness of academic staff?

**Hypotheses**

**H01**: There is no significant joint contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff.

**H02**: There is no significant relative contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff.

**3. Methodology**

The study used the descriptive design of the survey type. The justification for using this design is that it helps the researcher collect data from the respondents towards providing answers to the objectives of the study, research questions and hypotheses. The population of this study comprised academic staff of Federal Colleges of Education, Akoka (Lagos State) and Federal Colleges of Education, Osiele (Ogun State). As of September 5th, 2021, the Federal College of Education, Akoka, Lagos State, has a total of 354 lecturers' while the Federal College of Education, Osiele, Abeokuta, Ogun State, has 283 lecturers'. The total population of the study, therefore, is 637 lecturers. A simple random sampling technique was used to select 300 lecturers from the Federal Colleges of Education, Akoka (Lagos State) and Osiele (Abeokuta, Ogun State), representing 47.10% of the population. Two researcher instruments were used in this Study: Appraisal System Questionnaire (ASQ) and Engagement and Job Effectiveness Questionnaire (EJEQ).

**Appraisal System Questionnaire (ASQ):** ASQ is a researcher's structured instrument geared towards eliciting information from lecturers regarding appraisal systems in operation. The questionnaire requested responses on a four (4) – point scale format which was a modification of the 5-point Likert scale. The responses rating scales are as follows: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD).

**Engagement and Job Effectiveness Questionnaire (EJEQ)**: EJEQ is a researcher's structured instrument geared towards eliciting information from lecturers regarding job engagement and effectiveness. The questionnaire (EJEQ)requested responses on a four (4) – point scale format, which modified the 5-point Likert scale.

The responses rating scales are as follows: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD).

To ensure the content validity of the instruments, a copy of each instrument was made available to the two experts to review in content, grammar and structure. Reliability of the instrument was done using Cronbach's alpha. In this case, copies of the instruments (ASQ and EJEQ) were administered to 20 lecturers parallel to the sampled population. The collected data were analysed, and their respective reliability estimates were reported as 0.78 and 0.81, respectively. Regression analysis was used in answering the research questions and testing the study's hypotheses. Decisions were made at a 0.05 alpha level of significance. The equation (regression model) used for this study is as follows:

Y =β0 + β1X1+ β2X2 + ɛ

Where, Y= is Job effectiveness.

X1= is Appraisal system.

X2= is Job engagement

ɛ = is the error term.

β0 = a constant which is the value of dependent variable when all independent variables are 0 (intercept).

β1 = Regression Coefficient (slope) of variable X1 , Appraisal system.

β2 = Regression Coefficient (slope) of variable X2 , Job engagement.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Variables | M | SD |
| 1 | Appraisal System | 26.7000 | 9.10494 |
| 2 | Job Engagement | 28.3000 | 8.55115 |
| 3 | Job Effectiveness | 53.0000 | 7.37865 |

The mean and standard deviation scores of the independent variables (appraisal system and Job engagement) and the dependent variable (Job effectiveness) considered in the study are presented in Table 1.

**4. Results and Discussion**

**Research Question 1**: To what extent can the appraisal system influence academic staff's job effectiveness?

**Table 2: Extent appraisal system influence job effectiveness of academic staff**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | | Unstand. Coefficients | | Stand. Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 5.123 | 3.005 |  | 1.705 | .089 |
| Appraisal system | .350 | .089 | .222 | 3.931 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Job effectiveness of academic staff | | | | | | |

The first important thing to note in Table 2 is that the sign of the coefficient of the appraisal systemis positive. This implied that the job effectiveness of academic staff increases with a sound appraisal system. Furthermore, the probability (p = 0.00), as reported in Table 1 for the appraisal system, implied that the slope (𝛃 = 0.222)is statistically significant. Hence, the researcher concluded that appraisal systems influence academic staff's job effectiveness.

**Research Question 2**: To what extent can engagement influence academic staff's job effectiveness?

The first important thing to note in Table 3 is that the sign of the coefficient of engagementis positive. This implied that the job effectiveness of academic staff increase with good job engagement. Furthermore, the probability (p = 0.00) reported in Table 2 for job engagement implied that the slope (𝛃 = 0.387)is statistically significant. Hence, the researcher concluded that engagement influences academic staff's job effectiveness

**Testing of Hypotheses**

**H01**: There is no significant joint contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff.

Table 4 revealed that there was a significant joint contribution of the independent variables (appraisal system and engagement) on the dependent variable (job effectiveness of academic staff); R = 0.687, P< .05. The table further reveals {44.4% (Adj. R2 = 0.444)} that about 44% of the variance in job effectiveness of academic staff was accounted for by the linear combination of the independent variables. The ANOVA results from the regression analysis show that there was a sign of the independent variables on the dependent variables; F (2, 297) = 26.227, p<.05. ).

**HO2**: There is no significant relative contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff.

**Table 3: Extent engagement influences job effectiveness of academic staff**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | | Unstand.  Coefficients | | Stand. Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std. Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.532 | 1.731 |  | 2.618 | .009 |
| Engagement | .576 | .080 | .387 | 7.242 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Job effectiveness of academic staff | | | | | | |

Table 5 showed that the sign of the coefficients of appraisal system and engagement was positive, which implied that an increase or improvement in any of these will increase the job effectiveness of academic staff. The two independent variables were found to be significant and strongly determine the job effectiveness of academic staff, with their p-value less than 0.05. Sign of appraisal system (β = .977, t = 24.819, P<.05) and engagement (β = .373, t = 5.94, P<.05).

**5. Discussion of Findings**

The study's findings revealed that the appraisal system and engagement positively influence the job effectiveness of academic staff. These findings corroborate with Sittar (2020), who indicated a weak positive correlation between work engagements and the job performance of university teachers. Winarno and Hermana

(2019) show that the implementation of the Human Resources (HR) function to improve the research performance of the lecturers is based on JDR (job demand resources). The excellent performance of research, community service and teaching is based on the work paradigm. The orientation of private universities' HR function to optimise performance has not touched the commitment aspect as much as an effort to encourage work engagement and improve lecturer performance.

**Table 4: Joint contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R = .687  R2= .450  Adj R2= .444  Std. Error = 5.38795 | | | | | |
| ANOVA | | | | | |
| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F-ratio | P |
| Regression | 1522.762 | 2 | 761.381 | 26.227 | 0.000 |
| Residual | 8621.904 | 297 | 29.030 |
| Total | 10144.667 | 299 |

Dependent variable: Job effectiveness of academic staff

Performance is influenced by work engagement based on commitment based on ethical awareness of the function of lecturers in higher education. Efforts to meet job demand and resources are physical, psychological, and ethical in the work function to improve the performance that is managed as a sustainable system.

The findings also correlate with Agbionu, Anyalor and Nwali (2018), who revealed a positive relationship between employer reciprocity and lectures' research output. Anumnu (2018) indicated that academic staff in Nigerian universities did not differ in their levels of job commitment and involvement irrespective of differences in age, gender and marital status. The study also reveals that the job commitment of academic staff seemed to be related to their job status. Ahuja and Savita (2018) revealed that work engagement is positively associated with organisational

commitment. A long tenure could be an outcome of a match between an organisation's result orientation with employees' personal and professional orientation. Hence, it implies that Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) must design ingenious ways to map the two orientations to retain faculty members for long tenures and capitalise upon their work engagement. Jalal (2016) indicated that employee engagement significantly positively affects organisational commitment. It was also found that the work environment significantly positively impacts organisational commitment. Finally, the outcomes of this study confirmed that organisational learning has a significant positive effect on organisational commitment. These findings provide valuable insights and suggestions for the management in higher educational institutions to learn to develop organisational commitment among their employees by adopting effective human resource practices that could ultimately lead to organisational competitiveness and increased performance. Furthermore, the findings corroborate with Momoh, and Koolo (2017), who revealed that all the seven techniques examined are utilised by both schools, but the frequency is significantly more in private schools.

**Table 5: Relative contribution of appraisal system and engagement on job effectiveness of academic staff**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | | Unstand.  Coefficients | | Stand.  Coefficients | t | Sig. |
| B | Std.Error | Beta |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.627 | 2.857 |  | 1.270 | .205 |
| Appraisal system | 1.639 | .066 | .977 | 24.819 | .000 |
| Engagement | .557 | .094 | .374 | 5.935 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Job effectiveness of academic staff | | | | | | |

**6. Conclusion**

The effectiveness of lecturers’ Job in tertiary institutions cannot be ignored if the goal actualisation of the higher institutions is to be attained. Appraisal and engagement lay bedrock for ensuring the effectiveness of lecturers’ job. Having examined the appraisal system and engagement as correlates of job effectiveness of academic staff, the following conclusions were drawn based on the findings of the study that appraisal system and engagement do

influence job effectiveness of academic staff and that about 44% of the variance in job effectiveness of academic staff was accounted for by the linear combination of the appraisal system and engagement. This study is limited to a segment of a larger entity which is the Federal College of Education alone. Future research could make use of a broader sample of higher institutions lecturers (federal, state and private), this would help to reveal if this research will generate a similar outcome or not, in order to allow for in-depth analysis. Future studies could analyze how leadership styles moderate the prediction of appraisal system and engagement to lecturers’ effectiveness. The study measured the research variables based on the perception of the lecturers. For future research, consideration should be given to secondary data as well.

**7. Recommendation**

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are hereby given:

1. The Appraisal system, which is an annual exercise, should be properly carried out because it dramatically impacts lecturers' job effectiveness. Lecturers should also know what is expected of them while carrying out their duties, which can be achieved if the employers let the lecturers know about their various assignments. The lecturers should be informed about the importance of the appraisal system.
2. The government should provide a conducive working environment for the lecturers’. That will go a long way to increase their job effectiveness.
3. The Appraisal system should provide accurate and relevant ratings of a lecturer's job effectiveness compared to pre-established criteria. The HOD who is to rate the lecturers during the appraisal exercise should go on training. The set criteria should be used. Lecturers' should not be appraised based on their traits, but the performance variables should be considered.
4. The Appraisal system of lecturers should be carried out based on the institution's adoption of the proper performance appraisal technique to avoid bias and unfair appraisal of employees.
5. The institution should strictly follow the organisational blueprint for a reward system to encourage the lecturers.
6. There should be periodic training of lecturers in terms of seminars and conferences to keep them acquainted with the fact that performance appraisal exercise should not be seen as ingestion but rather as a means of developing the employee in his job to strengthen the strong points of the employee and enable him to improve on his weak point.
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