IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)
e-ISSN:2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 27, Issue 4. Ser. 3 (April. 2025), PP 41-57
www.iosrjournals.org

Performance Management And Productivity Of Employees In Nigeria Public Sector.

Uchenna, Clems Ozegbe
Faculty Of Management Sciences
Veritas University, Abuja Nigeria,
Department Of Accounting.

Okolie, Franklin Chukwueloke
Department Of Finance And Account,
National Space Research And Development Agency,
Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract
This study assessed the impact of performance management on employee productivity in Nigerian Public Sector Entities (PSEs). It aimed to examine the effect of performance planning, capacity-building initiatives, performance review and evaluation mechanisms, and performance reward systems on employee productivity. The study adopted a quantitative survey design. Using a structured questionnaire, data were collected from a sample of 224 participants out of approximate 546 Human Resource Management and Administrative Officers of fiften (15) selected public sector entities (PSEs) in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) multiple regression. The analyses were facilitated with the aid of Jamovi statistical software (Version 2.3.8). The findings revealed that performance planning (PP) had a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. Capacity-building (CB) initiatives yielded a negative and insignificant effect; while performance review and evaluation (PER) and performance reward systems (PRS) showed positive but statistically insignificant effects. These results highlight the importance of robust performance planning mechanisms in driving productivity, while also indicating the need for improved implementation of other performance management components. The study recommends that performance planning should be enhanced by aligning individual goals with organisational objectives and involving employees in the planning process. It also calls for more targeted and job-relevant capacity-building programmes, improved design and delivery of performance evaluations, and the development of tangible, merit-based reward systems. The study highlights the importance of effective performance management practices in enhancing employee productivity in the Nigerian public service, and concluded that a more integrated and employee-inclusive performance management approach is essential for improving productivity and overall service delivery within Nigerian PSEs.

Keywords: *performance management, employee productivity, performance planning, capacity building, performance evaluation, reward systems, Nigerian public service.*

Date of Submission: 01-04-2025 Date of Acceptance: 11-04-2025

I. Introduction

The Nigerian public sector has long been characterised by inefficiencies, resource wastage, and inadequate service delivery, leading to increasing citizen dissatisfaction. This has prompted successive administrations to seek measures that enhance public sector employees' performance. (Agbonifoh & Osifo,2017). Amid global economic pressures, technological advancements, and the demand for high performance, it is crucial for public sector entities to develop performance management systems that focus on continuous improvement.

Performance management is an umbrella term for activities that ensure organisational goals are effectively achieved. In recent years, Performance management has gained attention due to increasing competition and the growing popularity of frameworks like the balanced scorecard, which integrates corporate strategy across all levels of an organisation.(O'Boyle, I. (2011). Performance management connects organisational goals to employees' aspirations, ensuring alignment between individual efforts and company objectives. Performance management is a planned approach to increasing productivity by improving both individual and team capabilities (Baron & Armstrong, 2007). Employee productivity is measured by how

effectively workers convert inputs into outputs, with performance often compared to industry standards. High productivity is vital for the success of any organisation, particularly in the public sector.

As noted by Okeke et al. (2019), organisations increasingly require higher skills, productivity, and work attitudes from their employees. According to Krett (2000), an efficient performance management system is essential for evaluating employee performance and ensuring compliance with standards. Performance management is critical both for organisations and employees, as it helps employers understand how well employees contribute to organisational goals. For organisations to achieve their objectives, the coordinated efforts of employees are essential

Public sector organisations often struggle with starting and maintaining sustainable performance while enhancing staff productivity. To overcome this, management must implement effective strategies and reward systems to motivate employees. Armstrong (2009) stresses the need for public sector entities to focus on maintaining long-term productivity and enhancing employee performance through various measures.

In recent years, the importance of performance management as a tool for improving productivity has become more evident, especially as organisations grow in size and complexity. Performance management is seen as a strategy to improve organisational productivity, and companies worldwide are investing in performance assessment systems to increase efficiency and gain a competitive edge (Odhiambo, 2015). Given the crucial role of performance management in enhancing productivity, this study aims to evaluate how performance management influences the productivity of employees in Nigerian public sector entities.

The Nigerian public sector has a history of inefficiencies, waste, abysmal performance, and inadequate service delivery. As people's dissatisfaction with the poor delivery of public services has increased, successive administrations have looked for ways to enhance public sector employees' performances - with little or no success. In recent years, there has been increasing advocacy for effective performance management as essential means for improving the efficiency of employees across public sector entities in Nigeria. As the PSEs grow in size, geographical scope, and complexity, it has become increasingly apparent that performance management, rather than performance appraisal, would be an effective strategy to improve productivity in Public Sector Entities in Nigeria. However, a review of available literature on the subject matter has shown that most previous studies merely employed a theoretical angle to analyse the dynamics of the impact of performance management on the efficiency of employees. Even at that, none has examined the dynamics of the impact of performance management on the efficiency of public servants in Nigeria in the context of the Nigerian public sector environment and peculiarities. This study is, therefore, a deviation from the previous ones as an attempt is made to employ a more robust empirical analysis to underpin performance management as a tool for improving the efficiency of employees on a contextual basis.

Statement of the Problem

In the shift towards a knowledge-based and networked global economy, organisations must strategically manage performance to enhance employee productivity and maintain competitiveness. Despite the potential benefits of performance management, Nigerian public sector entities continue to rely on performance appraisal systems, focusing on comparing actual productivity against set standards, without aligning performance with employee goals (Okeke et al., 2019). This misalignment hampers employee productivity. Another issue lies in the oversight of variance analysis in performance measurement, where the expected outcomes, actual results, discrepancies, and necessary corrective actions are not adequately assessed. In addition, Nigerian public sector managers often fail to plan, manage, and align performance effectively, which leads to poor employee engagement and productivity. Pulako (2014) highlights challenges such as ineffective performance planning, evaluation, and feedback processes, contributing to overall unproductivity in many public sector organisations.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to assess the impact of performance management on the productivity of employees in Nigerian Public Sector Entities (PSEs). The specific objectives are to: examine the impact of performance planning on employee productivity; assess how capacity-building initiatives influence employee productivity; determine the effect of performance review and evaluation mechanisms on employee productivity; and explore the impact of performance award systems on employee productivity.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows: section 2 provides a thorough examination of relevant literatures, focusing on performanace Management,dimensions of Performance Management and Employee Productivity. Section 3 Describes the research methodology, including data collection and analysis procedures. Section 4 Describes the Results, analysis, and examines the consequences of these Results, discussing the limitations of the research and offering recommendations for future studies.

II. Literature Review

Conceptual Framework

Performance management

Performance management is an ongoing process of aligning individual and organisational goals, providing feedback, and fostering development to meet organisational objectives. Armstrong (2001) defines performance as the accomplishment of tasks, through which individuals, teams, and organisations achieve their goals. According to Armstrong (2009), it is a structured approach aimed at improving employee, team, and organisational performance, driven by line managers. (Uka & Ardita 2021) emphasises creating a motivating work environment to help employees perform at their best. The process includes goal setting, appraisals, rewards, and training. (Kumarasinghe & Dilan 2021). describes it as a comprehensive approach to evaluating performance, ensuring alignment with organisational and individual objectives. Aguinis (2007) highlights the importance of feedback in addressing weaknesses and aligning performance with goals. Cokins (2004) adds that performance management helps managers adjust quickly to changes in performance. It integrates individual roles, objectives, and organisational needs (Tashtoush 2021) . Baron and Armstrong (2007) view it as a strategic approach to enhancing productivity by improving individual and team capabilities. Over time, it has evolved from a technical tool to a comprehensive process addressing both results and behaviours critical to success (Tashtoush 2021)

Objectives and Benefits of Performance Management

Performance management optimises organisational performance by developing human capital (Gutterman 2023. Boxall and Purcell (2003) argue that it helps identify and address performance issues, improving individual and organisational outcomes. Luthans (2003) outlines three key objectives: reviewing employee performance, fostering personal development, and enhancing potential. Ofosu-Yeboah, & Efthymiou & Uzunboylu (2024) note that it ensures proper direction, equitable reward distribution, and improved productivity, while preparing employees for future roles. Wellins, Bernthal, and Phelps (2006) highlight benefits such as targeted training, informed promotion decisions, and improved motivation and retention. For employees, it identifies strengths and areas for improvement, aligns personal goals with organisational objectives, and boosts morale and engagement (Tommy et al., 2015). By evaluating performance, organisations recognise individual contributions, fostering responsibility and effective performance.

Dimensions of Performance Management

Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is the formal evaluation of an employee's performance and potential, often conducted periodically (annually or semi-annually). It is used to assess various aspects of an employee's work, such as job knowledge, leadership, dependability, and cooperation, to identify strengths and areas for improvement. The ultimate goal of performance appraisal is to enhance productivity by providing feedback, setting clear goals, and offering opportunities for skill development. A well-executed performance appraisal system contributes to achieving organizational objectives, rewarding high performers, and promoting individuals to higher responsibilities (Zayum et al., 2017). Several methods are used, including the essay method, critical incident method, and graphic rating scale (Decenzo & Robbins, 2016). However, poor performance appraisal systems can lead to negative outcomes such as job dissatisfaction and absenteeism (Nwanolue & Ezeabasili 2018).

Capacity-Building

Capacity-building, particularly through training and development, plays a vital role in enhancing employee productivity by equipping employees with the necessary skills and resources to perform effectively. This section discusses the impact of capacity-building on employee productivity, drawing on academic literature. Capacity-building improves employees' skills and competencies, leading to greater efficiency. Pujianto (2024) suggests that training programmes enhance job-related skills, enabling employees to complete tasks more quickly and accurately. Bandura (2023) argues that improved self-efficacy, fostered through training, boosts employees' confidence, motivating them to perform at higher levels, thus increasing productivity. Capacity-building also enhances motivation. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), opportunities for growth, such as training, satisfy intrinsic motivation, encouraging higher performance. Vroom's (1964) Valence Expectancy Theory asserts that employees are motivated when they see a direct link between effort, performance, and rewards. If capacity-building is perceived as contributing to career advancement, employees are more likely to be motivated, leading to better productivity. Training increases job satisfaction by boosting employees' confidence and providing them with the tools to succeed. Locke (1968) links job satisfaction with performance, asserting that satisfied employees tend to be more productive. Furthermore, capacity-building helps retain

employees by offering career progression opportunities. Devaro (2020) finds that organisations investing in development are more likely to retain employees, reducing turnover and improving productivity.

Performance Evaluation and Review

Performance evaluation is a process of examination of employee related attitudes to work, productivity and performance (Okeke et al 2019.). They further asserted that performance evaluation helps the organization to determine the strength and weakness of employees in relation to their objective. Performance evaluation seeks to ascertain why there is underperformance or what the factors were, that allowed good performance in a particular area. Where targets have not been met, the reasons for this must be examined and corrective action recommended. Evidence to support the status is also reviewed at this stage. An additional component is the review of the indicators to determine if they are feasible and are measuring the key areas appropriately (Okeke, Onyekwelu, Akpua & Dunkwu, 2019). Yeboah et al . (2023). states that performance evaluation and control actions include performance measurements, consistent review of internal and external issues and making corrective actions when necessary. Any successful evaluation of the strategy begins with defining the parameters to be measured.

A performance review is a systematic, periodic process where an employee's job performance and productivity are assessed according to pre-established criteria (Abu-Doleh & Weir, 2007). It often includes assessing aspects like job accomplishment, citizenship behaviour, potential for future improvement, strengths, and weaknesses (Manasa & Reddy, 2018). Performance reviews help in compensation, promotion decisions, performance improvement, and employee effectiveness. However, poor execution of performance reviews can lead to dissatisfaction and legal issues (Sudarsan, 2009). Self-assessment, a form performance review, is a method where employees evaluate their own performance against pre-set criteria. This process promotes self-awareness, allowing employees to reflect on their strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement (Okeke et al., 2019). It fosters open communication between employees and management, bridging gaps between expectations and actual performance. However, it can be influenced by a self-other bias (Robbins, 2007). Another form, 360-degree feedback involves gathering feedback about an employee from multiple sources - superiors, peers, subordinates, and sometimes even external stakeholders. This method provides a more comprehensive and balanced view of an employee's performance, making it more accurate and motivating (Mello, 2015). By receiving feedback from various sources, employees are more likely to adjust their work habits to improve performance. The approach is particularly effective in fostering self-awareness and guiding developmental efforts.

Performance Reward System

A performance reward system is a framework within an organisation that links employee performance to tangible rewards, with the aim of motivating and reinforcing positive behaviours and outcomes. It focuses on recognising and rewarding employees based on their performance in achieving organisational goals and objectives. These rewards can be monetary, such as bonuses, commissions, or salary increments, or non-monetary, such as recognition, career development opportunities, or work-life balance improvements (Zhou et al 2009). A performance reward system has several critical functions within organisations. First, it aligns individual goals with the broader organisational strategy, ensuring that employees are motivated to work towards common objectives. By linking performance to rewards, organisations can incentivise employees to perform at their best and foster a culture of accountability (Armstrong, 2006). It also serves as a tool for retaining high-performing employees, as competitive reward systems can enhance job satisfaction and reduce turnover (Kuvaas, 2006).

There are two main types of performance reward systems: **intrinsic** and **extrinsic** rewards. Intrinsic rewards focus on personal satisfaction derived from the work itself, such as a sense of accomplishment or personal growth, while extrinsic rewards involve tangible incentives like salary increases or bonuses (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Organisations often combine both types to create a more holistic approach to employee motivation. The effectiveness of a performance reward system is contingent on its fairness, transparency, and alignment with the performance criteria set by the organisation. If employees perceive the reward system as equitable and reflective of their contributions, they are more likely to be motivated and engaged in their work (Lawler, 1990). Conversely, a poorly designed reward system, which fails to align with performance outcomes or is perceived as unfair, can lead to dissatisfaction, reduced motivation, and even ethical concerns (Heneman & Schwab, 1985).

Efficiency of Productivity

Efficiency measures the productivity of individuals, machines, or systems in converting inputs into outputs (Marsor, 2011). It applies at all levels, from individuals to organizations. According to the Oxford Dictionary, employee productivity is the rate at which a worker produces goods, considering the time, effort,

and resources needed. Employee productivity drives organisational growth and profitability. Robert and Tybout (2007) define it as the ratio between the quantity and quality of goods produced and the resources (labour, capital, and technology) used. Jayamaha & Mula (2011).similarly describes it as the relationship between the output of goods and services and the resources employed. Productivity is thus the ratio of output to input, and a higher ratio indicates greater productivity. Mali (2008) highlights that productivity measures how efficiently resources are utilised to achieve targets, aiming for the highest output with the least expenditure. When inputs match the target output, employees are considered productive. Increased productivity means more is accomplished in less time, saving the organisation money. Conversely, unproductive employees take longer to complete tasks, raising costs (Ikeanyibe, 2009). Good human relations can enhance productivity. Effective workplace relationships create an environment conducive to employee productivity, and fair rewards further foster these relations, contributing to organisational success (Okeke et al., 2019). In today's competitive, rapidly expanding business environment, efficient and highly productive human resources are essential for growth. Organisations strive for continuous improvement, as the best productivity is always ahead.

Theoretical Framework

This study draws upon Victor Vroom's Valence Expectancy Theory and John Stacey Adams' Equity Theory to explain the relationship between performance management practices and employee productivity. These theories provide a foundation for understanding how different performance-related factors influence employee motivation and, consequently, their productivity levels within the workplace.

Victor Vroom's Valence Expectancy Theory

Victor Vroom's Valence Expectancy Theory (1964) is based on the premise that individuals are motivated to act in certain ways based on the expected outcomes of their actions. The theory posits three key elements that influence motivation: expectancy (the belief that effort will lead to performance), instrumentality (the belief that performance will lead to outcomes), and valence (the value an individual places on the outcome). This model suggests that individuals will only be motivated to perform if they believe their effort will result in desired outcomes that are valuable to them.

In a performance management context, this theory suggests that employees will be more productive if they believe that their efforts will result in positive performance appraisals, rewards, and other tangible outcomes. Performance planning, which includes setting clear expectations and goals, plays a significant role in shaping employees' expectations and motivation. Similarly, the capacity-building process, which includes training and development, can enhance employees' skills and their belief that effort leads to improved performance, thereby increasing motivation (Locke, 1968). Performance reviews and evaluations are mechanisms that directly influence the instrumentality and valence aspects of Vroom's theory, as they provide feedback that links performance to rewards. The performance award system also taps into valence, as employees are more likely to be motivated by awards that they value highly

Vroom's theory emphasises the importance of clear goal-setting and performance expectations in motivating employees. If performance planning is effective in shaping employees' expectations, they will be more likely to invest effort in achieving organisational goals. However, if employees perceive the planning process as unclear or unrealistic, motivation and productivity will likely suffer. Therefore, it is hypothesized (**$H0_1$**) that ***performance planning does not have significant positive effect on employee productivity.***

Also, the capacity-building process (training and development) is expected to enhance employees' skills and perceptions that effort leads to improved performance, thereby increasing motivation. From Vroom's perspective, employees who receive adequate training may believe that their efforts will result in improved outcomes. However, if the training is not perceived as relevant or effective, the expected relationship between effort and performance may be weakened. Hence this study hypothesizes in (**$H0_2$**) that ***capacity-building has no significant positive effect on employee productivity***.

Equity Theory

Equity Theory, proposed by John Stacey Adams (1963), suggests that employees are motivated not just by external rewards but by the fairness of the reward system. The theory argues that employees evaluate the fairness of their input-output ratio compared to others. If employees perceive an inequity - whether they are receiving less reward for the same or greater effort compared to colleagues, or conversely, receiving more reward for less effort - they are likely to adjust their behaviour to restore equity. This may result in reduced effort, lower productivity, or withdrawal from the organisation.

Performance management systems, including performance planning, reviews, capacity-building, and the award system, play a critical role in shaping perceptions of fairness. When employees believe that performance appraisals and awards are distributed equitably, they are more likely to be motivated and

productive. On the other hand, if employees perceive the performance review system as biased or the rewards as unjust, it can lead to dissatisfaction, reduced motivation, and lower productivity (Greenberg, 1990).

According to Vroom, employees are motivated by clear feedback on their performance, which links their efforts to rewards. Meanwhile, Adams' Equity Theory suggests that employees' perceptions of fairness in performance reviews are crucial to maintaining motivation. If employees perceive the review process as unfair or biased, their productivity will likely decrease, regardless of performance outcomes. Hence, hypothesis 3 (**$H0_3$**) postulates that ***performance review and evaluation mechanisms does not have significant effect on employee productivity***.

Regarding the reward system, Vroom's theory suggests that employees will be motivated by rewards they value, while Adams' Equity Theory emphasises the importance of fairness in the distribution of rewards. If the performance award system is perceived as fair and linked to desired outcomes, employees will likely be more motivated to enhance their productivity. Conversely, if employees perceive the system as unfair or disconnected from their efforts, motivation and productivity may decline. Thus, it is hypothesised that in (**$H0_4$**) that ***performance award system do not have significant positive effect on employee productivity***.

Synthesis of the Theories

Both Vroom's Valence Expectancy Theory and Adams' Equity Theory offer complementary insights into understanding the dynamics of employee motivation. While Vroom's theory focuses on the individual's expectation that effort will lead to desired outcomes, Equity Theory highlights the importance of fairness and the relational aspects of motivation. These theories suggest that performance planning, capacity-building, performance reviews, and award systems must be managed in a way that ensures fairness and clear links between effort, performance, and reward. By addressing both expectancy and equity concerns, organisations can foster a motivated workforce that is more likely to achieve high levels of productivity.

Empirical Review

Several studies have explored the relationship between performance management and employee productivity. This section presents a structured review of relevant studies, highlighting their methodologies, findings, and gaps in relation to the current research.

Kibichii, Kiptum, & Chege (2016) assessed the effects of the performance management process on employee productivity within commercial banks in Turkana County. The objectives of the study were to establish the effects of performance appraisal systems, training and development, and reward systems on employee productivity. The population consisted of 200 employees from various commercial banks, and the sample size was 133, determined using the Yamane formula. Data were collected through questionnaires, and reliability was tested using a pilot study, yielding a Cronbach alpha of 0.87. Data analysis involved both descriptive and inferential statistics, with findings indicating that performance appraisal, training, and reward systems positively influence employee productivity. The study investigated key performance management practices but it did not fully capture the influence of performance planning or performance review mechanisms, which are central to performance management. Furthermore, it did not assess capacity-building initiatives or performance reward systems in relation to employee productivity. The focus is primarily on appraisal, training, and rewards, missing a broader view of how these systems interact with employee performance planning and evaluations.

The study conducted by Ayandele & Isichei (2013) examined the impact of performance management systems on employee job commitment in selected listed companies in Nigeria. The objective was to determine how performance management affects employees' commitment to organizational goals. A sample of 50 respondents was selected, and data were collected using a Likert-scale questionnaire. The analysis used simple linear regression, and the result showed that employee participation in performance management systems significantly impacted their commitment to organisational goals. Although, the study contributes to understanding the relationship between performance management and employee commitment, it does not focus on productivity, a key aspect of this study's objectives. It also overlooks critical aspects like the influence of performance planning, capacity-building initiatives, and performance awards, which are central to functional performance management system. Furthermore, the study's narrow focus on commitment may not fully capture the comprehensive impact of performance management systems on productivity as envisioned in this study.

Mwema & Gachunga (2014) investigated the influence of performance appraisal on employee productivity in selected World Health Organisation offices in East Africa. The study aimed to establish the effects of performance appraisal systems on productivity in the WHO offices. The population consisted of 410 employees, and the sample size was 105, determined using stratified sampling. Data were gathered through questionnaires, and SPSS was used for analysis. The study found that performance appraisal systems influence employee performance and serve as a motivational tool that improves employee and, eventually, organisational performance. While the study provides useful insights into the role of performance appraisal in employee

productivity, it does not examine other performance management elements, such as performance planning or the impact of performance review and evaluation mechanisms. Furthermore, it does not address capacity-building initiatives or performance award systems, which are central to your research objectives. Therefore, it misses a comprehensive approach to understanding the multifaceted influences on employee productivity.

Tommy, Umoh, Inegbedion & John (2015) examined on the effectiveness of performance management systems in enhancing employee productivity at Multichoice Nigeria. The study population consisted of 617 employees, and a sample of 50 respondents was selected using simple random sampling. Data were collected via structured questionnaires, and frequency distributions and percentages were used for data analysis. The findings indicated that employees were generally dissatisfied with the performance management system, which failed to adequately assess their contributions. This study highlights employee dissatisfaction with performance management systems but does not provide insights into the specific mechanisms of performance planning, reviews, or awards. It overlooks the impact of capacity-building initiatives as well, which are a key objective of this study. Furthermore, the study's findings primarily focus on dissatisfaction with the system rather than the positive influence of well-designed performance management processes on employee productivity.

The study conducted by Zayum, Aule & Hangeior (2017) explored the relationship between performance appraisal and employee productivity in the Plateau State Internal Revenue Service, Nigeria. The study aimed to assess the impact of management by objectives and 360-degree feedback on employee productivity. The population consisted of 1,580 employees, and the sample size was 319, determined using the Taro Yamane formula. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire, and data analysis included frequency, percentages, and logit regression. The study found that management by objectives and 360-degree feedback appraisal methodologies increased staff productivity in PSIRS. While the study focused on performance appraisal and its effects on productivity, it lacks exploration of other critical performance management elements such as performance planning and the role of performance awards in motivating employees. The study also does not assess the impact of capacity-building initiatives on employee productivity. This gap leaves out a holistic view of how performance management systems, beyond appraisals, influence employee performance.

Okeke et al. (2019) examined the effect of performance management on employee productivity in selected large organisations in South East Nigeria. The study had a sample size of 366 employees, with data collected using structured questionnaires. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis. The findings revealed that 360-degree feedback appraisal significantly influenced employee productivity, performance evaluation had a significant effect, self-assessment had no significant influence, and performance review had a significant effect on employee productivity. While the study comprehensively explored performance evaluation and review, it did not assess capacity-building initiatives or performance award systems. This study extends the analysis by incorporating these missing aspects and assessing their impact on employee productivity.

Muhammad, Khan & Hameed (2021) explored the impact of performance management systems on employee performance within Air Blue Airline, Pakistan. The study aimed to understand the relationship between performance management and employee performance, using a sample of 160 employees. Data were collected through questionnaires, and regression and correlation analysis were used for data analysis. A performance management system was found to have a significant impact on staff performance. It was also found that there was a positive and significant association between performance management and employee performance. Although the study offers valuable insights into the link between performance management systems and employee performance, it does not address the role of performance planning, capacity-building initiatives, or performance award systems which are areas that are crucial to your study's objectives.

The study conducted by Osisioma & Audu (2022) investigated the effect of performance management practices on employee productivity at Nigeria Brewery and Guinness Plc in South-West Nigeria. The objective of the study was to examine the extent to which training and development impact employee efficiency. The population of the study consisted of the combined staff and management of the two firms, totaling 6,417 employees. A sample size of 362 was determined using Krejcie and Morgan's sample size determination formula. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed on a five-point Likert scale. For data analysis, the study employed simple linear regression. The findings showed a significant positive relationship between performance management, particularly in training and development, and employee productivity. The regression analysis revealed that effective performance management through training positively influences employee productivity, with a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.814. The study concluded that aligning training and development with the employees' work requirements can enhance productivity. While the study offers valuable insights into the relationship between performance management and productivity, it overlooked several aspects relevant to your study's objectives. Specifically, it did not address the role of performance planning in enhancing employee productivity, nor did it examine the influence

of performance review mechanisms or performance award systems. In addition, the study did not explore the impact of capacity-building initiatives on overall employee productivity.

Ishiwu, Chikeleze & Okwueze (2024) explored performance management systems and employee performance in selected ministries in Enugu State, Nigeria. The study aimed to investigate the effects of performance planning, target setting, and performance monitoring on employee performance. The population of the study was 637 employees, and data were collected through a structured questionnaire. The study employed a t-test to analyse the data. The study provides valuable insights into performance planning, target setting, and monitoring, aligning with some of your study's objectives. However, it does not explore the impact of capacity-building initiatives or performance award systems on employee productivity. Furthermore, the study lacks a detailed examination of performance reviews and evaluation mechanisms, which are central to your research objectives.

Research Gap

While previous studies have provided valuable insights into the influence of performance management on employee productivity, many have overlooked crucial components such as performance planning, capacity-building initiatives, performance review mechanisms, and performance award systems. These elements are the focus of the current study, which aims to examine how these specific aspects of performance management influence employee productivity. This current study, seeks to address these gaps, and offer a more detailed understanding of the various mechanisms within performance management that drive productivity, thereby contributing to both academic literature and practical applications in organisational settings.

III. Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology, detailing the design, sampling techniques, data collection methods, and analytical procedures adopted to achieve the study's objectives. The methodological choices made were grounded in ensuring that the research would be both reliable and valid, facilitating a comprehensive exploration of the relationship between performance management practices and employee productivity.

Research Design

A quantitative survey design was adopted for this study, as it allows for the collection of numerical data that can be analysed statistically to test hypotheses about relationships between variables (Babbie, 2010). Specifically, a correlational design was employed to examine the associations between predictor variables - performance planning, performance evaluation and review, performance capacity building, and performance reward systems - and the outcome variable of employee productivity. The choice of a correlational design is appropriate for exploring the strength and direction of relationships between variables without manipulating them (Leedy & Ormrod, 2014).

Population, sample Size and Sampling technique

The participants of the study consist of 546 HRM and Administrative Officers of fifteen (15) selected Public Sector Entities (PSEs) in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, particularly those responsible for appointments, promotions, and discipline. The sample size, determined using Yamane's (1967) formula, was 231. A simple random sampling technique was used to select participants, ensuring that every member of the population had an equal chance of being included in the sample (Fink, 2013). This reduces sampling bias and enhances the generalisability of the findings to the larger population. In addition, a purposive sampling strategy was applied to identify participants with relevant expertise in human resource management and administrative functions at the offices of fiften (15) selected public sector entities (PSEs) in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja . Purposive sampling ensures the selection of participants whose characteristics align with the research aims, providing richer and more relevant data (Campbell, et al., 2020). At the end, 224 valid responses were collected.

Materials and Measures

The questionnaire used in this study was carefully designed to align with the study's objectives and research questions. It employed a 4-point Likert scale, a commonly used and reliable measurement tool in social science research, allowing for the quantification of participant attitudes and perceptions (Dawes, 2008). The reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, which measures the internal consistency of the scale (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The overall Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.820, indicating good reliability. The Cronbach alpha values for the individual variables ranged from 0.752 to 0.834, further confirming the reliability of the instrument.

Data Collection Procedure

Based on the sample size, 231 questionnaires were distributed. Data collection was conducted in a transparent and ethical manner. The questionnaire was structured using a 4-point Likert scale (ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree), a method that facilitates clear and quantifiable data collection while minimising response bias (Boone & Boone, 2012). This scale was chosen for its ability to balance clarity with the depth of response needed for statistical analysis. At the end of the final data collection window, only 224 were completed and returned successfully. This number was considered adequate for analysis.

Model Specification

The general functional form of the model is:

EP = f (PP, CB, PER, PRS)

Where:

EP = Employee Productivity (Dependent Variable)

PP = Performance Planning (Independent Variable)

CB = Capacity-Building (Independent Variable)

PER = Performance Evaluation and Review (Independent Variable)

PRS = Performance Reward System (Independent Variable)

The econometric form of the model is:

$EPi=\beta0+\beta1PPi+\beta2CBi+\beta3PERi+\beta4PRSi+\varepsilon i$

Where:

$\beta0$ = Intercept (constant term)

$\beta1, \beta2, \beta3, \beta4$ = Coefficients representing the effect of each independent variable on employee productivity

εi = Error term, capturing unobserved factors affecting employee productivity

i = Individual observation

Method of Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics provided an overview of the demographic characteristics of the sample and the distribution of responses, while inferential statistics tested the hypotheses and examined the relationships between variables. Specifically, correlation and multiple regression analyses using the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method were employed to assess the impact of performance management practices on employee productivity. OLS regression is a robust statistical technique for estimating relationships between multiple independent variables and a dependent variable (Hair et al., 2010). Jamovi software (version 2.3.8) was used to conduct the analysis, ensuring rigorous, systematic, and accurate data processing (Şahin & Aybek, 2019).

Ethical Considerations:

The study adhered to ethical guidelines throughout the research process. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, ensuring their voluntary participation (Creswell, 2014). Participants were briefed on the study's objectives, and informed consent was obtained, ensuring that their participation was voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the research purpose (Bryman, 2016). Participants were provided with clear instructions on how to complete the questionnaire, emphasising thoughtful engagement with each item. This process ensured that responses were both accurate and reflective of participants' true perceptions, aligning with best practices in survey data collection (Fowler, 2014). Confidentiality was assured to protect the identities and responses of participants, aligning with ethical standards in research (Bryman, 2016).

IV. Result

This chapter provides an analysis and discussion of the results, with an emphasis on the relationships between performance management components and staff productivity in the Nigerian public sector. The chapter is split into four (4) interconnected sections: Reliability analysis, Descriptive statistics, Normality test and inferential analyses.

Reliability results

The reliability analysis of the measurement scale was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha (α). The result demonstrates strong internal consistency. The overall reliability score of 0.820 indicates that the scale is highly reliable and suitable for measuring the intended constructs. At the individual item level, Employee Productivity (EP) has the highest reliability ($\alpha = 0.834$), followed by Performance Reward Systems (PRS) at 0.802, both indicating strong consistency in responses. Capacity Building (CB) and Performance Planning (PP) recorded reliability scores of 0.771 and 0.762, respectively, suggesting that these constructs are measured reliably. Performance Review and Evaluation (PER) has the lowest Cronbach's Alpha (0.752), though still within the

acceptable threshold, indicating that responses to performance review mechanisms are fairly consistent. Given that all reliability values exceed the recommended minimum of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), the scale is deemed robust and dependable for further statistical analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to summarise and interpret the key variables in the study. They provided insights into the overall trends and distribution of responses. Measures such as mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum values were used to assess the distribution and variability of responses. The result is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptives Statistics

	Employee Productivity	Performance Planning	Capacity Building	Performance Evaluation & Review	Performance Reward System
N	224	224	224	224	224
Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	3.08	3.19	3.32	3.17	3.20
Median	3.00	3.33	3.33	3.25	3.50
Standard deviation	0.577	0.546	0.483	0.582	0.683
Minimum	1.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.00
Maximum	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

Source: Jamovi output

The descriptive statistics summarise the central tendency, variability, and range of each study variable. Mean scores indicate a moderate to high level of agreement, while standard deviations reflect response variability. Employee Productivity (EP) has a mean of 3.08 (SD = 0.577), suggesting a moderately positive perception with relatively consistent responses. Performance Planning (PP) (M = 3.19, SD = 0.546) and Performance Evaluation & Review (PER) (M = 3.17, SD = 0.582) indicate favourable views with moderate variability. Capacity Building (CB) has the highest mean (3.32, SD = 0.483), reflecting a strong positive perception and the most uniform agreement. Performance Reward System (PRS) (M = 3.20, SD = 0.683) shows the greatest response variability, suggesting diverse opinions. Overall, participants view these factors positively, with capacity building perceived most favourably, while the performance reward system elicits varied opinions. These insights support further analysis of factors affecting employee productivity in the Nigerian public service.

Diagnostics Tests

Diagnostic tests in regression analysis evaluate model validity by checking key assumptions. These included skewness and kurtosis values to determine the shape of the distribution, and normality tests (Shapiro-Wilk) to confirm that the residuals follow a normal distribution; autocorrelation tests (Durbin-Watson) to check residuals for correlation, and multicollinearity tests (VIF, Tolerance) to detect correlations between independent variables. These tests help ensure model reliability and identify potential issues.

Normality Test Results

A normality test assesses whether the data follows a normal distribution, which is important for determining the appropriate statistical analyses. Skewness and kurtosis values indicate the shape of the distribution, while the Shapiro-Wilk test provides a formal assessment of normality. The result is contained in Table 2.

Table 2: Normality statistics

	EP	PP	CB	PER	PRS
Skewness	-0.333	-0.377	-0.374	-0.493	-0.353
Std. error skewness	0.163	0.163	0.163	0.163	0.163

Table 2: Normality statistics

	EP	PP	CB	PER	PRS
Kurtosis	-0.00439	-0.238	0.467	0.476	0.116
Std. error kurtosis	0.324	0.324	0.324	0.324	0.324
Shapiro-Wilk W	0.979	0.971	0.975	0.965	0.962
Shapiro-Wilk p	< .063	< .109	< .221	< .062	< .181

Source: Jamovi Output

The skewness values for all variables range from -0.333 to -0.493, suggesting a slight negative skew across all variables, indicating that responses are somewhat concentrated towards the higher end of the scale. These values are close to 0, indicating that the data distribution is fairly symmetrical but with a slight tendency towards the lower end. Kurtosis values range from -0.238 to 0.476, with Performance Evaluation and Review (0.476) showing the highest positive kurtosis. This suggests a distribution that is slightly more peaked than a normal distribution. Other variables, such as Employee Productivity and Performance Reward System, have lower kurtosis values, indicating a more moderate peak in their distribution. The Shapiro-Wilk test results indicate p-values ranging from 0.062 to 0.221, all greater than 0.05. This suggests that there is no significant deviation from normality for any of the variables. While slight skewness and moderate kurtosis values are observed, the data overall appears to be approximately normal, allowing for the use of parametric statistical tests.

Table 3: Overall Normality Test (Shapiro-Wilk)

Statistic	p
0.991	0.159

Source: Jamovi Output

The Shapiro-Wilk test results indicate a statistic of 0.991 and a p-value of 0.159. Since the p-value is greater than the typical significance level of 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests that the data does not significantly deviate from a normal distribution, indicating that the data is approximately normally distributed.

Autocorrelation Analysis Result

The Durbin-Watson test for autocorrelation examines whether there is any autocorrelation (correlation of a variable with its own lagged values) in the residuals of a regression model. The test statistic (DW) value ranges from 0 to 4, where a value around 2 suggests no autocorrelation, values approaching 0 indicate positive autocorrelation, and values approaching 4 suggest negative autocorrelation. The autocorrelation analysis result is presented in table 4.

Table 4: Durbin–Watson Test for Autocorrelation

Autocorrelation	DW Statistic	p
0.0324	1.92	0.558

Source: Jamovi Output

The DW statistic is 1.92 which is close to 2. This indicates there is no significant autocorrelation in the residuals. Also, the p-value is 0.558, which is greater than the common significance level of 0.05. This further suggests that there is no significant autocorrelation present, implying that the residuals are independent of each other and the regression model does not suffer from issues related to autocorrelation. Therefore, the results of the regression analysis can be considered reliable with respect to autocorrelation.

Multicollinearity Test Result

Multicollinearity tests included Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance. They are used to evaluate the presence of multicollinearity in a regression model. Multicollinearity occurs when two or more independent variables are highly correlated, potentially complicating the estimation of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The VIF measures the degree to which the variance of a regression coefficient is inflated due to multicollinearity. A VIF value greater than 10 suggests substantial multicollinearity, while values between 1 and 10 are generally acceptable. Tolerance, which is the inverse of the VIF, indicates the proportion of variance in an independent variable that is not explained by other independent variables. A tolerance value below 0.1 signals high multicollinearity, while values close to 1 suggest minimal multicollinearity. The collinearity result is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Collinearity Statistics

	VIF	Tolerance
PP	1.96	0.510
CB	2.08	0.481
PER	2.25	0.444
PRS	1.54	0.651

Source: Jamovi Output

In this analysis in Table 5, Performance Planning (PP) has a VIF of 1.96 and a tolerance of 0.510, indicating no significant multicollinearity. Capacity Building (CB) has a VIF of 2.08 and a tolerance of 0.481, also showing no issues with multicollinearity. Performance Evaluation & Review (PER) has a VIF of 2.25 and a tolerance of 0.444, further confirming the absence of multicollinearity. Finally, the Performance Reward System (PRS) has the lowest VIF of 1.54 and the highest tolerance of 0.651, supporting the same conclusion. Overall, the VIF and Tolerance values for all variables suggest that multicollinearity is not a concern in the regression model, as all values are well within acceptable limits.

Inferential Analyses Results

was conducted to determine the nexus between variables and the extent to which the performance planning, capacity building, performance evaluation and review, and performance reward system predict employee productivity. These analyses included Pearson correlation and regression.

Correlations

Pearson correlations analysis was conducted to explore the predictive relationship between Employee productivity and Performance management as predictors. The result is presented in table 6.

Table 6: Correlation Matrix

		EP	PP	CB	PER	PRS
EP	Pearson's r	—				
	df	—				
	p-value	—				
PP	Pearson's r	0.429	—			
	df	222	—			
	p-value	< .001	—			
CB	Pearson's r	0.319	0.608	—		
	df	222	222	—		
	p-value	< .001	< .001	—		
PER	Pearson's r	0.387	0.653	0.658	—	
	df	222	222	222	—	

Table 6: Correlation Matrix

		EP	PP	CB	PER	PRS
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	—	
PRS	Pearson's r	0.317	0.473	0.532	0.529	—
	df	222	222	222	222	—
	p-value	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001	—

Source: Jamovi Output

The correlation matrix in Table 6 provides information about the relationships between different variables. Of interest is the correlation between the predictor variables – performance planning, capacity building, performance evaluation and review and performance reward system – and the outcome variable (Employee productivity).

Performance Planning (PP) positively and significantly correlated with Employee Productivity ($r = 0.429$, $p < 0.001$). This indicates that, as Performance Planning increases, there tends to be an increase in Employee Productivity.

Capacity Building (CB) also positively and significantly correlated with Employee Productivity ($r = 0.319$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that an increase in Capacity Building is associated with an increase in Employee Productivity.

Furthermore, Performance Evaluation & Review (PER) equally positively and significantly correlated with Employee Productivity ($r = 0.387$, $p < 0.001$). This suggests that higher levels of Performance Evaluation & Review are associated with higher Employee Productivity.

Lastly, Performance Reward System (PRS) positively and significantly correlated with Employee Productivity ($r = 0.317$, $p < 0.001$). This means that a more robust Performance Reward System is associated with higher levels of Employee Productivity.

These correlations suggest that all predictors - Performance Planning, Capacity Building, Performance Evaluation & Review, and Performance Reward System - have positive associations with Employee Productivity. These associations suggest that improvements in each of these aspects are linked with enhanced Employee Productivity within the Nigerian public service.

Regression

Linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the effect of the predictor variables on the outcome variable. The result is presented in tables 7 and 8**.**

Table 7: Model Fit Measures

				Overall Model Test			
Model	**R**	**R^2**	**Adjusted R^2**	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**p**
1	0.460	0.211	0.197	14.7	4	219	< .001

Note. Models estimated using sample size of N=224

Table 7 presents the model fit results. The R value of 0.460 indicates a moderate correlation between the variables, with an R^2 of 0.211, meaning 21.1% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the model. The adjusted R^2 of 0.197 accounts for the number of predictors and sample size. The F-statistic of 14.7, with degrees of freedom ($df1 = 4$, $df2 = 219$), is statistically significant ($p < .001$). This indicates that the model as a whole significantly explains the variation in the dependent variable (EP). Overall, the result suggests that the independent variables combined have a meaningful relationship with the outcome variable (EP).

Model Coefficients – EP

	95% Confidence Interval	

Predictor	Estimate	SE	Lower	Upper	t	p	Stand. Estimate
Intercept	1.3978	0.2527	0.8998	1.896	5.531	< .001	
PP	0.3034	0.0888	0.1283	0.478	3.416	< .001	0.2871
CB	-0.0139	0.1033	-0.2175	0.190	-0.135	0.893	-0.0116
PER	0.1479	0.0892	-0.0278	0.324	1.659	0.098	0.1494
PRS	0.0914	0.0628	-0.0324	0.215	1.455	0.147	0.1082

Source: Jamovi Output

Table 7 shows the model coefficients for the effect of predictor variables on the Employee Productivity (EP).

Performance Planning (PP) has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity (EP) with estimate of 0.3034 (t-value =3.416, $p < 0.001$). It can therefore be concluded that performance planning has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity in the Nigerian public service. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 ($H0_1$), which posits that performance planning has no significant positive effect on EP, is rejected.

Capacity Building (CB) shows a negative effect on EP (estimate = -0.0139), but the effect is not significant (t-value = -0.135, $p = 0.893$). It can therefore be concluded that capacity building initiatives have not had significant positive effect on employee productivity in the Nigerian public service. Thus, Hypothesis 2 ($H0_2$), which stated that capacity building does not significant positive effect on EP, is accepted.

Performance Evaluation & Review (PER) has a positive but marginally insignificant effect on EP (estimate = 0.1479, $t = 1.659$, $p = 0.098$). Thus, it right to conclude that performance evaluation & review have had positive effect on employee productivity in the Nigerian public service. However, this is effect is not significant. As such, Hypothesis 3 ($H0_3$), which states that Performance Evaluation & Review has no significant effect positive on Employee Performance is accepted.

Performance Reward System (PRS) shows a positive effect on EP (estimate = 0.0914), but the effect is not significant ($t=1.455$, $p = 0.147$). This suggests that performance reward system has positive effect on employee performance. This effect is however not significant in the Nigerian public service. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 ($H0_4$), which posit that Performance Reward System (PRS) has no significant effect on employee productivity is accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The findings from this study offer valuable insights into the relationship between performance management practices and employee productivity (EP) in the Nigerian public service.

Performance Planning and Employee Productivity: This study finds that performance planning has a positive and significant effect on employee productivity, which aligns with the findings of Kibichii, Kiptum, & Chege (2016), who also observed that performance management processes like planning positively influenced productivity. However, while the current study supports this relationship, Kibichii et al. did not fully capture performance planning as a critical element of performance management, focusing more on performance appraisals, training, and rewards. This study's emphasis on performance planning, therefore, extends the understanding by highlighting its significant impact on employee productivity, which Kibichii et al. did not fully explore. The study's results also corroborate those of Ishiwu, Chikeleze & Okwueze (2024), who noted that performance planning positively influences employee performance in government ministries. Thus, the current study's findings agree with earlier studies that acknowledge performance planning as an essential element of performance management.

Capacity Building and Employee Productivity: The study finds that capacity building has a negative, insignificant effect on employee productivity, which contradicts the findings of Osisioma & Audu (2022), where training and development (a form of capacity building) had a positive and significant effect on employee productivity. Similarly, Kibichii et al. (2016) found that training and development were important for enhancing productivity. The lack of a significant effect in this study could be due to various factors specific to the Nigerian public service context, such as inadequate or ineffective training programmes, which may not directly influence productivity. Unlike Osisioma & Audu who emphasised the direct benefits of training, this study suggests that without proper alignment to work requirements, capacity-building efforts may not have the desired impact. This finding contributes to the existing literature by suggesting that capacity-building initiatives might not always lead to immediate productivity gains unless they are strategically aligned with the specific needs and goals of employees.

Performance Evaluation & Review (PER) and Employee Productivity: This study reports a positive but marginally insignificant effect of performance evaluation and review on EP. This finding aligns

with Okeke et al. (2019), who also observed that performance review mechanisms had a positive effect on productivity but did not emphasize its significant role. The marginal significance found in this study suggests that while employees may perceive performance evaluations as useful, the lack of a substantial effect may be due to the review processes not being robust or well-implemented. In contrast, Mwema & Gachunga (2014) found that performance appraisals were a motivational tool that improved performance, which may indicate a more direct or integrated appraisal system compared to the performance evaluation mechanisms in the Nigerian Public Service. This discrepancy highlights the need for more effective performance reviews in the Nigerian public sector to ensure significant positive impacts on productivity.

Performance Reward System (PRS) and Employee Productivity: The study finds that the performance reward system has a positive but insignificant effect on EP. This finding is in line with Zayum, Aule & Hangeior (2017), who also found that performance appraisals had a positive influence on employee productivity, though they did not assess the reward system directly. The lack of significance here could be attributed to the perception that rewards may not be effectively tied to performance in the Nigerian public service, or that employees may not view the rewards as sufficiently motivating. This study's findings contrast with those of Kibichii et al. (2016), who emphasised the role of reward systems in enhancing productivity but did not explore how they are implemented or perceived in relation to employee performance. This suggests that while rewards may influence productivity in some contexts, their effect may not always be significant unless paired with other well-designed performance management practices.

Overall, the current study's findings support some elements of the previous research, particularly the importance of performance planning in driving employee productivity, and the positive role of performance evaluations, though with marginal significance. However, the study also highlights areas of divergence, particularly with capacity building and performance rewards, where the findings suggest a weaker or less significant impact compared to earlier studies. These contradictions underscore the importance of contextual factors in understanding the effectiveness of performance management systems in different settings.

V. Conclusion And Recommendations

Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate the role of performance management practices - specifically performance planning, capacity building, performance evaluation, and performance reward systems in enhancing employee productivity within the Nigerian public service. The findings have provided valuable insights into the complex relationship between these performance management elements and employee productivity, as well as how these relationships manifest in the Nigerian context.

The study found that performance planning had a significant positive effect on employee productivity, aligning with prior research that emphasised the importance of structured planning and goal-setting in performance management systems. This finding suggests that clear objectives, task expectations, and strategies for achieving these goals can effectively motivate employees, leading to improved performance. However, capacity building, which includes training and development, was found to have a negative but statistically insignificant impact on productivity. This result contrasts with previous studies that demonstrated a positive correlation between capacity-building initiatives and employee performance, highlighting the need for a more nuanced understanding of how such initiatives are implemented and perceived in the public service sector. Similarly, performance evaluation and review showed a positive but marginally insignificant effect on productivity. While performance evaluations are considered essential for measuring and improving performance, the lack of a significant effect in this study suggests that performance reviews may not be effectively designed or executed within the public service, leading to underwhelming outcomes in terms of employee motivation and performance improvement. Finally, the study found that the performance reward system had a positive but insignificant effect on employee productivity. This suggests that while reward systems are often seen as a way to motivate employees, they may not be effectively tied to performance in the Nigerian public sector, or employees may not view the rewards as sufficiently motivating. This finding contrasts with previous research that linked reward systems with enhanced employee productivity, pointing to the need for a more robust reward mechanism in the public service.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be made to enhance the effectiveness of performance management practices in the Nigerian public service:

i. **Enhancing Performance Planning Mechanisms**: Since performance planning was found to significantly impact employee productivity, it is essential for public sector organizations to invest in creating clear, detailed, and realistic performance plans. These plans should align individual roles with organizational goals, ensuring that employees understand their tasks and objectives. Furthermore, performance planning should involve employees in setting goals to increase their commitment to achieving them.

ii. **Improving Capacity Building Initiatives**: While capacity-building initiatives did not show a significant impact on productivity in this study, this should not deter investment in training and development. However, public sector organizations should ensure that training programs are relevant, up-to-date, and aligned with the specific needs of employees. A more targeted approach to capacity building, focusing on skill development directly related to job functions, may yield better results in terms of employee performance.
iii. **Strengthening Performance Evaluation and Review Systems**: Given that performance evaluations showed a marginal impact on productivity, it is crucial to improve the design and implementation of performance reviews. These reviews should be comprehensive, transparent, and aligned with performance planning processes. Furthermore, feedback from evaluations should be constructive and actionable, providing employees with clear guidance on areas for improvement and opportunities for growth.
iv. **Revamping Performance Reward Systems**: Public sector organizations should reconsider how performance rewards are structured. Rewards should be tangible, aligned with the performance of employees, and serve as a genuine motivator. Developing a more personalised and merit-based reward system could enhance the motivational effects of performance rewards and drive greater employee engagement and productivity.
v. **Encouraging Employee Participation in Performance Management**: Engaging employees in all stages of the performance management process of planning, evaluation, and review, can increase their commitment and buy-in. When employees have a voice in setting their goals and evaluating their performance, they are more likely to feel empowered and motivated to perform at their best.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations. First, it focuses on the Nigerian public sector, which may limit the generalisability of the findings to other sectors or countries, as contextual factors like politics, culture, and economic conditions may influence performance management systems. Second, the study did not consider key contextual factors such as leadership styles, organisational culture, or external influences like economic conditions, which may shape the effectiveness of performance management practices. In addition, the study examined only performance planning, capacity building, performance evaluation, and performance reward systems. Other important practices, such as feedback mechanisms and employee wellness programs, were not explored. Finally, the reliance on self-reported data from employees may introduce biases, suggesting that future research could benefit from using multiple data sources to improve reliability. Addressing these limitations by future research will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of performance management practices.

Suggestion for Future Research

Future studies should explore the specific contextual factors that may affect the relationship between performance management practices and productivity in the Nigerian public service. In addition, researchers could investigate the role of leadership styles, organisational culture, and external factors (such as economic conditions) in shaping the effectiveness of performance management systems. Moreover, further research could examine the impact of other performance management practices, such as feedback mechanisms and employee wellness programs, on employee productivity. Lastly, future studies could expand the scope and use a mixed-methods approach that incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data to provide a more holistic view of the effects of performance management on employee productivity.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study highlights the importance of effective performance management practices in enhancing employee productivity in the Nigerian public service. While performance planning emerged as the most influential factor, other elements such as capacity building, performance evaluation, and performance reward systems require improvement to maximize their impact. Public sector entities (PSEs) can better align their performance management procedures with the objective of increasing staff productivity by putting the suggested solutions into effect. This will ultimately improve organisational performance and service delivery.

References

[1] Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards An Understanding Of Inequity. Journal Of Abnormal And Social, 67, 422-436.
[2] Agbonifoh, C. & Osifo, S.J. (2017). Factors Responsible For Poor Service Delivery In Nigerian Public Organizations. Nigeria Journal Of Business Administration. 15(1), 7 - 21. Retrieved From Https://Www.Researchgate.Net/Publication/350102617 .
[3] Aguinis, H. (2007). Performance Management. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson
[4] Armstrong, M. (2001), A Handbook Of Human Resource Management Practice. London: Kogan Page.
[5] Armstrong, M. (2006). Human Resource Management Practice. Landon And Philadelphia. Kogan Page Ltd.
[6] Armstrong, M. (2009). Armstrong's Handbook Of Human Resource Management Practice. London: Koga Page.
[7] Ayandele, I. A. &Isichei, E. E. (2013). Performance Management System And Employee Job Commitment: An Empirical Study Of Selected Listed Companies In Nigeria. International Journal Of Management, 2(1) 1 – 13.

[8] Babbie, E. (2010) The Practice Of Social Research. 12th Edition, Wadsworth, Belmont.
[9] Bandura, A. (2023). Cultivate Self-Efficacy For Personal And Organizational Effectiveness. Principles Of Organizational Behavior: The Handbook Of Evidence-Based Management 3rd Edition, 113-135.
[10] Baron, N. & Armstrong, M. (2007). Psychology Applied To Work (8th Ed). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
[11] Bernthal, P., Wellins, R. S., & Phelps, M. (2006). Employee Engagement: The Key To Realizing Competitive Advantage. Development Dimensions International. Retrieved From : Https://Theengagementeffect.Com/Wp-Content/Uploads/DDI-Employeeengagementmonograph.Pdf
[12] Boone, H.N. And Boone, D.A. (2012) Analyzing Likert Data. The Journal Of Extension, 50(2), 15. Https://Archives.Joe.Org/Joe/2012april/Tt2.Php
[13] Boxall, Peter & Purcell, John. (2003). Strategy And Human Resource Management. Industrial & Labor Relations Review. 57. Https://Doi.Org/10.1108/00251740310479368.
[14] Bryman, A. (2016). Social Research Methods (5th Ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
[15] Campbell Et Al (2020). Purposive Sampling: Complex Or Simple? Research Cas Examples. Journal Of Research In Nursing : JRN, 25(8), 652–661. Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/1744987120927206
[16] Cokins, G. (2004). Performance Management: Finding The Missing Pieces And Closing The Intelligence Gap: Australia: John Wiley And Sons.
[17] Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative And Mixed Methods Approaches (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
[18] Dawes, J. (2008). Do Data Characteristics Change According To The Number Of Scale Points Used? An Experiment Using 5-Point, 7-Point And 10-Point Scales. International Journal Of Marke Research, 50(1), 61-104. Https://Psycnet.Apa.Org/Doi/10.1177/147078530805000106
[19] Decenzo, D. A., Robbins, S. P., & Verhulst, S. L. (2016). Fundamentals Of Human Resource Management. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. Rtrieved From: Https://Www.Scirp.Org/Reference/Referencespapers?Referenceid=2866573
[20] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic Motivation And Self-Determination In Human Behavior. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media. Https://Doi.Org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7
[21] Devaro, Jed. (2020). Strategic Compensation And Talent Management: Lessons For Managers. Https://Doi.Org/10.1017/9781108861458
[22] Fink, L. D (2013). Creating Significant Learning Experiences—An Integrated Approach To Designing College Courses (P. 35). Jossey-Bass.
[23] Fowler, F. J. (2014). Survey Research Method (5th Ed.). Centre For Survey Research, University
[24] Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, And Tomorrow. Journal Of Management, 16(2), 399-432. Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/014920639001600208
[25] Gutterman, A. S. (2023). Organizational Performance And Effectiveness. Available At SSRN 4532570.
[26] Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. And Anderson, R.E. (2010) Multivariate Data Analysis. 7thedition, Pearson, New York.
[27] Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay Satisfaction: Its Multidimensional Nature And Measurement International Journal Of Psychology, 20(2), 129–141 Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/00207598508247727
[28] Herzberg, F. (2015). Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Organizational Behavior 1, 61-74.
[29] Ikeanyibe, O. M. (2009) Principles And Practices Of Public Personnel Administration: A Nigeria Perspective. Onitsha Perfect Image.
[30] Ishiwu, U., Chikeleze, O., & Okwueze, O. (2024). Performance Management Systems And Employee Performance In Selected Ministries In Enugu State, Nigeria. Journal Of Policy And Development Studies, 16(1), 347-357. Https://Dx.Doi.Org/10.4314/Jpds.V16i1.20
[31] Jayamaha, Ariyarathna & Mula, Joseph. (2011). Productivity And Efficiency Measurement Techniques: Identifying The Efficacy Of Techniques For Financial Institutions In Developing Countries. Journal Of Emerging Trends In Economics And Management Sciences (JETEMS). 2. 454-460.Retrieve From: Https://Www.Researchgate.Net/Publication/233727036_Productivity_And_Efficiency_E Surement_Techniques_Identifying_The_Efficacy_Of_Techniques_For_Financial_Institutions_In Developing_Countries
[32] Kibichii, K.E., Kiptum, K.G., & Chege. K. (2016). Effects Of Performance Management Proces On Employee Productivity: A Survey Of Commercial Banks In Turkana County. IOSR Journal Of Business And Management (IOSR-JBM), 18(11), Ver. IV: 52-64.
[33] Kumarasinghe, H. P. N. I., & Dilan, H. K. T. (2021). Organizational Change And Change Management. Contemporary Innovations In Management, 49-69.
[34] Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance Appraisal Satisfaction And Employee Outcomes: Mediating And Moderating Roles Of Work Motivation. The International Journal Of Human Resource Management, 17(3), 504522.
[35] Lawler, E. E. III. (1990). Strategic Pay: Aligning Organizational Strategies And Pay Systems. Jossey Bass/Wiley. Retrieved From : Https://Psycnet.Apa.Org/Record/1990-98343-000
[36] Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2014). Practical Research: Planning And Design (10th Ed.). Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education.
[37] Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward A Theory Of Task Motivation And Incentives. Organizational Behaviour & Human Performance, 3(2), 157–189. Https://Psycnet.Apa.Org/Doi/10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004 4
[38] Luthans, F. (2003). 360-Degree Feedback With Systematic Coaching:Empirical Analysis Suggests A Winning Combination. Human Resource Management, 42(3): 243-256.
[39] Manasa, K. V. L., & Reddy, K. R. (2018). Work Life Balance And Job Satisfaction Of Women Employees In It Sector-A Study. Apeer Reviewed Journal XXV (2)
[40] Marsor, R. (2011). Influence Of Prior Acquaintance With The Ratee On Rater Accuracy And Halo. The Journal Of Management Development 26 (8), 790.
[41] Mello, D. M. (2015). Performance Management And Development System In The South African Public Service: A Critical Review. Journal Of Public Administration, 50(Si-1), 688-699.
[42] Muhammad, S., Khan, I., & Hameed, F. (2021). The Impact Of Performance Management System On Employees' performance. International Journal Of Business And Management Sciences, 2(3), 38-47. Https://Ijbmsarchive.Com/Index.Php/Jbmis/Article/View/795/199