

Institutional, Personal and Reward System Factors as Determinants of Teachers' Productivity in Public Secondary Schools in Oyo State, Nigeria

Emmanuel O.Adu

*Faculty of Education, University of Fort Hare, P. O. Box 1005, East London 5200 South Africa
E-mail: eadu@ufh.ac.za*

KEYWORDS Teacher Productivity. Institutional Factor. Reward System. Personal Factors. Descriptive Study

ABSTRACT The standard of any education has to do with the level of the teachers' productivity and it has effect on the labor force. This study examined the relationship that exists between an institutional reward system, and personal factors and teacher productivity in public secondary schools. The study adopted a survey research design, which is descriptive in nature. Basically, it is a simple non-experimental study. The study revealed that personal factors ($\beta = -0.53$; $t = -8.57$; $p < .05$) and reward system ($\beta = -0.40$; $t = 7.73$; $p < .05$) were relatively significant to teacher productivity while institutional factors ($\beta = 0.08$; $t = -1.72$; $p > 0.05$) were not relatively significant to teacher productivity. Moreover, personal factors explained the most variation of teacher productivity, followed by the reward system. It is obvious that these are the factors that significantly impact teacher productivity when considered individually. Based on the findings of this study, the education stakeholders and school management should take into consideration the personal factors and reward system that can promote teacher productivity.

INTRODUCTION

Teachers play a pivotal role in the education sector. It was widely believed that there is no nation greater than the quality of her teachers. For an education system to achieve the desired goals and objectives, the teachers' efficiency must be taken into consideration. The future of any educational level depends on not only the psychological factors but also emotional factors of the teachers (Adu et al. 2012). The teachers' roles on students' academic achievement cannot be overemphasized. The educational attainment of students depends on the efficiency of teachers. Hence, the teachers' social, political, and economic well-being are very imperative.

When the teachers' productivity declines, it has a correlation to the standard of education both in the short and long term. Teachers exert a great influence on students, and the children look up to them for guidance, support and protection. Children are supposed to learn from them informally by observing their attitude, mannerism, conduct and general behavior, and formally through their teaching in the classrooms. That is why Adu and Okeke (2014) point out that the things to do to make teachers work hard for the interest of the school and themselves are fundamental to sustainable development in the edu-

cational sector. There is evidence (Ilori 2005) that if issues of the teachers' quality of work life are not considered they can undermine commitment to teaching.

Anyanwu (2012) contends that teachers, like people in the industry, are affected by their experiences. No matter what, the zeal of the teachers to put in their best can be hampered by many factors. These factors are referred to as quality of work life (Adu et al. 2012). The quality of work has significant effects in teaching and learning as well as the teachers' social interaction within and outside the school environment. According to Bharathi et al. (2011), the quality of relationship a teacher has will determine his or her productivity. According to them, the organization culture must be taken into consideration.

According to Bharathi et al. (2011), organizations must recognize the role of human resources and treat them accordingly. They further describe a high work environment as one in which people are "essentially members of an organization that challenge the human spirit, that inspires personal growth and development and that gets things done". Anyanwu (2012) supports this when he avers that teachers would feel wanted and committed to their duty and perform creditably if the principal can provide an enabling environment for them. This probably explains why Adu et al. (2013) submit that

work environment is a refreshing approach to motivating workers for high productivity.

Oloko (2003) argues that some researchers who had searched for the “one best” form of approach to run an enterprise had found out that the level of labor productivity was directly related to the extent to which the style of leadership is generally open rather than close, democratic rather than authoritarian, employee-oriented rather than production-oriented, and non-punitive rather than punitive measures. Other researchers have revealed that the quality of work and productivity of workers can be improved if they are given a greater variety of tasks and more responsibilities (Emunemu et al. 2010). Despite the fact that there is no general definition of the concept, it has become a catchall phrase that encompasses whatever improvements could be seen in general organizational climate that are noticeable.

Productivity in the educational sector can be taken as a measure of the success of operations of the activities that would lead to the realization of the goals and objectives of the sector in the economy just as applicable to other forms of business or corporate organizations. As applicable to the educational system, the measure of the success of a school, otherwise known as the productivity level is hinged on the efficiency and effectiveness of teachers which, in turn, is partly measured in terms of students’ achievement in internal and external examinations as well as the ability of the schools’ products to defend their certificates. The importance of productivity to the success of a school makes it necessary for the teacher to have a high level capacity, coupled with a sense of commitment, integrity and responsibility in order to achieve the objective of teaching and learning as applicable. The education sector remains critical and one of the largest employers of labor in Oyo State. Hence, the government strives hard to increase its budgetary allocation to improve the development of the sector (Akinwumi 2010). The status accorded to education is not unconnected with the importance, which the citizenry, and indeed, the Nigerian government attach to it. Education is not only regarded as a very vital instrument of socialization, scientific and technological development, it is also a crucial factor in economic development and sociopolitical emancipation of the citizenry.

It is also established that for many teachers, there is little or no material and intellectual support for them in the form of on-the-job training and retraining. Increasingly, the quality of the teachers’ work life is worsening and this is negatively impacting the classroom experiences and adversely affecting secondary schools’ products in Oyo State. Apparently, there is the need to stem the existing anomalies of the teachers’ work life quality if their performance is to appreciably improve, especially given fact that the recurring increases in salaries have not provided the desired improvement in performances. Further, efforts in the past that did not pay due attention to work life of teachers have marginal positive results. How then does one motivate the teachers to sustainably provide quality services that would in that regard add value to the products of the school? (Adu et al. 2013)

The quality of workforce in any organization can be regarded as one of the prime factors that propel the organization to achieve higher-level productivity. The capacity and sense of duty of the teacher would, other things being equal, significantly impact the productivity level of the school system in terms of the educational outcomes as represented by the quality of the students produced in a country. The level of efficiency and effectiveness, and the chances of an organization achieving its set goals depend primarily on the extent to which its workers are performing their defined roles (Emunemu et al. 2010).

Research Objective

This paper examines the extent to which institutional factors, personal factors and reward systems determine teachers’ productivity.

Research Questions

The following are the research questions:

1. What are the composite effects of personal, institution, and reward system factors on the productivity of teachers?
2. Of what contribution relatively do personal, institution, and reward system factors have on the productivity of the teachers?
3. Which of the personal, institution, and reward system factors can best predict the productivity of teachers?

Literature Review

Conceptualization of Productivity

Productivity is a concept that applies to all aspects of life and therefore means different things to different people. Thus, after years of research on productivity, what is clear is that a generally accepted meaning has failed to materialize primarily because of the different reference points of the various scholars involved. Adu et al. (2012) identify four different reference points, which he contends have made a single encompassing definition of productivity difficult.

- i. A national reference point, which views the country as a whole. It takes into account, in a simplistic way, the complex interplay of factors such as labor, capital, management, raw materials and other resources as forces influencing economic goods and services. This reference point describes all effects converging in mix rather than isolating the factors as groups.
- ii. Another reference point examines productivity in industries. It isolates the factors that relates and affects specific industries such as labor, management, capital and others. This emphasis concentrates on the factors that bear exclusively on a particular industry, thus any comparison of firms in different industries will be misleading.
- iii. Another is the individual firm or organization. The organization has a more visible cause-effect relationship of its many factors. Man-hours employed and output can be measured and compared to that of the past to determine the efficiency of the firm.
- iv. A final reference point is the individual worker. The productivity of an individual is affected by his work environment and the available tools, processes and equipment.

In a period of timid economic growth and even the economic meltdown, achieving productivity gains has acquired a new sense of urgency. This is particularly felt in developing countries where rapid population growth, reduction in export prices of raw materials, growing indebtedness and inflation have clouded the future. Raising productivity can offset the impact of some of these problems and at the same time help the cause of social development.

Belcher (2007) says that an organization's white-collar activities particularly those involv-

ing knowledge workers, require special consideration from a measurement standpoint while the productivity of some white-collar groups, for example, clerical is susceptible to measurement through the 'output divided by input' approach. Others simply cannot be dealt with so clearly. The productive processes of many white-collar functions are much less tangible than those of manufacturing. The conception of productivity changes in a white-collar environment, even if outputs could be defined, is maximizing the quantity produced relative to the inputs utilized and may not be appropriate as a key performance objective. To be sure, increased efficiency in producing outputs is an appropriate objective for virtually any white-collar organization. But in most cases, there will be other objectives that are of equal, if not greater importance. Quality that is providing services, that is error free, and valuable to the customer must be a high priority (Belcher 2007).

Personal Factors and Teacher Productivity

When the employees' personal needs are aligned appropriately with those of the organization, it leads to satisfaction for both, the employer and the employees. It is on this basis that personal factors relating to teachers' needs were also made part of the work environment. Personal factors here refer to personal needs such as comfortable housing, optimal standard of living, benefits, retirement benefits, pay, and vocation period. These factors have been found to have a significant influence on job outcomes (Adu and Adeyanju 2013). It is evident that the meeting of personal needs of employees is an important factor that drives business (McShane and Von Glinow 2010). In fact, studies have shown that meeting the personal needs of personnel is profitable for businesses with accumulating research evidence pointing to positive influence of need fulfillment on the company's performance (Robins 2008). Therefore, personal factors are also important in affecting job outcomes, especially in situations where personnel poor performance has been found.

Institutional Factors and Teacher Productivity

Institutional factors refer to efforts made by school management and the employer to provide assistance to teachers. Efforts such as gov-

ernment policies made to enhance the effectiveness of teaching staff, and school management policies are meant to improve teaching and general welfare of teaching. Staff institutional support is critical to effective teaching and therefore, when such support is duly received it positively affects job outcomes and creates positive relation between the management and employees (Elseberger et al. 2006). However, absence of institutional support can lead to a wide gap between management and employees and such poor relations have been noted to have a negative impact on job outcomes. For instance, Elseberger et al. (2006) note that low perceived organizational support can create a vacuum between the management and employees and such gaps can have serious implications on job performance, stress, and employees' wellbeing in general. Further support for such claims has been in the works of Adenike (2011) where he reported that socio-emotional needs of administrative staff affect their job satisfaction.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The research design adopted for this study was descriptive survey design to elicit information from the respondents about the relationship that personal, institution, and reward system factors have on teacher productivity.

Population

The population of this study consists of teachers, vice principals and students offering the subject Economics in schools that are categorized as public in the state.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were used to select 553 secondary schools from a total of 1,095 secondary schools in Oyo State.

Research Instruments

Data for this study was collected from primary sources. Four instruments were used in the collection of data, namely:

1. Institutional Factors Questionnaire (IFQ).
2. Personal Factors Questionnaire (PFQ).

3. Reward System Factors Questionnaire (RSFQ)
4. Teacher Productivity Questionnaire (TPQ).

Validity of Instruments

Validity pertains to how an instrument measures what it is desired to measure. To determine the extent to which the instrument used in this study measured what they were supposed to measure, a two-stage process was used to validate the instruments. It entails requesting some experts, lecturers, and colleagues in the faculty of education to assist in reviewing the questionnaire items. Inappropriate items were expunged. The items of the questionnaires were designed to give sufficient information relating to the objectives of the study.

Reliability of the Instruments

Reliability of instruments refers to the accuracy or precision that is, consistency and stability of any measuring instrument. It is possible for an instrument to be valid and not reliable. So any instrument to be used must be valid at the same time reliable. In ensuring that the instruments used for this study are reliable the researcher used the approach of test-re-test to measure the reliability of the instrument, which was calculated using the Spearman Rank correlation formula.

Data Analysis

All data collected for the study was coded and analyzed using a computer. The SPSS-Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used for the statistical analysis. The data collected was analyzed using inferential statistics of multiple regression analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What are the composite effects of personal, institution, and reward system factors on the productivity of teachers?

The results from Table 1 showed that personal, institution, and reward system factors are significantly contributing to the productivity of teachers ($F(6, 1089) = 23.87$; $R^2 = 0.12$; $p < .05$). The three factors resulted into twelve percent variance. That means the eighty-eight percent

Table 1: Composite contribution of personal, institution, and reward system factors on the productivity of teachers

Mode	SS	DF	MS	F	R	R ²	P
Regression	14134.92	.6	2355.82	23.87	0.34	0.12	<.05
Residual	106872.10	1083	98.68				
Total	121007.10	1089					

are other variables that are unimportant. According to Adu et al. (2014), the teachers' characteristics are fundamental factors that can enhance their productivity and job satisfaction and this will promote effective learning of Economics in class.

Research Question 2: Of what relative contribution do personal, institution, and reward system factors have on the productivity of teachers?

The results in Table 2 showed that personal factors ($\beta = -0.53$; $t = -8.57$; $p < .05$) and reward system factors ($\beta = -0.40$; $t = 7.73$; $p < .05$) were significant to the productivity of teachers. However, institutional factors ($\beta = 0.08$; $t = -1.72$; $p > 0.05$) did not determine the productivity of teachers.

Research Question 3: Which of the personal, institution, and reward system factors can best predict the productivity of teachers?

Table 2 also showed the personal factors ($\beta = -0.53$; $t = -8.57$; $p < .05$) and reward system factors ($\beta = 0.40$; $t = 7.73$; $p < .05$). Moreover, personal factors explained the most variation of teacher productivity, followed by reward system. It is obvious that these are the factors that significantly impact teacher productivity when considered individually.

The above findings are in line with Adu et al. (2013) who posited that institutional and personal factors of a teacher should be improved, and the work organization must be able to meet crucial needs of the teachers. The study of Kuma (2008) reported a significant relationship between these factors and productivity. The researchers however, aver that for high productivity to be attained, organizations must build

their human resource policy in line with identified factors.

Further, personal factors and reviewed systems, which are revealed in this study to have significant impact on productivity have also been found in previous studies to influence productivity and job satisfaction (Emunemu et al. 2010). The probable reason for this is that when personal needs of teachers are met, and there are good school relations, this is likely to induce positive attitudes from teachers. However, their absence may seriously affect productivity. In Nigeria, even when the school relation is good, but personal needs, which are referred to in the current study as personal factors, are absent, it is not unlikely to have a situation where low productivity is recorded among teachers.

When the salient needs of teachers are not met and they perceive psychological contract breach or violation, this usually results in negative attitudes among teachers and indeed employees (Adu et al. 2012; Robinson and Morrison 2005). Institutional factor was not significant in relation to determining teacher productivity in public schools. This result is rather surprising as institutional factors are thought to be very important for productivity be it in private or public schools. For instance, the provision of an enabling work environment can only be provided by the government through institutional policies and support. If essential contributions from the government are not provided this may even lead to collapse of the school system. Although one cannot rule out the fact that factors such as the Parent-Teacher Association might act in ways that may limit the damage that ab-

Table 2: Relative contributions of personal, institution, and reward system factors on the productivity of teachers: Multiple Regression Analysis

Factors	B	SE	β	T	P	Remark
Institutional factors	-0.33	0.19	0.08	-1.72	ns	Not Sig
Personal factors	-1.60	0.19	-0.53	-8.57	<.05	Sig
Reward system	1.42	0.18	0.40	7.73	<.05	Sig

sence of institutional support might cause (Cas-
cio 2013; Raduan 2013). Moreover, studies on
the role of institutional factors on teacher pro-
ductivity showed that institutional factors sa-
liently affect teacher productivity (Marcia and
Joanna 2009).

CONCLUSION

Getting high quality job performances from
teachers depend on giving them the opportuni-
ties for personal growth, career development,
achievement, responsibility, recognition, reward
and involvement in decision-making among oth-
ers. Based on the findings of this study, there is
the need for all the stakeholders in education to
take cognizance of factors like personal factors
and reward system. All these and more make the
teachers' productivity. As widely accepted that
no nation or educational system can rise above
the quality of their teachers, the life of workers
on the job must be improved by creating the
kind of work environment that can contribute to
the workers' productivity must be adopted by
the government.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Premised on the findings, the school man-
agement and education stakeholders must put
in place things that will improve the teachers'
productivity. This should comprise monetary
and non-monetary packages that could bring
about improved quality of work. The govern-
ment should take advantage of this to enhance
teacher output. This should be by comprehen-
sively upgrading the composite variables to
achieve the desired objective of improved teach-
er productivity. Further, given the high rating of
personal factors on its contribution to teacher
productivity, governments, through the Minis-
try of Education, should look into the modalities
of promoting issues relating to personal factors
in order to enhance teacher productivity.

REFERENCES

- Adu EO, Oshati T, Eze I 2013. Teachers' workload and gender as determinant of teacher productivity in public schools in Oyo state, Nigeria. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1): 14-25.
- Adu EO, Oshati T, Eze I 2012. Career advancement, school relation and support factors as determinant of teacher productivity in public schools in Oyo state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education*, 4(4): 27-40.
- Adu EO, Adeyanju HI 2013. Home and school factors as determinant of students' achievement in senior secondary school economics in Botswana. *ARNP Journal of Science and Technology*, 3(2): 219-223.
- Adu EO, Okeke CIO 2014. Factors affecting teachers' participation in continuing professional development CPD: Lecturers' perspectives. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology (JSSA)*, 5(3): 271-281.
- Adu EO, Galloway G, Olaoye O 2014. Teachers' characteristics, and students' attitude towards economics in secondary schools: Students' perspectives. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences (MJSS)*, 5(16): 455-462.
- Adenike A 2011. Organizational climate as a predictor of employee job satisfaction: Evidence from covenant University. *Business Intelligence Journal*, 4(1):164.
- Akinwumi FS 2010. *Impact of Motivation and Supervision on Teacher Productivity in Secondary Schools in Oyo State, Nigeria*, PhD Thesis. Dept. of Educational Management. Nigeria: University of Ibadan.
- Anyanwu IE 2012. *A Causal Model of School Management Climate and Teacher Productivity in Senior Secondary Economics in Ibadan, Nigeria*. PhD Thesis. Institute of Education. Nigeria: University of Ibadan.
- Belcher JG 2007. *Productivity Plus*. Texas: Gulf Publishing Houston Company.
- Bharath S, Umaselvi M, Kuma NS 2011. QWL: Perception of college teachers. *Indian Journal of Commerce and Management Studies*, 2(1): 47-65.
- Cascio WF 2013. *Managing Human Resources: Productivity, Quality of Work Life and Profits*. 6th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Davis J, Wilson SM 2010. Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress. *The Clearing House*, 73(6): 349-353.
- Eisenberger R, Hunting R, Hurchinson S, Sowa D 2006. Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3): 500-507.
- Ellis TI 2004. Motivating Teachers for Excellence. ERIC Digest, Number Six, ED291017. From <<http://ericae.net/db/edo/ED259449.htm>> (Retrieved on 9 September 2004).
- Emunemu BO, Oshati T, Adu EO 2010. Quality of work life as determinants of teacher productivity in secondary schools in Oyo state, Nigeria. *West African Journal of Management and Liberal Studies*, 4(1): 131-144.
- Ilori O 2005. *School Environment, Teacher Characteristics and Teaching Process as Factors of Teacher Productivity in Selected Nigerian Unity School*. PhD Thesis. Department of Educational Management. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Johnson WL, Johnson AM 2009. World class schools in the 21st century. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(606): 26-32.
- Kahn RL 2002. Stress in organizations. In: MD Dunnette, LM Hough (Eds.): *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. 2nd Edition. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Volume 2, pp. 571-650.

- Marcia S, Joanna EM 2009. Is there a relationship between QWL and personality type among radiation therapist. *Canadian Journal of Medical Radiation Technology*, 371(1): 12-13.
- Maslach C, Leiter MP 2009. Take this job and love it! 6 ways to beat burnout. *Psychology Today* 32(5): 50-53.
- McShane SL, Von Glinow MA 2010. *Organizational Behaviour*. Columbus, USA: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Oloko A 2003. Factors in labour productivity. In: AM Osoba (Ed.): *Productivity in Nigeria*. Ibadan: NIS-ER, pp. 7-46.
- Rauduan C 2013. QWL: Implication of career dimensions. *Journal of Social Science*, 76: 31- 39.
- Robbins SP 2008. *Organisational Behaviour: Concepts Controversies and Applications*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robinson S, Morrison W 2005. Psychological contract: OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16: 289-298.