

Prospects and Challenges of the Revitalised SPADEV Reporting System in Lagos State Civil Service, Nigeria

Folahan T. Adetomiwa¹ & Daniel E. Gberevbie

Department of Political Science and International Relations
Covenant University, Ota, Ogun-State, Nigeria

Corresponding Author¹

ABSTRACT

Lagos State Civil Service employs the revitalised Staff Performance and Development Evaluation (SPADEV) System, a switch from the Annual Performance Evaluation Reporting System currently in use in the Nigerian Civil Service. This is because it is said to be a better system that provides an efficient and effective solution to the evaluation exercise. It is expected that as long as human beings are in control of the system and not robots, challenges must abound. Thus, it is imperative to investigate the prospects and challenges associated with the system and bring to bear the concerns and its effects on the civil servants as regards their evaluation and job performance. The research was conducted using a descriptive design with a structured survey questionnaire and interview guide. Using the census approach, respondents of this study was the 142 employees from Grade Levels 01-14 of a Lagos State Commission. Data collected were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics to address the research question and hypothesis. The findings revealed the challenges of the evaluation system and its significant impact on the employees of the organisation. The paper concludes that there is no system that does not have its challenges, no matter how efficient or effective it may be. Nonetheless, the paper recommends that the appraisal system must show credibility and effectiveness of the employees' evaluation processes which is dependent on flexibility, due respect for ethical principles, availability of supportive structure, personal integrity, professionalism, dignity, honesty, and respect from both the superiors and subordinates.

Keywords: Challenges, job performance, Lagos State Civil Service, performance appraisal, SPADEV reporting system

DOI: [URL:https://doi.org/10.36758/ijpamr/v7n1.2021/02](https://doi.org/10.36758/ijpamr/v7n1.2021/02)

1. INTRODUCTION

Just a year after establishing the SPADEV Reporting System in 2007, some factors were observed to be absent by practitioners during its implementation. They were the requirement for workers' pay rates and yearly increments to be founded on pay-for-performance and the necessity for officers' professional success (advancement inclusive) to be performance-based (OTCI, 2013). Thus, the initial intention for the substitution of APER with SPADEV forms seemed vanquished. The anomalies or inherent weaknesses were the inconsequential effects of job performance evaluation scores on advancement, as shown in the scoring formulae used below:

Table 1: SPADEV Scoring Parameters

SPADEV SCORING PARAMETER HISTORY					
Duration	Criteria	GL 01-06	GL 07-12	GL 13-14	GL 15-17
THE SPADEV					
2007-2013	Examination	78%	78%	78%	78%
	JOB PERFORMANCE	15%	15%	15%	15%
	Appearance	5%	5%	5%	5%
	Seniority	2%	2%	2%	2%
	Total Score	100%	100%	100%	100%
THE REVITALISED SPADEV					
2014-2015	JOB PERFORMANCE	45%	45%	45%	50%
	Examination (Written)	24%	30%	24%	20%
	Interview/Oral Exam	30%	24%	30%	25%
	Seniority	1%	1%	1%	5%
	Total Score	100%	100%	100%	100%
2016-2019	SPADEV	20%	20%	20%	20%
	Structural Training Programme	40%	40%	40%	40%
	Oral Interview	40%	40%	40%	40%
	Total Score	100%	100%	100%	100%
2020-2021	SPADEV	30%	30%	30%	30%
	Structural Training Programme	35%	35%	25%	25%
	Oral Interview	35%	35%	45%	45%
	Total Score	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Author's Field Survey (2021)

The evaluation standards were discovered to be too centred towards examination (78%) to the disadvantage of real job execution, bringing about bright however lazy staff with poor SPADEV or job execution rating scores (representing just 15% of promotion scores), getting advanced to the detriment of more dedicated officers.

For advancement, the appearance was scored twice under the SPADEV Assessment Form (5%) and during the interview (5%) (OTCI, 2013). The assessment curriculum for promotion comprised the Financial Regulations (FR), Public Service Rules (PSR), and Circulars remained prevalent over time with no precise bearing on real job delivery. In addition, the rigid curriculum was utilised for advancement across a band of grade levels (GL1-17). As a result, the SPADEV Reporting System fell short of the expectation of a more efficient and pragmatic Annual Staff Performance Appraisal System envisaged to ensuring officers quality service delivery. As a result of the SPADEV reviews and its lapses, the Office of the Transformation, Creativity, and Innovation (OTCI) developed a new reporting system called the Revitalised SPADEV Reporting System, which took effect in January 2014 assessment year.

The Revitalised SPADEV Reporting System became more service delivery and job performance-focused, such that officers render performance returns when due; appraiser and appraisee jointly comprehend work plan explained and specific duties agreed. The amendment ensured that staff were assessed based on their job description, set goals, and achievements for the reporting period. The revitalised system ties the Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs)/Delegated Duties in accordance with their service delivery responsibilities towards seamlessly fostering good governance and accountability. Job descriptions for all staff, just as target-setting/Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), are currently principal and reinforced; the importance is directly positioned on performance-based promotion just as pay-for-performance, thereby eradicating the advancement driven mentality of officers, as being the reason for performance evaluation and reporting; evaluation scores practically reflect effective service delivery, productivity improvement, and outputs (on-the-job-performance) amongst others.

The Revitalised SPADEV form is categorised into: SPADEV 1 (GL 01-06); SPADEV 2 (GL 07-12); SPADEV 3 (GL13-14); and SPADEV 4 (GL15-17). The SPADEV forms are now completed biannually for GL 01–17, mid-year in June and year-end in December (OTCI, 2013). The five-scale rating is configured as: Outstanding/Exceptional (5 at 80%); Very Good (4 at 66% - 79%); Good/Satisfactory (3 at 50% - 65%); Below Average/Failure (2 at 35% - 49%); and Unacceptable (1 at 34% and below). The system has Zero tolerance for late completion and submission of the SPADEV form to the corresponding parties involved in the evaluation processing. A Letter Day to communicate on-the-job performance to staff is observed every 31st March succeeding appraisal year. Exceptional performance recorded through the SPADEV forms afford recipients education sponsorship, performance earning bonus, or accelerated promotion. In addressing the bias towards examination against on-the-job performance, the scoring parameter, which gave adequate recognition to on-the-job performance, was employed from 2014. In 2016, Ambode's administration changed the scoring parameter because of the impracticality of the civil servants' examination and the scoring of seniority level that had no bearing whatsoever when it comes to actual job delivery. They made it to be more of job performance, training, and oral interview. In 2020, the scoring parameter was again restructured by the Sanwo-Olu's administration, still maintaining the previous standard. The current scoring pattern is used across board in all the Ministries, Departments, and Agencies of Lagos State.

2. EMPIRICAL DISCOURSE

The success of the employees' evaluation system in the organisation is determined by the realisation of strategic purposes and the increase of work process efficacy through the continuous improvement of employees' performance and procedures, alongside focusing on improving work inadequacies (Bekele, Shigutu & Tensay, 2014). Without any doubt, employees' evaluation is one of the major fulcrums that hold the organisation together, as popularly known to be an organisational life cycle, which consists of numerous administrative processes such as job performance measurement, reward management, and training and development (Mengistu, 2018). Sajuyigbe (2017) noted that performance evaluation has been the most appraised, criticised, and debated administrative or management practice for several scholarly works. With the innumerable benefit accrued from executing employees' evaluation system, from research discoveries, numerous researchers (Komendat & Didona, 2016; Sinkeet, 2016; Molle, Mulongo & Razia, 2017; Loliya & Osikwemhe, 2018) have shown that performance evaluation practices usually suffer from issues relating to the subjectivity of performance evaluation standards, the irrelevances of the criteria's employed to appraise employees, inadequate knowledge and skills of the appraiser, bias and favouritism of evaluators, failure to deliver timely feedback, lack of consistency in documentation, the unclear role of performance assessment, unfairness in rewarding employees, and the insufficiency of the evaluation system.

According to Abdullateef & Mohd-Nazri (2019), employees' evaluation has been charged with the inability to provide on-time feedback, favouritism, subjectivity, leniency or strictness, bias and stereotyping from supervisors, lack of knowledge and skilled supervisors, and lack of continuous documentation. Ekpe, Ekong & Ekpe (2013) stated that employees' evaluation systems fail because the appraisal methods lack reliability and validity. Reliability problems include ethnicity, nepotism, and fear of reprisal, while the validity issues include halo or horn effect and central tendency error (Mengistu, 2018). Another scholar indicated that the exercise is futile and expensive (Dyaji, Ibietan & Abasilim, 2020). They stated that those performance evaluations have guaranteed so much and conveyed pretty much nothing. Sajuyigbe (2017) identified five problems that are pertinent to employee performance evaluation, such as the absence of tools aimed at improving employees' evaluation systems, unfair employee perspective of the appraisal system, lack of senior management support, unskilled raters who

lack communication and interpersonal skills and thusly unable to conduct effective performance feedback, and conflicting criteria which may prompt negative attitude against the evaluation system. Abasilim (2014) also sees the problem of the superior-subordinate relationship related to trust, which is a critical element in managing organisational performance. Another serious problem stated by him is the similarity effect, which indicates appraisers' tendencies to give a favourable rating to those subordinates like themselves regarding behaviour, race, religion, background, gender, or personality. The effect of this mistake can be potent, and when the similarity depends on race, gender, or religion, it could be termed as discrimination. One more problem of employees' evaluation is the appraiser's mood in the evaluation process's commencement. In a study by Forgas & George (2001), attitude plays a paramount role when tasks require a degree of cognitive processing. This is saying that the state of an appraisals mind affects his/her behaviour and judgement. If he is in a good mood, he will most likely recall positive events and information on the appraisee's performance, vice-versa.

The problems and challenges emanating from employees' evaluation will always be prevalent because it deals with humans, and human beings are the most difficult resources to manage. When workers' perception of the evaluation system is adversely affected, behavioural and attitudinal reactions impact their work, superiors, and the organisation at large (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; Dastmalchian, Bacon & Varnali, 2020). For example, this effect could express dissatisfaction towards the supervisor, reduce dedication to the organisation, and increase the tendency to resign (Abusi, 2014). Therefore, it might not be out of place to assume that the original aim to execute employees' evaluation will be seriously contested. Not surprising, most employees detest performance evaluations because they do not believe in the system's sanctity and believe it is partial and unproductive (Shukla & Adhikari, 2017).

The appraisal of job performance in the evaluation process is one of the major variables impacting the employee evaluation system (Selvaraj, Ghosh, & Jagannathan, 2016; Zeleke, 2019). The clarity of the members and their acceptance by those engaged impact the efficiency of the review process. The level of receptivity, support, and acceptance that a performance evaluation system is likely to receive in an organisation is largely determined by the importance that employees place on it as a valuable source of feedback to help them improve their performance (Root, 2017). If there is satisfaction in the execution of the appraisal system, employees will perceive well and exert every possible energy to discharge their duties and obligations effectively and efficiently. Thus, making the organisation more successful and productive. It is critical that employees view the performance evaluation as a tool for exhibiting their abilities and skills for personal development and career growth. Whereas, employees who have a poor opinion of the appraisal process, regarding it as an unreasonable attempt by management to exert greater oversight and control over their duties, may cause more harm than good.

From the foregoing, it is seen that many scholarly contents have given specific accounts of problems and challenges pertaining to employees' evaluation systems from various patterns of application, which may be or may not be generalised at all levels (micro or macro) of organisation in the world. However, with regards to the Revitalised Staff Performance Appraisal and Development Evaluation Reporting System of Lagos State Civil Service, it cannot be assumed that the above challenges are also the same. It is stated that the evaluation system is a unique characteristic that differentiates the State from the remaining thirty-five States in Nigeria (Okorie, 2019). So, it is imperative to investigate the challenges associated with the system and bring to bear the concerns and its effects on the civil service officers as regards their evaluation and job performance. Hence, the hypothesis for the review is:

H₀: Challenges associated with the employees' evaluation system do not significantly affect the Lagos State Commission's employees' job performance.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

The descriptive survey design is employed in this study. The Census approach was used to ascertain this study's sample size, which enlisted all the one hundred and forty-two (142) Grade-Level 1-14 Officers in a Lagos State Commission. The choice of approach was due to the small and manageable size of the population used for the research. Out of which 131 (92.3%) Officer's responses, adequately filled, were collated and formed the basis of the analysis and presentation of data to address this study's research objective and question. The justification for using the Commission is that it is a human resources hub with substantive knowledge on workforce planning, development, and training of service staff in Lagos State Civil Service.

The mixed-method was applied in this study. The method captured both quantitative and qualitative methods of collecting data, analysing data, and discussing data results. The intent of using this method is to unite the varying strengths and non-intersecting shortcomings of qualitative methods (in-depth, details, and small population) with those of quantitative methods (transferability or generalisation, trends, and large sample size); to expand or validate quantitative data with qualitative data, and base the interpretation on both results (Creswell, 2018). Data were collected with the aid of a closed-ended structured questionnaire and an in-depth structured interview guide. The Likert Scale psychometrics developed in 1932 by Rensis Likert was used to measure the respondent's perceptions (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree – modified into four). This is used because it allows for decisive answers. A purposive selection of six (6) officers from the three-levelled categories (GL.1-6; 7-12; 13-14) from the Commission was chosen to be interviewed. Creswell (2018); Saunders & Townsend (2018) recommended that where the population of interest is homogenous, 3 to 12 interviewees are likely to be sufficient. Using the in-depth interview method, the officials selected were strictly those in the organisation with thorough, ample, and adequate knowledge of the evaluation system in the commission.

To guarantee that the research instruments are valid, content validation was employed to validate the tools by subjecting them to thorough scrutiny in wording, content, question construct, and bias before its application by experts in the field of Public Administration. To establish the instrument's reliability, a pilot survey was done to ascertain the tool's appropriateness and correctness. An external pilot survey was used to conduct the test were 10% of 142 respondents not marked for the study were used to administer the questionnaire and interview guide. These people were the senior officers (GL.15-17) in the Lagos State Commission because of the Civil Service protocol and that they know what is ethically right for the organisation in terms of Oath of Secrecy. In giving their feedback, the respondents were asked to comment on the clarity and conciseness of the questionnaire and interview questions; and suggest possible readjustments.

The information gathered was analysed through descriptive and inferential statistical methods with the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (version 25). The descriptive analysis involved frequencies and percentages, while simple linear regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis. The linear regression was used to test how much the independent variable impacts the dependent variable in the hypothesis. In other words, it allows the researcher to determine how the values of the independent variable (challenges associated with the evaluation system) may or may not help to explain variation in the dependent variable (job performance of the study area). The data gathered through the interview were analysed using thematic analysis. The responses of the interviewees were, therefore, grouped into the identified theme for analysis. Both the quantitative and qualitative data obtained were triangulated accordingly. The Methods Triangulation was used, which allowed for the combination of two data analysis methods to prevent the weaknesses or problems that come from a single method.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Background Data of Respondents

This section presents the respondents' background data using frequencies and percentages.

Table 2: Respondents' Background Data

Variables	Item	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	61	46.6
	Female	70	53.4
	Total	131	100.0
Age	21-30 years	3	2.3
	31-40 years	54	41.2
	41-50 years	65	49.6
	51 and above	9	6.9
	Total	131	100.0
Grade Level	01-06	5	3.8
	07-12	95	72.5
	13-14	31	23.7
	Total	131	100.0

Source: Author's Field Survey (2021)

The analysis of the background data of respondents shows that more female officials (53.4%) participated in the survey than male officials (46.6%). Also, the majority of the survey respondents are within the age range of 41-50 years (49.6%); 31-40 (41.2%); 51 and above, and 21-30 years have the smallest percentages of respondents with 6.9% and 2.3% respectively. A large percentage of respondents are within the grade level of 7-12 (72.5%); respondents within grades 13-14 made up 23.7%, and the least number of respondents (3.8%) were within grades 1-6. This shows that the respondents are in their career prime age, which gives a very high assurance of having sound and knowledgeable responses. This is with the fact that most of the respondents have attained significant promotion levels in the organisation.

4.2 Quantitative Findings

Challenges Associated with the Employees' Evaluation System

This section aimed to present a descriptive analysis of the challenges associated with the evaluation system used in the Lagos State Civil Service. The survey respondents expressed their opinion, with a scale of 4 for strongly agree to 1 for strongly disagree. Their responses were presented using frequencies and percentages, as shown in the table section.

Table 3: Challenges of the Performance Appraisal System

S/N	ITEMS	SA		A		D		SD		Total
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F (%)
1	Lack of appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity.	44	33.6	74	56.5	12	9.1	1	0.8	131 (100%)
2	The appraisal system is insufficient to manage the evaluation of contemporary Lagos State Civil Service.	17	13.0	67	51.2	26	19.8	21	16.0	131 (100%)
3	The key performance indicators (KPIs) are not set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees and the organisation.	5	3.8	84	64.1	22	16.8	20	15.3	131 (100%)
4	Employees' salaries and annual increment are not based on pay-for-performance.	33	25.2	66	50.4	22	16.8	10	7.6	131 (100%)
5	The key performance deliverables (KPDs) are not streamlined in alliance with the KPIs to ensure collaboration between goals, objectives, and realities.	13	9.9	87	66.4	27	20.6	4	3.1	131 (100%)
6	The appraisal system is not efficient to ensure quality service delivery.	22	16.8	73	55.7	25	19.1	11	8.4	131 (100%)

Source: Authors' Field Survey (2021)

There is a strong need to routinely assess the rising challenges that affect employees' appraisal systems to ensure that the appraisal system matches the employees' development. These challenges were adopted from the responses gotten from the pilot study, as the respondents were asked to identify the challenges associated with the system, which became a valid variable for a wider study. For this appraisal system, respondents strongly agreed with the statement that there is a lack of appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity, which made up 33.6% of the respondents, 56.5% stated that they agreed to this, also bringing the total percentage of individuals who concur that there is an inappropriate work environment to 90.1%. Respondents who disagreed and strongly disagreed made up 9.1% and 0.8%, respectively. The public sector needs revamping as analogue processes still exist and obsolete systems with much output expected with minimal inputs. Another challenge stated is that the appraisal system is insufficient to manage the evaluation of contemporary Lagos State Civil Service (LSCS). Majority of the respondents agreed (64.2%) to this, which may signify that the system is currently not capable of giving an effective assessment of an official's responsibilities. On a high magnitude, 67.9% of respondents agreed that the key performance indicators (KPIs) are not set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees and the organisation. Those who disagreed made up a cumulative of 32.1% of respondents that the key performance indicators (KPIs) are set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees and the organisation. This shows that the emergent need for a shift in methods to adjust key performance indicators in evaluating performance is required. Furthermore, respondents who disagreed with the statement that employees' salaries and annual increments are not based on pay-for-performance accumulated to 24.4%. In contrast, those who agreed that employees' salaries and annual increments are not based on pay-for-performance constituted 75.6% of the respondents. This may explain why employees struggle to give their best in the workplace as their motivation is dampened. Largely, 76.3% of respondents agreed that the key performance deliverables (KPDs) are not streamlined in alliance with the KPIs to ensure collaboration between goals, objectives, and realities. Those who disputed the statement made up 23.7% of the total 131 respondents. This could also explain why employees keep changing jobs and even choose to be their bosses. Over 60% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed at a magnitude that the evaluation system is not

efficient to ensure quality service delivery, while those who disagreed and strongly disagreed made up 19.1% and 8.4% of the respondents, respectively.

4.3 Test of Hypothesis

H₀: Challenges associated with the employees' evaluation system do not significantly affect the Lagos State Commission's employees' job performance.

Table 4: Hypothesis Two Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.644 ^a	0.414	0.386	0.31716
a. Predictors: (Constant), Challenges associated with the evaluation system.				

From the above table, the R shows a positively substantial relationship between the challenges associated with the evaluation system and employees' job performance, given a R of 0.644. Furthermore, the R-square reveals that the model's overall performance in the table is averagely satisfactory, given the R-square of 0.414. Therefore, it can be inferred that 41.4% of job performance is explained by the challenges associated with the employees' evaluation system used in LSCS.

Table 5: Hypothesis Two ANOVA Table

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	8.827	6	1.471	14.625	0.000 ^b
	Residual	12.474	124	0.101		
	Total	21.301	130			
a. Dependent Variable: Job Performance of LSCS's Employees						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Challenges associated with the evaluation system.						

The ANOVA table above shows that the p-value is 0.000, and the associated F-value is 14.625. This shows the test's significance, considering the p-value (0.000), which is less than the significance level (0.05). Therefore, it can be concluded that the challenges associated with the evaluation system significantly affect LSCS employees' job performance.

Table 6: Hypothesis Two Coefficient Table

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.463	0.225		10.923	0.000
	Lack of appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity.	-0.259	0.047	-0.409	-5.507	0.000
	The appraisal system is insufficient to manage the evaluation of contemporary Lagos State Civil Service.	-0.031	0.035	-0.070	-0.898	0.371
	The key performance indicators (KPIs) are not set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees and the organisation.	-0.133	0.046	-0.261	-2.880	0.005
	Employees' salaries and annual increments are not based on pay-for-performance.	-0.032	0.042	-0.067	-0.755	0.452
	The key performance deliverables (KPDs) are not streamlined in alliance with the KPIs to ensure collaboration between goals, objectives, and realities.	-0.224	0.069	-0.351	3.270	0.001
	The appraisal system is not efficient to ensure quality service delivery.	-0.163	0.037	-0.329	-4.476	0.000
-a. Dependent Variable: Job Performance of LSCS's Employees						

Source: Authors' compilation (from SPSS Output, Ver. 25), 2021

The coefficient table reveals more information needed to determine the significance of each independent variable (those challenges identified) to the dependent variable (job performance). The results returned all highly significant (i.e., $p\text{-value} < 0.05$) except for two statistically insignificant variables: The appraisal system is insufficient to manage the evaluation of contemporary Lagos State Civil Service and Employees' salaries, and annual increments are not based on pay-for-performance. Furthermore, the table shows the level of impact each challenge identified in the study affects the job performance of the LSCS employees. The table shows a negative relationship between the lack of an appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity and the dependent variable, Job Performance of LSCS' Employees. Thus, an increase in the lack of an appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity will lead to a 25.9% decrease in the job performance of LSCS employees. At the same time, the negative b-coefficient of -0.031 infers that an increase in the appraisal system's insufficiency to manage the evaluation of contemporary LSCS leads to a decrease of 3.1% in the job performance of LSCS employees.

The next challenge is that the key performance indicators (KPIs) are not set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees and the organisation. The table also shows that this challenge negatively affects employees' job performance. An increase in such a challenge leads to a 13.3% decrease in job performance. Similarly, the next challenge identified has a negative impact on job performance. This means that employees' salaries and annual increments are not based on pay-for-performance, and an increase in this results in a 3.2% in job performance of employees of the LSCS. On the other hand, as shown in the table above, the next challenge, which states that the key performance deliverables (KPDs) are not streamlined in alliance with the KPIs to ensure collaboration between goals, objectives, and realities, negatively affect the job performance of employees in LSCS. An increase in such challenges only leads to a 22.4% decrease in job performance. Lastly, the appraisal system is not efficient to ensure quality service delivery is affirmed to negatively impact the job performance of staff members of the LSCS as an increase in such challenge leads to a 16.3% reduction in the job performance of LSCS employees.

4.4 Qualitative Findings

This section represents the data obtained through an in-depth interview with some staff of the commission. Six (6) employees from the Commission in Lagos State were selected to participate in the data-gathering exercise for the qualitative data. The respondents' feedbacks are further presented in a theme in line with the research question of this study.

The challenges associated with the employees' evaluation system and Lagos State Civil Service's job performance

As identified by the interviewees, detailed attention is not given to the issues and training needs of the officers by the overall evaluators. They only record the SPADEV score as if there are recording examination scores. There is no attention given to the specific needs of the officers. They do not take their time to go through the forms to have sufficient data to conclude the actual needs, whether training or motivational needs. Another visible challenge is feedback on an annual basis as against the biannual performance evaluation (mid-year and end-year) procedure. As a result of this issue, they impede the performance and effectiveness of employees and the system, leading to late communication of reports and possibly affecting the overall performance when it gets to the officer's annual promotion processing and delivery of services.

Furthermore, staffs are not sincere with the filling of the SPADEV form; they copy and paste. In this sense, sincerity means that those who need training will not own up to it; instead, they will be claiming all things are all right. Overall, the system is not sincere in measuring key performance indicators with key performance deliverables, training needs, and reward

management. The issue of bias and favouritism is evident in SPADEV. Also, they claimed that officers give gifts to their superiors to favour them, copy and paste each other's SPADEV forms. 'After writing my SPADEV, if you are my friend, you do not come to work, but when it is time for promotion, you go and copy my SPADEV.' It is not the best way to appraise staff. The SPADEV is who knows who! If you are not friends with your boss, you will most likely have a bad score, and if otherwise, you will be recommended for promotion. Also, they may rate a lazy staff higher than a hardworking one.

In most cases, the performance evaluation does not indicate an officer's actual performance because of appraiser/appraisee rapport ('Oga mi'). A staff can lobby his/her way to get a favourable report for promotion. Also, the issue of rewarding excellence for a job done can be shocking. Some people manoeuvre their way to get excellence awards that they do not deserve. Those hardworking staffs become deprived of the opportunity to get this recognition, whereas underperforming staffs get the awards. Also, the interviewees stated that the pay-for-performance is not realistic because some staff are paid below their performance, and some will be ghost workers and still be paid. Some work more and some work less, but they all receive the same salary monthly. It works in two ways; it is favourable to some and not to others. They are no balance of scale when it comes to pay-for-performance.

5. DISCUSSION

The hypothesis states that the challenges associated with the employees' evaluation system do not significantly affect the Lagos State Commission's employees' job performance. The analysis showed a substantial positive relationship between the challenges associated with the evaluation system and employees' job performance, given that $R = 0.644$. Furthermore, the R-square reveals that the model's overall performance in the table is averagely satisfactory, given that $R\text{-square} = 0.414$. Therefore, it can be inferred that 41.4% of job performance is explained by the challenges associated with the employees' evaluation system used in the LSCS. Using the analysis of variance to test the significance of the two variables, it was discovered that the challenges associated with the evaluation system significantly affects the LSCS employees' job performance, statistically, given that the $p\text{-value} = 0.000 < 0.05$, and the associated $F\text{-value} = 14.625$. From table 6, six challenges (independent variable) were identified in the study; when tested with job performance (dependent variable) to determine their significance (regression coefficient), the result returned all highly significant except two statistically insignificant variables, which are: the appraisal system is insufficient to manage the evaluation of contemporary Lagos State Civil Service and employees' salaries/annual increment is not based on pay-for-performance.

In addition, the impact of each challenge on the job performance of the LSCS employees was identified in the analysis through regression co-efficient. The findings exposed a negative connection between the lack of an appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity and the job performance of the LSCS' employees. This suggests that if there is an inadequate work environment to drive productivity, LSCS employees' job performance will not improve. From the descriptive analysis, most respondents (90.1%) agreed that the lack of an appropriate work environment to drive efficiency in productivity affects job performance. The work environment is such a dynamic setting; Shukla & Adhikari (2017) found out that how well employees engage with their work environment positively or negatively affects their performance. Also, a good working environment changes employees' approach towards jobs. Evaline & Bula (2017) discovered that office design plays a vital role in increasing employees' productivity. Farzad & Atefeh (2013) revealed that aside from rewards, compensations, and job security, the work environment also increases the sense of belonging and commitment to the organisation. A suitable working environment in an organisation increases job satisfaction, ultimately leading to organisational goals. However, most work environments in the public

sector are unsuitable today, creating a high level of impediments to executing work duties (Abdullateef & Mohd-Nazri, 2019).

The appraisal system is insufficient to manage the evaluation of contemporary LSCS came out negative. An increase in the appraisal system's insufficiency to manage the evaluation of contemporary LSCS leads to a decrease in the job performance of the LSCS employees. In this challenge, as proven to impact employees' performance negatively, over half of the respondents (64.2%) acknowledged the statement that the current system cannot give an adequate assessment of the official's responsibilities in the LSCS. To bolster more, according to interviewee three and six (oral interview, January 22, 2021), the performance evaluation does not define an officer's actual performance because of appraiser/appraisee rapport. A staff can lobby his/her way to get a favourable report for promotion. Also, interviewee three (oral interview, 2021) stated that the issues of rewarding excellence for a job done could be shocking. Some people manoeuvre their way to get excellence awards that they do not deserve; those hardworking staff becomes deprived of the opportunity to get this recognition, whereas underperforming staff get the awards. Fatimah, Nik & Nik (2019) stated that if employees perform well and then senses that they are evaluated unfairly, they will have little motivation to remain with the organisation. If they even stay, they will become disengaged, withdrawn, and create resentment toward the management. Selvaraj, Ghosh & Jagannathan (2016) revealed that workers are more likely to become displeased and burnt out in their duties if the performance evaluation system indicates some sense of subjectivity, unfairness, or invalidity. So also, employees may not know what is required of them if there are no performance criteria in place, and they would just not understand what justifies bad or excellent performance (Evaline & Bula, 2017).

The key performance indicators (KPIs) are not set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees. The organisation showed that this challenge negatively affects employees' job performance. An increase in such a challenge leads to a decrease in job performance. In support of the aforesaid, from the descriptive statistics, it is seen that the majority of the participant (67.9%) agreed that the key performance indicators (KPIs) are not set in a SMART manner to ensure a balanced win-win result for the employees and the organisation. Interviewee five (oral interview, January 26, 2021) explained further that overall, the system is not sincere in measuring key performance indicators with key performance deliverables, training needs, and reward management. This shows that the emergent need for a shift in methods to adjust key performance indicators in evaluating performance is required. Okorie (2019) revealed that it is essential that the KPIs follow the SMART criteria since their measure has a Specific objective for the organisation, is Measurable to obtain a value for the KPI, has specified norms to be Achievable, is Relevant to the performance of the employees, and must be Timed phased (the value or outcome are shown for a predefined period). Moreover, the KPIs are related to target values such that the values of the measure can be evaluated to whether employees meet or exceed standards (Eneanya, 2018).

Similarly, employees' salaries and annual increment are not based on pay-for-performance was discovered to have a negative effect on job performance, which means that the salaries and annual increment are not based on pay-for-performance. It was discovered that this subject has mixed views from the respondents of the study. A high percentage of the respondent (75.6%) from the descriptive statistic concurred that in the LSCS, employees' salaries and annual increments are not based on pay-for-performance (oral interview, 2021). This may explain why employees struggle to give their best in the workplace as their motivation is dampened. Adding to this, the interviewees (oral interview, January 22, 2021) asserted yes and no! Yes, there is, but aside from money, there are arrangements for rewarding hardworking officers, like awards, recognition, special advancement, and gifts, but it is rare in monetary terms. Placing the private and public sectors side by side, there are differences in our objectives; the private

sector is profit-oriented, while the public sector is social service-oriented (oral interview, January 22, 2021). That would go into context; by and large, people must work and get paid, performance must be measured, and productivity must be determined. So, in essence, pay for performance is evident.

No, there is a structured salary estimate for each level according to its job description; the pay-for-performance is not realistic because some staff are paid below their performance (oral interview, January 22, 2021). Some work more and some work less, but they all receive the same salary monthly. It works in two ways; it is favourable to some and not to others. They are no balance of scale when it comes to pay-for-performance. Farzad & Atefeh (2013) itemised three benefits of a pay-for-performance based appraisal system, which are: positive impacts on the work behaviours of individual employees; increased organisational-level effectiveness; and facilitates socialisation and communication. According to Kuranchie-Mensah & Amponsah-Tawiah (2016), pay-for-performance provides individual workers with a high degree of satisfaction from their jobs, boosts motivation and morale, and helps to attract and retain outstanding employees since they are aware that their contributions will be rewarded. Nevertheless, it will breed employees who will be lackadaisical, slacking off and underperforming if not adopted in the appraisal system.

The key performance deliverables (KPDs) are not streamlined in alliance with the KPIs to ensure collaboration between goals, objectives, and realities negatively affect employees' job performance in LSCS. An increase in such a challenge only leads to a decrease in job performance. A large number of participants (76.3) agreed that the challenge affects their job performance. This could also explain why employees keep changing jobs and even choose to be their bosses. Okorie (2020) stated that goals, objectives, key performance deliverables, and key performance indicators are collectively essential elements linked together under the umbrella of performance management. If the performance evaluation is to be executed effectively, the proper documentation and assessments must be used in the right place and at the right time. The major way for organisations to get a competitive advantage over their competitors is that the KPDs in alliance with the KPIs should be in the right direction, realistic, and achieving targets in pre-set goals and objectives.

Lastly, the appraisal system's inefficiency in ensuring quality service delivery is confirmed to have a detrimental effect on the LSCS staff members' job performance. An increase in such a challenge leads to a decrease in LSCS employees' job performance. To back up the statement, a good number of the respondents (72.5%) attested that the evaluation system is not efficient to ensure quality service delivery. Interviewee one (oral interview, January 22, 2021) disclosed that detailed attention is not given to the issues and training needs by the overall evaluators. They only record the SPADEV score has if there are recording examination scores. There is no attention given to the specific needs of the officers. They do not take their time to go through the forms to have sufficient data to conclude the actual needs, whether training or motivational needs. Interviewee two (oral interview, 2021) mentioned that feedback is done annually against the biannual performance evaluation procedure (January-June and July-December). As a result of this issue, they impede the performance and effectiveness of employees, leading to late communication of reports and possibly affecting the overall performance when it gets to the officer's delivery of social services. Interview three (oral interview, January 22, 2021) stated that the evaluation system lacks substantial requirements for measuring employees' quality of service delivery. Instead of using both job performance and service delivery based metrics as a measurement for the civil service, the assessment system focuses mostly on work results. Eneanya (2018) observed that service targets and standards against which performance can be assessed are rarely included in Nigerian Ministries, Departments, and Agencies (MDAs). Where they are, there are no indications that they are being monitored. According to Adepaju, Opafunso & Lawal (2017), the measurement of quality service delivery should

exhibit five dimensions for the system to be effective in its designated application. It should be tangible, reliable, responsive, assured, and empathetic. By this, the level of service quality can be evaluated in relation to employee's job performance, which will ensure that employees become aware of what connotes quality service delivery.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no system that does not have its challenges, no matter how efficient or effective it may be. Nonetheless, for every problem, there should be a solution. That is why, for many centuries, scholars have brought forth different recommendations as solutions to strengthen the processes involved in employee performance evaluation. Among the numerous ones, Harrington & Lee (2015) stands out from the others (simple, generic, wholesome, and essential). They stated that an appraisal system must show credibility and effectiveness of employees' evaluation processes which is dependent on flexibility, due respect for ethical principles, availability of supportive structure, personal integrity, professionalism, dignity, honesty, respect from both the superiors and subordinates and acceptance of constructive criticisms from a subordinate (cited in Zeleke, 2019:146). However, on a specific note, it is recommended that:

1. Employees would be more motivated and productive if they are rewarded based on their performance. They can be motivated to do better if they are given a monetary or non-monetary incentive. Fair administrative decisions and equitable compensation and promotions for completed assignments would increase employees' commitment to the organisation.
2. In making the KPIs align with the KPDs, the system formulators need first to ascertain that the KPIs and performance measures to purpose or strategy are measurable. Choose the workflow model (function) that suits the organisation and consider the relationships between the KPIs and KPDs beyond cause and effect but on strong relationships that influence decision-making (reality). Lastly, create a visual model of how KPIs relate to goals and objectives at each organisation level.
3. SMART assessment set up employees for success by making evaluations specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely. The SMART method helps push employees further, gives them a sense of direction, clarifies, and helps them organise and reach their organisation's goals and objectives. So, the parameter for evaluation should be clearly and precisely created using the acronyms as mentioned.
4. Measures to determine quality service deliverables should be imprinted in the form and implemented, such as SERVQUAL (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy) developed by Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry (1985), to enhance performance improvement in the course of executing the day-to-day activities of the Lagos State Civil Servants.

REFERENCES

- Abasilim, U. (2014). A note on understanding performance evaluation in organisations. *UNIUYO Journal of Politics and Administration*, 1(1), 11-22.
- Abdullateef, A., & Mohd-Nazri, B. (2019). The assessment of the effect of performance appraisal purposes on employee performance in the Nigerian Civil Service. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 16(5), 1-17.
- Abusi, O. (2014). *Employees' 'appraisal' of performance appraisal: evidence from the Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry* (Master's Dissertation). The University of Manchester, Manchester Business School, Faculty of Humanities, Manchester, London.

- Adepoju, O., Opafunso, Z., & Lawal, A. (2017). Influence of performance appraisal on quality of service delivery: A case of primary health care facilities, Southwestern Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 19(3), 73-81.
- Bekele, A., Shigutu, A., & Tensay, A. (2014). The effect of employees' perception of performance appraisal on their work outcome. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, 2(1), 136-173.
- Creswell, J., & Creswell, D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dastmalchian, A., Bacon, N., & Varnali, R. (2020). High-performance work systems and organisational performance across societal cultures. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51, 353-388.
- DeNisi, A., & Murphy K. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 102(3), 421-433.
- Dyaji, M., Ibietan, J., & Abasilim, U. (2020). Performance appraisal and public sector productivity in Nigeria: Lessons from a Military. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*, 10(1), 171-182.
- Ekpe, A., Ekong, D., & Ekpe, M. (2013). Analysis of performance appraisal system of the Nigerian Public Sector Organisations. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 18(3), 49-54.
- Eneanya, A. (2018). Performance management system and public service in Nigeria: Impacts, problems, challenges, and prospects. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 6(1), 1-9.
- Evaline, H., & Bula, H. (2017). Performance appraisal systems and employee performance in Commercial Banks in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *International Journal of Current Aspects in Human Resource Management (IJCAHRM)*, 1(I), 114-125.
- Farzad, F. & Atefeh, R. (2013). Satisfaction with Performance Appraisal from the Employees' Perspective and Its Behavioural Outcomes (Case Study of Headquarters Office of Bank Refah). *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 296-305.
- Fatimah, M., Nik, A., & Nik, A. (2019). *Factors influencing employee perception on the performance management system*. Proceedings of the 2nd KnE Social Sciences/FGIC Conference on Governance and Integrity (pp.537-550). Dubai, United Arab Emirates.
- Forgas, J., & George, J. (2001). Affective influences on judgements and behaviour in organisations: An information processing perspective. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), 3-34.
- Komendat, N., & Didona, T. (2016). Performance evaluations and employee's perception of job security. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(1), 646-649.
- Kuranchie-Mensah, E., & Amponsah-Tawiah, K. (2016). Employee motivation and work performance: A comparative study of Mining Companies in Ghana. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 9(2), 255-309.
- Loliya, A., & Osikwemhe, D. (2018). Diversity management discourse: An African perspective. *African Journal of Business Management*, 12(13), 396-405.
- Mengistu, G. (2018). Article on assessment of performance appraisal practices in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Trend in Research and Development*, 5(2), 638-644.
- Molle, E., Mulongo, L., & Razia, M. (2017). The influence of performance appraisal practices on employee productivity: A case of Muheza District, Tanzania. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 5(4), 45-59.
- Okorie, G. (2019). Appropriateness of Balanced Scorecard of Objective (BSCO) or Staff Performance Appraisal and Development (SPADEV) Reporting System as a performance appraisal method in the Civil Service of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IHRISS)*, 3(7), 226-235.

- Okorie, G. (2020). Effect of learning and growth perspective in performance appraisal using Balanced Scorecard of Objective (BSCO) as an alternative to Staff Performance Appraisal and Development (SPADEV) Reporting System in the Civil Service of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Global Scientific Journal*, 8(9), 1322-1343.
- Root, G. (2017). *Factors affecting employee performance*. Retrieved September 24, 2020, from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/factors-affecting-employee-performance-978>
- Sajuyigbe, A. (2017). Impact of performance appraisal on employee performance in Nigerian Telecommunication Industry (A study of MTN, Nigeria). *IIARD International Journal of Economics and Business Management*, 3(1), 80-90.
- Saunders, M., & Townsend, K. (2018). Choosing participants. *In the SAGE handbook of qualitative business and management research methods* (pp.480-492). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Selvaraj, P., Ghosh, S., & Jagannathan, S. (2016). The downside of performance appraisals and the potential for deviant behaviours. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 52(1), 117-129.
- Shukla, S., & Adhikari, G. (2017). The study on employee perception of performance appraisal system. *Gurukul Business Review (GBR)*, 13, 66-72.
- Sinkeet, N. (2016). *Impact of performance appraisal on employee morale in non-governmental organisations: The case of UNEP* (Master's Dissertation). The United States International University Africa, Chandaria School of Business, Nairobi, Kenya.
- The Office of the Transformation, Creativity, and Innovation. (2013). Lagos State Government operational guide for the implementation of revised SPADEV reporting system, 2007. *Government Press*, 1(1), 45-53.
- Zeithaml, V., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L. (1985) Problems and strategies in services and marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(2), 33-46.
- Zeleke, W. (2019). A study of employee perceptions about performance appraisal at Transnet Engineering, South Africa. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 35(5), 145-156.