UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.15 (2);
https://unijerps.org
2021 Impact Factor: 5.641; 2020 Impact Factor: 5.355.
January-June, 2023
Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363

JOB INVOLVEMENT INDICATORS AS TOOLS FOR TEACHERS' JOB PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Dr. Israel Chijiuka Oparaji; Okonkwo Eucharia Chinenye
&
Dr. Chika Nonye Eziamaka
Department of Educational Management and Policy,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka
Email: ic.oparaji@unizik.edu.ng; Phone: 08106429095; Email: ec.okonkwo@unizik.edu.ng
Email: cn.eziamaka@unizik.edu.ng ; Phone: 08168983795

ABSTRACT
In this study, the researchers investigated job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal. The descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The population consisted of 5,314 teachers of public secondary schools in Imo state while 2,486 teachers were randomly selected as the sample size of the study. The instrument for the study was a 15-item structured questionnaire which consisted of two clusters. Cluster A dealt with the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal while cluster B was concerned with the constraints against the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal. The instrument titled "Job Involvement Indicators as Tools for Teacher Job Appraisal (JIITTJPA)" was used to elicit responses from respondents. It was validated by three experts, two from the Department of Educational Management and Policy and one from the Department of Educational Foundations. The reliability of the instrument which was 0.82 and considered high enough for the study was obtained through Cronbach Alpha while mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 significant level through the use of T-Test statistics. A hypothesis was accepted when the value was more than or equal to alpha value but it was rejected when the p-value was less than the alpha value.

Keywords: Job Involvement, Tools, Job Performance, and Appraisal

Introduction
The idea of job involvement is associated with organizational templates that facilitate work performance. It is not fully unconnected with job performance but differs from it as predicated by job templates mentioned above. This according to Angaraemet and Raspo (2016) is because a worker can be involved in a job but may not perform in line with organizational nuances. It is the later that makes for organizational productivity.

Job involvement can be defined as the psychological attachment of a worker to his job. It can be used to describe the belief and function of how a worker's job responds to his immediate needs. Akter and Rahman (2012) suggested that job involvement could be explained in terms of the psychological,

emotional and cognitive preoccupation and engagement a worker has with his job.

Job involvement is not the same as organizational apathy. In other words, an individual can be productively involved in his job, that is, engaging in his work but he is not may be concerned with what transpires in the organization. Fuvaker (2012) stated that job involvement could be considered to have two overlapping features. According to him, the first could be the worker's psychological identification with the job while the second should be the extent to which the identity of a workers is shaped by the work.

In other words, job involvement should have a positive impact on the behavior of a worker in an organization and influence him to make positive contribution to the organization in its quest to meet productivity targets. Job involvement is connected with worker's job behavior and this is predicated by job involvement templates mentioned earlier in this study. These templates can in research parlance be called or regarded as job involvement indicators or models (Alshar and Doosti, 2016).

Job involvement indicators as communicated by Karam and Rahman (2014) could be identified as organizational commitment, organizational effectiveness, job satisfaction, performance and job design. Job commitment can be considered as workers' psychological connection with the organization. It is the attachment between a worker and his employing organization. This attachment is predicted by organizational job security, leadership distribution, workers' behavior, stress control mechanism, workers 'empowerment for job performance and role unambiguity or demarcations.

Organizational commitment as a job involvement indicator is a matrix of three components. They are affective commitment. This deals with a worker's positive emotional connection to the job. Affective commitment of a worker to his job creates a relationship between him and the organization in such a way that it forecloses his chances of considering a better opportunity elsewhere. Some of the factors that enhance this engagement are level of education, age, gender, and tenure (Biron and Boon, 2013).

Another component of organizational commitment is continuance commitment. Rahman and Ferdansy (2012) stated that this could be regarded as the need constituent which has to do with the desire of a worker to make gains while working in an organization. Gain making here is in terms of satisfying his personal needs while contributing to the organizational desire to meet targets. Gains can also be in terms of making investments and considering huge losses that could occur if one leaves the organization. These losses most of which are economic are in the form of pension, annual accruals and losing one's friendships with colleagues which could be regarded as social costs. A balanced consideration makes a worker to stay in an organization. The challenge however is that these "side bets" only accumulate with age and tenure (Madhuri, 2014).

Normative commitment is a situation where a worker stays in an organization due to certain obligation owed to the organization. This happens when a worker was trained by the organization before joining or immediately he was employed. It can also take place where an organization produces high level of incentives and rewards to workers and displays high or reasonable welfare package to workers (Rahman, Karan and Ferdansy, 2013). Normative commitment can also occur where one's family is a partner or major shareholder in the organization. The worker therefore in this situation is expected to remain in the organization and be loyal to management in order to guide the family's interest in the organization.

Anotherjob involvement indicator is job effectiveness. It can be described as the extent an organization strives to realize its goals or set objectives. It is a concept that explains how serious or effective an organization deploys its human and material resources in order to achieve its objectives or goals. Economically, organizational effectiveness can be explained in terms of its profitability. In the school system, it can be considered to be the degree at which educational goals are achieved (Furaker, 2012). At the teaching and learning level, organizational effectiveness could be measured in terms of learning outcome or the academic achievement of students and this can be rather understood through the components or models.

Typologically, organizational effectiveness consists of three models that tend to overlap each other. Rahman, Karan and Arif (2014) explained these components as goal-attainment approach, systems resource approach and strategic constituencies approach. This goal-attainment approach explains the extent an organization has achieved the goals set at the beginning of the work year. In the school setting, it deals with how far the school has achieved its pre-determined objectives. One way of doing this is by comparing the academic achievement of students with the expectations of the school and other critical stake holders like parents. The goal attainment approach consists of a broad scope and demands a quantitative assessment of the impact of a school on its students, parents and development partners (Chaghter and Rahman, 2013).

Another component or model of job effectiveness is systems resource approach. This model sees an organization as an interrelated system with different parts working together to produce the desired result. This is akin to the school system which comprises a set of interrelated parts that work to determine a holistic result. If any sub-system performs poorly, the productivity of the entire system will be adversely affected (Akter and Rahman, 2012).

The strategic constituencies approach according to Robbins and Judge (2009) states that organizational effectiveness can be discussed with reference to its ability to meet the demands of its critical stakeholders satisfactorily. In other words, it is the ability of the education system to positively respond to expectations or desires of its frontline clienteles that define its

effectiveness. This therefore presupposes that an organization (educational or otherwise) can only be regarded as effective when it satisfies the demands of its primary constituents from where it derives its continuous existence or relevance (Khan and Nermati, 2011).

Job satisfaction is a very critical job involvement indicator. It can be defined as the positive attitude of a worker to his job. Ather and Nimlathasem (2006) indicated, that it can be explained as the positive psychological identification of a worker with his job. Such a situation according to them leads to goal-related behavior, self-motivation and personal growth. In the school system, teachers' job satisfaction is their positive response to the demands of their job. As indicated earlier, it enhances teachers' passion for their job and increases the quality of teaching and learning (Zopiatis, 2014).

Performance is one other job involvement indicator. It can be described as the quantity of work done by a worker within a specified time or period. Robbins and Jendje (2013) defined performance as the activities or tasks executed by a worker that contribute to the goal realization of an organization within a given period. In a school system it is the summation of the efforts in teaching and non-teaching areas of a teacher's job that resulted in the achievement of educational objectives. Udding, Rahman and Howladar (2014) considered it as the extent of the accomplishment of tasks that constitute workers' job. It is the performance of a teacher's duties that facilitate high academic achievement of the students. Performance generally is work done and it is the extent of work done by a teacher that determines his job involvement of which he could be appraised.

Teachers' job performance appraisal could be simply referred to as staff appraisal. Yehi (2013) described it as the assessment of a teacher's job performance in academic and extra-academic activities within a particular period. In most cases, it is at the end of an academic session. However, it could be added that teachers' job performance is aided by job design. Job design can be seen as the content of the job. It consists of the activities and responsibilities required to perform a particular job or task. The quality of job design can determine the degree of job performance which inadvertently decides the extent of a workers' job involvement (Yeh, 2013).

However, there are constraints that affect the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal. Such constraint ranges from the ignorance of the impact of these job involvement tools to appraise workers to the distraction occasioned by the ecstasy of target realization and that of profit maximization (Ajayi, 2016).

Public secondary schools are post-primary schools established and controlled or regulated by government (Federal or State). Such schools are funded by government even as staff, tutorial and non-tutorial are recruited and posted to the schools by government. The salaries and conditions of service of the teachers and other ancillary staff are taken care of by government. Therefore, the performance of teachers in

these schools are appraised annually for promotion or at least for salary increment. Such appraisal is normally tailored to job involvement indicators which serve as the threshold on which teachers' job content activities or tasks are anchored (Olainyan, 2013).

Statement of Problem

Teachers' job appraisal can simply be regarded as staff appraisal. It is an annual job appraisal of teachers carried out by school management. The purpose is to determine teachers' attitude to work as against the tasks given to them. In other words, the assessment is always designed to ascertain whether teachers complied with job design. In most cases however, the tools or criteria for teachers' job performance appraisal are skewed or structured around issues that border on availability to the prosecution of subject curriculum.

Quite often, there are no deliberate efforts made to accommodate the issues that are concerned with the relationship between the employee and the employing organization. Such concepts are job commitment, job effectiveness, job satisfaction and performance that form the components of job involvement indicators. Additionally, there seem to be inadequate empirical research literature on job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal. It is on account of the above background that the study investigated job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal.

Purpose of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are;

1. To ascertain the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal
2. To determine the constraints in the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal.

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study.

1. To what extent can job involvement indicators be used as tools for teachers' job appraisal?
2. What are the constraints against the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal?

Hypotheses

The study was aided by the following hypotheses

1. There is no significant relationship between job involvement indicators and teachers' job performance appraisal.
2. There is no significant constraint between job involvement indicators and teachers' job performance appraisal.

Research Method

In this study, the researchers investigated job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal. The descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The population consisted of 5,314 teachers of public secondary schools in Imo state while 2,486 teachers were randomly selected as the sample size of the study. The instrument for the study was a 15-item structured questionnaire titled "Job

Involvement Indicators as Tools for Teacher Job Performance Appraisal (JIITTJPA)", with two clusters A and B. Cluster A contained 8 items on the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal, and structured on a five point rating scale of Very Great Extent (VGE), Great Extent (GE), Moderate Extent (ME), Small Extent(SE), and Very Small Extent (VSE), while cluster B has 7 items on constraints against the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal. Cluster B was structured on a four point rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). The instrument was validated by three experts, two from the Department of Educational Management and Policy and one from the Department of Educational Foundations. The reliability of the instrument which was 0.82 and considered high enough for the study was obtained through Cronbach Alpha. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions and determine the homogeneity in opinions of the respondents while t-test was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The decision on the hypotheses is that, a null hypothesis was rejected where the p-value is less than the alpha level; otherwise the null hypothesis was accepted. The data analysis as carried out using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 23.0.

Presentation of Results

Research Question I: To what extent can job involvement indicators be used as tools for teachers' job appraisal?

Table 1: Respondents' mean ratings and standard deviation on the extent job involvement indicators can be used as tools for teachers' job appraisal

S/N	Item	$\overline{X}$	SD	Remarks
1.	Job involvement indicators can be used to show a teacher's job identity.	3.54	.71	Great Extent
2.	It can be used to show organizational commitment.	2.86	.62	Moderate Extent
3.	Teachers' job involvement indicators can be used to show organizational effectiveness.	3.50	. 59	Great Extent
4.	It can be used to indicate teachers' job satisfaction	3.76	.68	Great Extent
5.	It can as well be used to show a teachers' commitment	3.64	.65	Great Extent
6.	It can equally be used to show a teacher's job performance.	4.80	.77	Very Great Extent
7.	Performance is in terms of availability and achieving targets.	4.86	.49	Very Great Extent
8.	Job involvement indicators can be used as tools for teachers' job appraisal.	4.10	.66	Great Extent
	Cluster Mean	**3.92**		**Great Extent**

Data in table 1 show items 6 and 7 are rated very great extent with mean of 4.80 and 4.86, items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 8 are rated great extent with mean ranging from 3.50 to 4.10,

while the remaining item (item 2) is rated moderate extent. The cluster mean score of 3.92 indicates that job involvement indicators to a great extent can be used as tools for teachers' job appraisal. The standard deviations for all the items are within the same range indicating that the respondents are not wide apart in their mean ratings.

Research Question 2: What are the constraints to the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal?

Table 2: Respondents' men ratings and standard deviation on the constraints to the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal

S/N	Item	$\overline{X}$	SD	Remarks
9.	Ignorance of job involvement indicator on the part of management can hamper their use as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal.	2.86	.91	Agree
10.	Lack of correct quantitative models can constrain their use as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal	3.06	.82	Agree
11.	Undue favouritism can hinder the use of job involvement indicators.	3.80	.59	Strongly Agree
12.	Target realization can affect the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal	2.88	.58	Agree
13.	High profit can hinder the use of job involvement indicators as teachers' job performance appraisal	2.86	.71	Agree
14.	Politics in the workplace can affect the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal	2.87	.54	Agree
15.	If thoroughly applied, job involvement indicators can serve as tools for teachers' job appraisal.	3.96	.49	Strongly Agree
	Cluster Mean	**3.18**		**Agree**

Data in table 2 indicates that the respondents strongly agree that items 11 and 15 with mean of 3.80 and 3.96 are constraints to the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal while they agree that the remaining 5 items with mean ranging from 2.86 to 3.06 are constraints. The cluster mean score of 3.18 means that on the whole, the respondents agree that items listed are the constraints to the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal. The standard deviations for all the items are within the same range indicating that the respondents are not wide apart in their mean ratings.

Hypothesis 1

Job involvement indicators cannot be used as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal.

Table 3: Summary of t-test comparison of the mean ratings on the extent job involvement indicators can be used as tools for teachers' job appraisal

Variables	X	SD	df	t-value	P-value	Decision
Job Involvement Indicators	3.68	.71				
			2,457	1.08	.03	Significant
Teachers' Job Appraisal	3.53	.83				

Table 3 reveals that at 2,457 df, and t-value of 1.08, the P-value is .03 which is less than .05 alpha level (p-value =.03 <.05). Therefore, the first null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, job involvement indicators can be used as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal.

Hypothesis 2: There are no constraints against the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal.

Table 4: Summary of t-test comparison of the mean ratings on constraints against the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal

Variables	X	SD	df	t-value	p-value	Decision
Constraints to Job Involvement	3.01	.67				
			2,457	.18	.01	Significant
Teachers' Job Appraisal	2.97	.71				

Table 4 reveals that at 2,457 df, and t-value of.18, the P-value is .01 which is less than .05 alpha level (p-value =.01 <.05). Therefore, the first null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there are constraints to the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job appraisal.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of the study as shown in Table 1 indicates that respondents were agreed that job involvement indicators can be used as tools to appraise teachers' job performance at the end of every given work period. The responses taken item by item represent the strong and positive opinions of the respondents on the use of job involvement indices to evaluate teachers' job performance. Though varied in terms of the structure of their responses, the respondents are not wide apart from one another in their agreement that job involvement indicators are valuable tools for job performance evaluation or appraisal of teachers. This is in conformity with the submissions of Akter and Rahman (2012) who opined that job involvement indices are templates to ascertain workers' compliance to job design.

Another finding of the study is that there are constraints that can militate against the use of job involvement indicators in appraising teachers' job performance for a given period of time. Such constraints are ignorance of

the use of job involvement models for job performance evaluation, lack of accurate quantitative models and job place politics (Robbins and Judge, 2015). It could however be argued that the use of job involvement indicators to appraise teachers could be subjective. In other words, it is believed that the tools could be manipulated. However, the fear of subjectivity or manipulation can be dismissed on the ground that, there is always a standardized job performance index that can be used as a checklist to ensure a high degree of objectivity. From Table 2, it can be seen that the respondents were in agreement that there are constraints that can affect the application of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance assessment.

Conclusion

Job involvement indicators are factors that show that a worker was part of job operation and the extent he was involved. Breaking a teacher's job into units, they are the structures that make up the collegiality of a teacher's job. In appraising teachers on their job involvement in a whole academic session or year, it behooves that these indicators be used as tools to assess teachers' involvement. Though some forms of subjectivity may set in due to human factor, it remains one of the veritable means of evaluating teachers' job involvement in a particular work period. The fear of subjectivity can be resolved with the use of job involvement index as a checklist.

Recommendation

In view of the above, the following recommendation are made.

1. Principals and other heads of schools can be trained on the use of job involvement indicators as tools for teachers' job performance appraisal.
2. To avoid subjectivity, job involvement indicators can be structured into a standardized checklist to reduce political or human factor interruption.

REFERENCES

Aggaeni and Rasto (2016) Jobs Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Determinants of Teacher Performance. Advance in Economics, Business and Management Research, 15, 525 – 529.

Ajayi, D. A. (2016). Target Realization and Profit Maximization: A challenge in staff work audit. Edumark Pub. Ltd, Ikeja. Pp. 224 – 308.

Akshar, H. S. and Doosti, M. (2016). Investigating the impact of job satisfaction / Dissatisfaction on Iranian English Teachers' Job Performance. *IranianJournal of Language Teaching Research,* 4(1), 97 – 115.

Akter, N. and Rahman, W. S. (2012). Impact of Stress on Task Performance: An Empirical Study. The Chittagong University Journal of Business Administration, 57, 57 – 76.

Biron, M. and Boon, C. (2013). Performance and turnover intentions: a social exchange perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(5), 511 – 531.

Chakraborly, S. and Rahman, M. S. (2013). Understanding the Relationship among Managerial Attributes, Job Satisfaction, and Service Quality of the Women Bankers. The Chittagong University Journal of Business Administration, 28, 253 – 272.

Furaker, B. (2012). Commitment to work and Job Satisfaction. New York, Routledge.

Khan, K. and Nemati, A. R. (2011). Impact of job involvement on employee satisfaction: A study based on medical doctors working in Riphah International University Teaching Hospital Pakistan.

Madhuri, K. (2014). The effect of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on employee's job performance. International Journal of Art and Humanity Sciences (DAHS), 1(2), 20 – 23.

Olaniyan, D. O. (2013). Teachers' Job Involvement Index: Issues & Concepts. West African Journal of Educational Administration Ibadan Varsity press Ltd. Nigeria.

Rahman, M. S. and Ferdausy, S. (2012). Investigating the Relationship between the Components of Transformational Leadership and Job Performance: An Empirical Study. Management Dynamics, India, 12(2), 27 – 43.

Rahman, M. S. and Karan, R. (2011). Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Performance and the Mediating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, The Chittagong University Journal of Business Administration, 26, 325 – 350.

Rahman, M. S., Karan, R. and Arif, M. I. (2014). Investigating the Relationships among Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Turnover Intention: An Empirical Study. SIU Journal of Management, Thailand. 4(1), 117 – 147.

Robbins, S. P. and Judge, T. A. (2015). Organizational Behaviour: New Jersay. Pearson Education.

Robbnis, S., Judge, T., and Vohra, N. (2012). Organizational Behaviour (14thed). New Delhi: Pearson Prentice Hall of India.

Yeh, C. M. Y. (2013). Tourism involvement, work engagement and job satisfaction among frontline hotel employees. Animals of Tourism Research, 42, 216 – 229.

Zopiatis, A. (2014). Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 41, 129 – 140.