

**THE INFLUENCE OF REWARD ADMINISTRATION ON
TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION:
A STUDY OF CARITAS UNIVERSITY, AMORJI-NIKE
ENUGU, ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA**

BY

VAASWEM TERNGU SOLOMON

(SOC/2009/058)

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, FACULTY OF
MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, CARITAS
UNIVERSITY, AMORJI-NIKE, ENUGU**

AUGUST, 2013.

TITLE PAGE

**THE INFLUENCE OF REWARD ADMINISTRATION ON
TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION:
A STUDY OF CARITAS UNIVERSITY AMORJI-NIKE
ENUGU, ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA**

BY

VAASWEM TERNGU SOLOMON

(SOC/2009/058)

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, FACULTY OF
MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, CARITAS
UNIVERSITY, AMORJI-NIKE, ENUGU. IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.Sc) DEGREE**

IN SOCIOLOGY

AUGUST, 2013.

APPROVAL PAGE

This research work titled “The influence of reward administration on total quality management implementation: A study of Caritas University Amorji-Nike, ENUGU, Enugu State, Nigeria”, has been approved for the department of sociology, Caritas University, Amorji-Nike, Enugu.

By

.....

Mr. Orji, O.E.

Project Supervisor

.....

Mr. C.C. Onwuka

HOD, Sociology

.....

External Examiner

DEDICATION

This project work is dedicated to my beloved parents Mr. and Mrs. Vaaswem for their effort made to ensure that I had less financial problems through my stay in the school, also to my lovely sister Doom Sonia Vaaswem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must first of all express my profound gratitude to Almighty God for giving me moral and spiritual guidance as well as projection throughout the period of my academic pursuit and during the course of carrying out this project work.

My sincere appreciation goes to my project supervisor Mr. Orji O.E. for his timeless advice, suggestion, constructive criticisms and useful incentives which guided me whenever I found myself at crossroads, I also wish to thank my Head of Department of Sociology Mr. C.C. Onwuka for his organization and supervision of the department for the smooth running and co-ordination of the activities. I am gratefully indebted to my beloved parents Mr. and Mrs. Vaaswem for their financial support given to me. I wish to register my appreciation to the following persons, Mr. C.I Ezeh, Mr. Abony, Mr. Oguamanam and Mr. F.U. Mbah. Not to forget also Mrs. L.C. Nwanosike of Psychology department, Margaret Iwada Egbe, Mfa Gideon Fyanka, Jennifer Anuligo, Samuel Awen, Mimidoo Maureen Zaki, Ukpabi Nnamdi, Percy Akajiaku, Sheila Odong, Theodora Idu, Cynthia Alaigy and to others whom lack of space and time are left out. I wish to register my appreciation to them all especially my course mates.

ABSTRACT

Consequent upon titanic competition that has beclouded business environment of all sorts, organizations have employed myriad of strategies. Positive reward to workers for good performance by management is among the motivational tools employed by management to enhance productivity and maintain high standard products. Organizations that are indifferent to motivational tool suffer lack of productivity and standard products. To achieve productivity and standard products, team work is imperative. To achieve teamwork, a system of reward administration and implementation is pertinent. To this end it is imperative to investigate the relationship between system of reward administration and its implementation to establish the influence of reward administration implementation. On this premise, this study seeks examine the impact of reward administration implementation has on total quality management (TQM). The object of this study aims at understanding the influence of reward administration on total quality management.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page

Approval page

Dedication

Acknowledgement

Abstract

Table of Content

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Background to the study
- 1.2 Statement of the problem
- 1.3 Research questions
- 1.4 Objective of the study
- 1.5 Significant of the study
- 1.6 Definition of terms

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

- 2.1 Total quality management
- 2.2 Operational requirement of TQM
- 2.3 TQM level of installation
- 2.4 Reward issues and performance appraisal

2.5 Determinants of workers consciousness

2.6 Review of theories

2.7 Theoretical framework

2.8 Study hypothesis

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

3.2 Study of area

3.3 Population of the study

3.4 Sample size

3.5 Sampling techniques

3.6 Instruments for data collection

3.7 Methods of data analysis

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Demographic variables of respondents

4.2 Analysis of research questions

4.3 Hypothesis testing

4.4 Presentation of data

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary of findings

5.2 Conclusion

5.3 Recommendations

5.4 Limitations of the study

References

Appendices

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background To The Study

Consequent upon the myriad of changes which have beclouded the operations of modern business organisations in recent times, including the fundamental and core changes in the nature of work and organisations, the dynamic nature of the competitive environment and the need to ensure a convergence of shareholders interests in the way the organisations are run, a need for new approaches in human resources management has arisen.

The paradigm shift, in other words, includes “total”. Put differently, total quality management. This means that everyone in the organisation must be involved in the continuous improvement effort. The concept quality indicates a concern for consumer satisfaction. Management on the other hand refers to the people and processes needed to achieve the quality (Aragon, 2003).

Subsequently, reward management deals generally with the handling of workers needs, drives and motivations in a way that will elicit the desired behavior from employees. This becomes more reasonable going by the submission of Brian Tracy (a world class management expert) in Omotosho, (2002) that an average worker will only put in 40% - 50% of his capacity to any job-function at a point in time. Therefore, for us to induce and trigger off exceptional performance of 70% - 95% from workers we need to motivate

them using any or combination of the reviewed motivational theories as our foundation.

From the foregoing, it becomes one of the ethical issues in staff management in Caritas University, that is, stimulating reward to emerge with total quality management implementation. Some experts contend that total quality management can only be implemented when there is a critical need for remunerative justice in organisation irrespective of teamwork syndrome.

Again, the contradiction of an acceptable methodology in rewarding employees is both inevitable and not universal. Therefore, for total quality installation and implementation with a quest for objectivity (statistical tools) there is a need for identifiable and acceptable techniques of rewarding players in the total quality management mix. According to Dulewicz (2009), “there is a basic human tendency to make judgments about those one is working with as well as about oneself”. Appraisal, it seems, is both inevitable and universal. In the absence of carefully structured system of appraisal, people will tend to judge the work performance of others, including subordinates, naturally, informally and arbitrarily. The human inclination to judge can beat serious motivational, ethical and legal problems in the work place. Without a structured appraisal system, there is little chance of ensuring that the judgments made will be lawful, fair, defensible and accurate.

For organizations to toe “total quality management” (TQM) and rewarding variables for its implementation, astute methods of determining

the value of individuals not group needs to be delineated. Understanding the context of the research work, (de-unionized workers operating in a peripheral capitalist state, baptismal mission University), concentration on collective responsibility and collaborating effort is replaced by acknowledging individuals responsibility and achievement, even within the context of a team approach (Cole, 2002).

On the above premise, the mechanics of this work is articulated on rewards as stimulating performance/motivation which makes or mark the implementation of total quality management not in the absence of performance appraisal as a veritable tool in assessing rather than control of processes of walk of paradigm shift.

The thrust of TQM concept is mainly to help work organisation cope with changing environment and the need to integrate an organisations human resource strategy and it's cooperate strategy. There quality control should be conducted as an integrate part of management control.

Thus, the purpose of this work therefore, is to examine the origin and development of the reward valuation model in juxtaposition with performance appraisal as technique for evaluating employees.

1.2 Statement Of The Problem

Work relation concern the control of the process wherein worker's capacity to labour is translated into actual work. In pursuit of profitability those who own the means of production adopt control processes to ensure

that maximum effort is extorted from those who have to sell their labour for wages.

Control strategy in relations may be located in the dimensions of bureaucracy-hierarchy, specialization and division of labour, impersonality and formalized rules as well as in the system of discipline and reward as occurred in the workplace.

The direction of work, the procedures for evaluating workers performance and the exercise of the firms' sanctions and reward becomes subject with of the company policy work becomes highly stratified, each given its distinct title and description and impersonal rules govern promotion. Similarly the disciplinary system takes care of act of challenge, recalcitrance and resistance, which inherently threaten 'order' whilst the pay system rewards compliance.

Paying people for performance or compliance to the procedure for the installation and implementation of TQM in organisations particularly Caritas University remains a mixture of paradoxes. The contradiction arises from the never abating controversy about objectivity of the appraisal process on one part and the link between individual's performance and corporate goals on the other hand.

Akata (2003: 211) argued that when objectives are stretched, employees easily become disenchanted but to otherwise is to encourage performance mediocrity. Akata further opined that different pay rate and bonuses to high performers of the quality implementation team and others who strive hard to attain average performance will feel aggrieved; Rewarding

underperforming executives with fat performance related bonuses and the work force would grumble.

On the above premise, it could be deduced that part from noting the human element in implementing TQM, other factors such as basic salary, cash allowance (housing, electricity, transportation, medical etc), fringe benefits (sale bonus/profit share, entrepreneurial reward, productivity bonus etc), cash awarded for loyalty, honesty, long service etc, and quality of leadership, workplace relationship and official recognition of employees ability and contribution to corporate growth and development has great influence on the level of quality expected from workers.

Taking cursory look at the reward variables, a process of determining who gets what, and how, in terms of income. Quality implementation in Caritas University however tends to be fixed on problems anchored on perceived trust, mediocrity religious ethic and appliance of viable oppressive apparatus on non mediocre workers. This translates into almost general silence by rank and file staff amidst so much important welfare and corporate issues to discuss. This is explained only in the context of fear of being sacked and driven back to swollen labour market. To many staff, half bread is better than none. Thus no matter the dehumanizing conditions of service it is better than none. This is against the view of Alwitt and Berger, (1993) that rewarding quality has been translated into economic vote which ultimately influence the purchase and investment decision of individuals.

Most academic staffs are beclouded by visible and invisible spies. The management system seems so operative that has attracted the slag hammer

of the National Universities Commission (NUC). But still, it seems unabated. Student are not left out in this managerial mis-normed. History is empty with the record of academic and general behaviour stimuli in terms of reward of any kind. Thus monument of doubts have strange up in the mind of staff and students regarding the expected positive impact of the NUC forensic auditing. Is this obnoxious managerial flaw inherent that even NUC appears too gullible in removing it? Derven, 1990 and lawrie, 1990 advocated for standardized performance appraisal as the most crucial aspect to guarantee organizational life and growth.

Total quality management calls for the elimination of performance assessments that rate employee in relations to each other and in mediocre criteria. Lack of performance appraisal has conferred on the managers of this University too power over employees and they most often abuse. Many managers fill performance assessment will let them document employee performance for possible reward, but some employee fear the assessment might used against them in some disciplinary actions. Performance assessments may give employees with grievances the documentation they need to prove that managers are treating them unfairly.

Thus, the crux of this study, therefore, is to identify the inherent contradictions in the workability of TQM and the manipulation of the reward variables in furthering its implementation in Caritas University.

1.3 Research Questions

The following question shall guide this study.

1. What is the relationship between pay, general performance reward and TQM implementation?
2. Is there any standard appraisal system or mechanism in operation in Caritas University?
3. Does reward have an impact on TQM implementation?
4. What is the impact of management style on total quality management implementation?
5. To what extent is TQM susceptible to performance assessment?

1.4 Objectives Of The Study

The general objective of this study is to find out the influence of reward administration on total quality management implementation.

The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To understand the relationship between pay, general performance reward and total quality management implementation.
2. To know if there is any standard appraisal system or mechanism in operation in Caritas University.
3. To find out if reward has an impact on total quality management implementation.
4. To discover the impact of management style on total quality management implementation.

5. To know the extent to which TQM is susceptible to performance assessment.

1.5 Significance Of The Study

This study has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, reward administration on total quality management implementation has not received adequate research interest in Nigeria in comparison to the myriad of studies that have been carried out in other aspect of work organization. This has created a gap in understanding the influence of reward administration on TQM implementation. It is hoped that this study will contribute in narrowing this gap. Besides, this study hopes to add to the body of existing knowledge on the influence of reward administration on TQM implementation.

Practically, this study hopes to contribute to the installation of TQM via performance appraisal and reward as a stimulus tool for increasing productivity and standardization of quality aimed at enhancing consumer satisfaction confidence.

1.6 Definition Of Concepts

Management

A team of high ranking officers charged with the implementation of organizational policy that is geared toward achieving specific goals. They are

also charged with general control of the work force including non human material assets of the organization.

Performance Appraisal

This refers to a systematic evaluation of a worker to ascertain the level of approximation to expected standards.

Reward

This is monetary and non monetary rewards such as promotion.

Total Quality Management (TQM)

This refers to a systematic and integrated and organizational way of a continuous implementation of organizational standard, productivity and general goal. It is not an end in itself but a means to an organizational end.

TQM Implementation

This is the installation of a standardized method of performance appraisal and reward system aimed at quality improvement.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Total Quality Management

TQM is the integration of all functions and processes within an organization in order to achieve continuous improvement of quality goods and services (Ferris, 1999). Many organizations that have made major improvement in quality of their operation have recognized that broad base quality efforts have been needed. TQM therefore is a comprehensive management process focusing on the continuous improvement of organizational activities to achieve the quality of goods and services supplied (Cole, 2002).

The goal is consumer satisfaction. TQM is based on a number of ideas. It means thinking about quality in terms of all functions of the enterprise and is a start-to-finish product that integrates inter-related functions at all levels. It is a system approach that consumes enough interaction between the various elements of the organization.

Thus, the overall effectiveness of the system is higher than the sum of the individual's outputs from the sub-systems (Brownbrige, 1996).

Following an international conference in May, 1990, Merier (1991) summed the key issues and terminology related to TQM as the cost of quality been seen on the measure of non quality (not meeting consumer requirements) and a measure of how the quality process is progressing.

Cultural changes that appreciates the primary need to meet consumer requirement, implements a management philosophy that acknowledge this emphasis. Encourages employee involvement and embraces the ethic of continuous improvement. Enabling mechanism of change, including training and education, communication, recognition, management behaviour, teamwork and customer satisfaction programmes. Implementing TQM by defining the mission, identifying the output and consumers, negotiating consumer requirements, developing suppliers specification that details consumers objective, and determining the activities, management behaviour that include acting as role model. Use of quality process and tools encouraging communication, sponsoring feedback activities and fostering and supporting environment.

Deming (1982) the best-known early pioneer of TQM is credited with popularizing quality control in Japan in the early 1950s. He defined quality as a predictable degree of uniformity and dependability at low cost and suited to the market. He developed what is known as Deming chain reaction. As quality improves cost will decrease and productivity will increase resulting in more jobs, greater market share and long term survival. Although it is the worker who will ultimately produce quality products, Deming stress work pride and satisfaction rather than the establishment of quantifiable goals. His overall approach focus on improvement on the processes on that system, rather than the worker, is the cause of variation. Deming's fourteen points for TQM includes; great consistency of purposes with a plan; adopt the new philosophy of quality; cease dependence on mass inspection; end the practice of choosing

suppliers base solely on price; remove barrier to pride of workmanship; institute vigorous education and training and create a structure in top management (Obiora, 2002).

Juran (1991) defined quality as fitness for use in terms of design, conformance, availability, safety and field use. Thus his concept more closely incorporates the point of view of the consumer. Crosby (2009) argues that poor quality in the average firm costs about 29% of revenues most of which could be avoided by adopting good quality practices. His absolutes of quality are that quality is conformance to requirements, not goodness. The system for achieving quality is prevention, not appraisal; the performance standard is zero defects, not that is close enough. The measurement of quality is the price of non-conformance not indexes.

Ahiauзу (1999) summarily describes TQM as new way of thinking about and ordering ideas that have to do with management of organizations. This is because TQM appears to be a comprehensive way of improving total organizational efficiency and effectiveness and alternative by management by control and therefore, it is plausible to see that it is paradigm shift, for it has enunciated the quality revolutionary thinking in current management thought. The salient elements as enunciated by Ahiauзу are that TQM establish quality enhancement as a determinant priority and one is vital for long term effectiveness and survival. It blurs boundaries between the organization and environment. The rolling in of TQM by managers is to create constancy of purpose of improvement of product and services and to create a system that can produce quality outcome; employees are

empowered to make decision, build relationships and take steps needed to improve quality with system. The organization is reconfigured as set of horizontal processes that begin with the consumer. And in TQM, changes, continuous improvement and learning are encouraged.

2.2 Operational Requirement of TQM

Quality-driven leadership is often describing a situation where certain individuals induce others to work towards some pre-determined objective. TQM must be an organization-system and as such it must state from the top most level of authority in the organization. The chief executive, his/her top level management team must understand, accept and show demonstration to quality system commitment (Yammariana, 1994). The most effective to top management to TQM is by producing and adopting a sound quality policy and by being manifestly and undoubtedly seen to produce the necessary organizational arrangements and facilities to put policy into effect. Ahiauzu (1999) explain this further when he advocates for the incorporation in the policy of organization the internal and external customers and suppliers of the organization in order to achieve quality management ideas on “customers orientation”, ‘continuous process improvement’, operation orientation, product design efficiency, product/service, reliability, continuous quality monitory arrangement and other necessary organizational process must be stated in the policy.

Obiora, (2002) noted that on effective communication system within the organization is of paramount importance in TQM. For the effectiveness

of this system, TQM requires excellent communication processes. To provide relevant information, convey relevant practices and policies, and thereby generate the required interest, awareness and commitment from members of the organization. Effective communication system involves the timely flow of accurate information, quality verbal communication. In line with this, Ahiauzu (1999) argued that a well established system of communication through which information flow from the management to all members of the organization would make the transmission of management's vision and commitment to TQM to everyone in the organization smooth and easy.

According to Obiora (2002) receptivity to teamwork and independence are major commitment of TQM organizational culture. Teamwork provides an environment in which continuous improvement in quality is achieved, through improved interpersonal, interdepartmental and general effective organizational communication system, wide trust and free exchange of ideas, knowledge and information.

Oliver (2003) argued that TQM cannot exist in the absence of general trust. Trust according to Oliver is emotional glue which bind workers at all level in the organization together. Thus, organization wide trust is important. There should exist, strong members' psychology attachment to the organization.

2.3 TQM Levels of Installation

TQM is installed at three basic levels in organization, namely: at the corporate level, departmental level and individual level. At the corporate level, the first in the implementation of TQM is the drawing up of the organization corporate quality policy, through a policy formulation committee comprising top management team. The essence of policy formulation is to have a thorough and detailed analysis of the organization as a set out in the instrument establishing it. (Blunt (2003). The committee also undertake a corporate purpose analysis by examining the overall assignment of each department and division within the organization with a view to determine which department or unit need to be closed down, merged with other or organized so as to eliminate duplication of function and wasteful expense. The external customers' needs and perception should be identified comprehensively Broedling (2000).

At the department level, the analysis is normally carried out by a committee led by the head of department. The committee lists all tasks and other activities. This is done to understand the importance of each task, with the objective of improving performance and breaking down departmental barriers.

At the individual level, it involves the adoption of certain specification and practices at the work place; which will condition the consciousness of the worker and improve his/her effectiveness. This quality practice include private work devotion, taste satisfaction, target setting, time management etc (Allen, 2001)

2.4 Reward Issues and performance Appraisal

The question whether appraisal results should be allowed to directly influence decisions about pay increase and other reward outcomes such as promotions has remained one of the most continuous issues in human resources management. This should be subsumed into the quality of work life, QWL Deets, (2006), Davis (2005) defined quality of work life (QWL) as the component values of individuals and group autonomy. Individual's responsibility and interpersonal interdependence in work organization and job design.

Shamir and Solomon (1988) argued that QWL has to do with individual's job related well being and extent of which his/her work experience is rewarding, fulfilling and devoid of stress and other negative personal consequences. Ahiauzu (1999) argued that well being has to do with psychological feeling of happiness or satisfaction and that the level of well being can only be determined by individuals observed to be effectively responding to work activities. On this premise therefore, Ahiauzu (1999) asserted that the QWL can only be ascertained by determining the workers perceived quality to work life. Thus, he defined perceived quality of work life as "a set effective impression and which the individual holds and directs towards such outcome as financial and other material benefits, opportunity for self actualization, security of employment, advancement opportunities and good social relations in the work domain of his life.

Herrick and Maccoby (2004) observed that the main perspective of QWL is concerned with humanization of work. This refers to work place

democracy, work reconstructing and job design, security, equity, individualization and social integration. Reasoning along this line Ahiauzu (1999) asserts that pursuing policy and adopting programs that generate workers security, health, improved income and future security of employment will enable the worker to put in his best at the work place.

Equity has to do with how commensurate the remuneration if a worker is to the effort his/her puts in at work. The extent of reward for a worker will influence the effort the worker will put in his/her job and the level of satisfaction obtained from the work done. This dependence largely on how suitable the worker perceives his remuneration (Wathon, 2007).

Discussion of pay at the time of performance appraisal increases employees' acceptance of appraisal (Barnnister, 1990).

Hence lack of congruency between appraisal results reward level including promotion has been discovered to be a source of employees' discontent and demotivation. Pay increase and motivation send powerful messages to employees. If this message does not match up with the appraisal result, employees are quick to dismiss the whole process as a manipulation by management. However, what is important to workers is the merit of who got what and who get promoted. In many organizations, the consistency in appraisal results and reward system is aggravated by the practice of hearing separate wage and salary reviews in which merit rises and supervisors and managers decides bonuses arbitrarily and often secretly (Balkin, 2009).

2.5 Determinant of Workers Consciousness

According to Marx (1977), it is not the consciousness of man that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness. The social being of a person which depends largely on the state of his material condition, determines his social consciousness. For instance, the average worker does not find anything strange in the work environment of the western world, because even at his home and in other aspect of his social life in the wider society. His pattern of social existence and indeed his total social being has evolved to a level such that the rhythm of living and the general pattern of thinking and world view in his wider society correspond perfectly with that which the western industrial mode of production demand.

But, Nigeria in general and Caritas University in particular, the material conditions and the total social being of people have not develop to a level that will result in the social and intellectual consciousness similar to that which exists in the western world (Richman, 2006). According to child, (1980) the independent factor in the equation for economic effectiveness is the cultural defined expectation of employees which if not satisfied, induce costly absenteeism, high rate of labour turn over and poor quality work. Hence, socio-cultural differences are likely to continue as a factor making for variation in forms of business organization.

2.6 Review of Theories

2.6.1 Systems Theory

Systems theory had a checkered history in sociology (Becker, 2001). It was the work of a German social thinker, Niklas Luhmann that gave system theory recognition as a frame of analysis in sociology. Though not as much as Luhmann, Kenneth Bailey also made an important contribution to the development of systems theory (Ritzer, 2008).

Systems theory is derived from the natural science and is applicable to all behavioural and social sciences (Buckley, 1967). Thus, system theory is in the eyes of its proponents a common vocabulary to unit both natural and social sciences.

Systems theory is interested in the many aspects of the social world and thus operates against piecemeal analysis of the social world. The argument of the system theory is that the intricate relationship of parts cannot be treated out of the context of the whole. System theorists reject the idea that society or other larger-scale components of society should be treated as unified social facts. Instead, the focus is on relationships or processes at various levels within the social system (Buckley, 1967).

Ball (1978) and Bailey (2005) offered a clear conception of the relational orientation of systems theory. According to them, system theory begins with a professional conception of reality as consisting fundamentally of relationships, as illustrated in the concept of gravity as used in modern physics. The term gravity those not describe entity at all. It is a set of

relationships. In the same vein, system theory demands that sociologists should develop the logic of relationships and conceptualize social reality in relational terms.

System theory sees all aspects of socio-cultural systems in process terms especially as network of information and communication. Most importantly, systems theory is inherently integrative. The individual and society are treated equally, not as separate entities but as mutually constitutive fields related through feedback processes (Ball, 1978).

According to Buckley (1967) and Mead (1962) consciousness and action are inter-related. Action begins with a signal from environment, which is transmitted to the author. The signal provides the author with information. On the basis of this information, the author is allowed to select responses. The key here is the author's possession of a mediating mechanism of self-consciousness which according to Buckley is a mechanism of internal feedback of the system's own states which may be mapped or be compared with other information from the situation and a repertoire of actions in a goal directed manner that takes one's own self and behaviour implicitly into account.

The relevance of this theory in this study is its ability to explain as a conscious election of actors predicated on a goal directed behaviour implicit. However, the flaw of this theory is its inability to explain in concrete terms the relationship between reward administration and TQM. Hence, it cannot be employed as framework for the analysis of this study.

2.6.2 Peter Blau's Exchange Theory

Blau (1964) goals were an understanding of social structure on the basis of an analysis of the social processes that govern the relations between individuals and groups. The basic question according to Blau is how social life becomes organized into increasingly complex structures of associations among men. Blau's intention was to go beyond Homans's (1967; 1974 and 1984) concern with elementary form of social life and into an analysis of complex structures. Indeed Blau focused on the process of change which in his view directs much of human behaviour and underlies relationship among individuals as well as among groups. He envisioned a four-stage sequence leading from interpersonal exchange to social structure to social change (Ritze, 2008).

One perspective on interpersonal relationship is to think of the behaviour as the product of history of exchange. This is the tack that Blau (1964) takes in *Exchange and power in social life*. Exchange can be economic or social. Economic exchange according to Blau has a market place character. Each partner to the exchange specified in advance exactly what will be exchanged and when the exchange will occur. Each commodity or services that are exchanged has a value that is independent of the persons or group offering that commodity or service. The exchange relationship has a finite duration and trust between the principals is not important because if either party reneges on contractual obligation the other party can seek recourse in enforcement mechanism such as the court or some other higher authority or referee. In contrast social exchange does not

make implicit what will be exchanged. A part initiates social exchange by spontaneously giving another party something of value—a tangible product or service. The value of what is given is subjective and depends on the identity of the person giving it. For example, praise from a high-status or respected person is valued more than praise from a less-respected source and the support of a politically powerful person is prized more than the support of someone with little doubt (Ogan, et al. 2006).

Some of the exchange that occurs between the organization (or its agents) and a participant is of economic or transactional character. In the employment relationship, an individual contracts to perform certain duties for specified intervals of time, for an agreed-upon package of basic pay, benefits and privileges. However, when a participant begins to interact with others, patterns of social exchange develop as well. Interaction with co-workers and customers and with supervisors and other managers in particular, develops in such a way that the relationship often becomes a mix of economic and social exchange. A participant realizes that certain contributions are mandated for exchange for contractually specified inducements. If the individual assesses some of those economic and social inducements, as enacted by organizational policy, practice and culture as going beyond what was contractually promised, he might also feel bound to pay back with contributions in some forms beyond those obligated by the employment contract and thus promote TQM (Organ, et al. 2006).

In his studies of human motivation, the Harvard psychologist, David McClelland was interested in establishing that a need for achievement

exists, that it is distinguishable from other needs and drives. And that it occurs to a different extent on individuals and also in cultures (Goldhorpes, 1996). One of the prominent as well as parsimonious of approaches to the explanation of motives in workplace environments comes from the work of McClelland and his colleagues on the needs for achievement, affiliations and power (McClelland 1961, 1965). According to McClelland, individuals have some degree of achievement, affiliation and power motives. The achievement motive is a need that arises from an individual's desire to accomplish goals or task more effectively. It pushes people to perform in terms of a standard of excellence. The affiliation motive pulls people towards establishing, restoring and maintaining relationships with other people. While the need for power is the desire to control the resource in one's setting.

McClelland's achievement motivation theory is applied to the concept of TQM as a meaning of understanding why people exhibit commitment and dedication in work place settings by Niehoff (2004). In the achievement motive theory TQM are exhibited as means for task accomplishment and assurance of quality. When achievement is the motive, TQM emerges because such behaviour is viewed as necessary for success in the task. Thus, need for achievement is seen as acquired rather than innate. Certain cues or stimuli could be emitted via administration of reward which in turn motivates TQM achievement.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

The exchange theory is adopted to provide the theoretical framework for this research. This theory has selected above others for the present study because it is deemed suitable for the researcher as formulation that best help construct a theoretical framework within which to study the interaction between Total quality management of rewards. With exchange theory different varieties of formulations have been made which relate to employee behaviour towards TQM. These have long been used to describe and analyze the motivational bases of employee behaviour and formation of positive employee attitudes (Molm, 1994). Particularly, why adopting the exchange theory to the analysis of large-scale-structure argued that exchange is fundamental underpinning to social order and generates higher levels of group solidarity to the degree that mutual trust is present among the actors: trust that others will discharge their obligation to the enrichment of society rather than for their self interest. This therefore implies in the TQM where reward determines compliance and degree of effort. That is reward exchange for efficient and effectiveness. For the purpose of this study therefore TQM is seen as occurring as the response of reward administration which extract from individual worker commitment and dedication. Thus if he knows that his effort will be rewarded positively he does more.

2.8 Study of Hypotheses

1. There is a positive relationship between reward administration and total quality management implementation.

2. Reward for good work stimulates dedication and commitment.
3. Total quality management is susceptible to performance assessment.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts survey design. To that effect it made use of questionnaire which is distributed to randomly selected respondents. This design is considered suitable for studying an organization with the nature and population such as Caritas University.

Adaptation of survey method in this study is also informed by its variability in using a sample drawn to represent the elements within Caritas University. Survey method is appropriate in the study of the influence of reward administration on total quality management.

3.2 Study Area

The area of study is Caritas University, Amorji-Nike, Enugu state of Nigeria. Caritas University was approved by the Federal Government of Nigeria on 16th December, 2004 and was formally opened on 21st January 2005. The University was founded by Rev. Father Edeh and is dedicated to the sisters of Jesus the savior. Sisters of Jesus the savior is a religious congregation of Reverend Sisters founded by Very Rev. Fr. Prof. Emmanuel M.P. Edeh C.S.S.P.

3.3 Population of The Study

The population of this study is 223 respondents made up of 154 academic staff and 69 non tutorial staff.

3.4 Sample Size

The sample study of this study is 60 respondents. This sample size is about 27% of the study population. The researcher considers this sample size larger enough for this study, considering the statistical analysis that would be involved. Again, the researcher considers the sample size larger enough for effective management by the researcher due to financial constraints and time.

3.5 Sampling Technique

The researcher employed a systematic sampling method. To ensure that subjects (respondents) have equal opportunity of being selected, the researcher collects the list of the staff from the time keeper. Arranged the names and selecting from the 3rd person, every 3rd person were selected until the 60th respondents were selected. The researcher selected 42 academic staff and 18 non academic staff representing 69.05% and 30.95% of the study population and sample size respectively.

3.6 Instrument for Data Collection

The questionnaire is the only instrument used for data collection for this study. The researcher engaged the assistance of two research assistants who helped in the distribution and retrieval of the questionnaire to and from the respondents. The questionnaire contains two sections. The first section seeks to identify the demographic characteristics of the respondents while the second section seeks the information on the influence of reward administration on total quality management implementation.

3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

Frequency tables, simple percentage and chi square (X^2) are used in the analysis of the data collected from the field via questionnaire.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Demographic Variables of Respondents

Q1 What is your sex?

Table 4.1 Gender distribution of respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Males	42	70%
Females	18	30%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from the field work showing responses to question one in the questionnaire.

Table 4.1 above shows the sex distribution of the respondents of this study. Males are 42 (70%) while females are 18 (30%). Ratio of male and female is 7:3.

Q2 Marital Status

Table 4.2 Marital status respondents.

Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	48	80%
Single	12	20%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 2 in the questionnaire

Table 2 above depicts the marital status of the respondents of this study. It shows that 48 (80%) of the respondents are married while 12 (20%) are single. The ratio of the married to the single is 4:1.

Q3 Job status

Table 4.3 Job status of respondents

Job status	Frequency	Percentage
Academic	45	75%
Non academic	15	25%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 3 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.3 portrays the job status of respondents 45 (75%) of the respondents are academic staff while 15 (25%) are non academic staff. The ratio of academic staff and non academic staff is 3:1.

Q4 What is your age bracket?

Table 4.4 Age distribution of respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Below 30	–	00%
31 – 35	33	55%
36 – 40	12	20%
41 – 45	12	20%
46 – 50	3	5%
51 and above	–	00%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 4 in the questionnaire.

From table 4 above majority of the responses are within the ages 31-35. Example, 33(55%) of the responses falls within this age category, they are followed by 36-40 and 41-45 who are 12(20%) each. The least is 46-50 they are only 3(50%). Age below 30 is zero, 51 and above is also zero.

4.2 Analysis of Research Questions

Q15 If you are motivated can you improve on your performance?

Table 4.5 Contingency table for testing research question one which seeks to establish the relationship between pay, general performance reward and TQM implementation.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	60	100%
No	00	00%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 15 in the questionnaire.

In table 4.5 above, all the respondents said that they can improve on their performance if motivated. This implies that there is a strong relationship between pay, general performance reward and total quality management implementation.

Q14 Do you know of any system of reward administration in Caritas University?

Table 4.6 Contingency table for testing research question 2 which seeks to which know if there is any standard appraisal system in Caritas University?

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	–	00%
No	60	100%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing response to question 14 in the questionnaire.

From table 4.6, it is apparent that there is no system of mechanism reward administration in Caritas University. 56 (93.33%) of the respondents of this study said they do not know of any system of reward administration in operation in Caritas University. Only 4 (6.67%) of the respondents said there is a system of reward administration.

Q16 Do think that reward for good or bad performance has any relationship with continuous improvement of workers skills and ability.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	54	90%
No	6	10%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 16 in the questionnaire.

From table 4.7, it is clear that reward has a significant impact on TQM implementation. For instance 54 (90%) of the response of this study agree that reward for performance whether good or bad has impact on TQM implementation. This means punishment which is the reward for bad performance deters workers from bad performance whereas approval (reward in monetary terms or otherwise) encourage workers to do more.

Q18 Respondents were asked to make statement regarding performance appraisal in Caritas University.

Table 4.8 Contingency table for testing research question 4 which seeks to know the impact management style has on TQM implementation.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Productivity	22	36.67%
Effective/efficiency	14	23.33%
Encourage workers to do more	24	40%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 18 in the questionnaire.

From table 4.8 above were the responses of the respondents were coded into three categories. If management style is friendly to TQM implementation, it will encourage productivity as argued by 22 (36.67%) of the respondents and it will encourage workers to do better as submitted by 24 (40%) of the respondents.

Q17 If you have ever been promoted, on what was the promotion predicated upon?

Table 4.9 Contingency table for testing research question 5, which seeks to know the extent to which TQM is susceptible to performance assessment.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Good performance	6	10%
Accreditation/NUC visit	45	75%
Normal promotion	4	6.67%
My application	5	8.33%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 17 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.9 above shows that workers in Caritas University are mostly promoted when NUC visit are anticipated on such occasion. 5 (8.33%) were promoted on request. 4 (6.67%) of the respondents were promoted on normal ground while 6 (10%) were promoted on good performance. To further understand the relationship between TQM and performance appraisal, and open end question 18 was asked. 54 (90%) of the respondents said there is no system of performance appraisal at all at Caritas University. 6 (10%) of the respondents said there is no standard system of performance appraisal.

4.3 Hypotheses Testing

Table 4.10 Contingency table for testing hypothesis 1

Respondents	Yes		No		Total
Academic staff	f_o	f_e	f_o	f_e	42
	2	6.3	40	35.7	
Non academic staff	7	2.7	11	15.3	18
Total	9		51		60

Source: Data collected from field work showing responses to question 12 in the questionnaire.

$$X^2 = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

Where: f_o = observed frequency

f_e = expected frequency

$$\text{Thus } X^2 = \frac{(2-6.3)^2}{6.3} + \frac{(40-35.7)^2}{35.7} + \frac{(7-2.7)^2}{2.7} + \frac{(11-15.3)^2}{15.3}$$

$$X^2 = -2.93 + 0.52 + 6.85 + 1.21$$

$$X^2 = 3.23$$

Degree of freedom (df) = (C - 1) (R - 1) = (2 - 1) (2 - 1) = 1

At 1df table value of X^2 at 0.05 level of significance = 3.84

With the calculated X^2 value of 3.23 and X^2 table value of 3.84, the working hypothesis 1 is rejected.

The implication of the above analyzed data is that TQM implementation does not depend so much on reward administration.

Table 4.11 Contingency table for testing hypothesis 2

Respondents	Yes		No		Total
Academic staff	fo	Fe	fo	fe	42
	42	37.8	00	4.2	
Non academic staff	12	16.2	6	1.8	18
Total	54		6		60

Source: Data collected from field work showing responses to question 16 in the questionnaire.

$$X^2 = \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$$

Where: fo = observed frequency

fe = expected frequency

$$\text{Thus } X^2 = \frac{(42-37.8)^2}{37.8} + \frac{(0-4.2)^2}{4.2} + \frac{(12-16.2)^2}{16.2} + \frac{(6-1.8)^2}{1.8}$$

$$X^2 = -0.47 - 4.2 + 1.09 + 9.8$$

$$X^2 = 7.16$$

Degree of freedom (df) = (C - 1) (R - 1) = (2 - 1) (2 - 1) = 1

At degree of freedom 1 table value of X^2 at 0.05 level of significance = 3.84

With the calculated X^2 value of 7.16 and X^2 table value of 3.84, the working hypothesis 2 is accepted. This implies that reward stimulates dedication and commitment.

Table 4.12 Contingency table for testing hypothesis 3

Respondents	Yes		No		Total
Academic staff	fo	Fe	fo	fe	42
	41	39.2	1	2.8	
Non academic staff	15	16.8	3	1.2	18
Total	56		04		60

Source: Data collected from field work showing responses to question 16 in the questionnaire.

$$X^2 = \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$$

Where: fo = observed frequency

fe = expected frequency

$$\text{Thus } X^2 = \frac{(41-39.2)^2}{39.2} + \frac{(1-2.8)^2}{2.8} + \frac{(15-16.8)^2}{16.8} + \frac{(3-1.2)^2}{1.2}$$

$$X^2 = 0.08 + 1.16 + 0.19 + 2.7$$

$$X^2 = 3.43$$

Degree of freedom (df) = (C - 1) (R - 1) = (2 - 1) (2 - 1) = 1

At df 1 table value of X^2 at 0.05 level of significance = 3.84

With the calculated X^2 value of 3.43 and X^2 table value of 3.84, the working hypothesis 3 is rejected. This implies that TQM is not absolutely susceptible to performance assessment.

4.4 Presentation of Data

Q5 Have long have you worked in Caritas University? Table 4.13

Response	Frequency	Percentage
1-2	27	45%
3-4	18	30%
5-6	12	20%
7-8	3	5%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing response to question 5 in the questionnaire.

From table 4.13, 27 representing 45% of the respondents have only worked for 1-2 years in Caritas University. 18 representing 30% have worked for 3-4 years. 12 representing 20% of the respondents have worked 5-6 years. Only 3, representing 5% of the respondents have worked for 7-8 years. This implies that there is a high rate of labour turnover which is an indication of bad condition of service. This is not a healthy practice to any organisation.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
	28	46.67%
Once	20	33.33%
Twice	9	15%
Trice	3	5%
More than trice	0	00%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing responses to question 6 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.14 shows that 28 (46.67%) of the respondents have never been promoted since they started work. 20 (33.33%) of the respondents have only been promoted once. 9 (15%) on the respondents have been promoted trice. None has been promoted more than trice. This situation is discouraging and counterproductive.

Q7 Have you ever been recognized for doing excellent work?

Table 4.15

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	27	45%
No	33	55%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing response to the question 7 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.15 indicates that 33 (55%) of the respondents have never been recognized for doing excellent work. 27 (45%) of the respondents have at one or the other been recognized for doing excellent work.

Q8 If yes to question 7 were you rewarded for that? Table 4.16

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	12	20%
No	48	80%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field showing response to question 8 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.16 above shows that 48 (80%) of the respondents were not rewarded for excellent work, only 12 (20%) were rewarded.

Q9 Apart from your salary, have you ever received any other benefit-financially or otherwise based on your performance?

Table 4.17

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	00	00%
No	60	100%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data from field work showing response to question 9 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.17 shows that apart from salaries all the respondents of this study have never received any other benefits. Thus, no motivation at all.

Q10 Are you happy with you working conditions?

Table 4.18

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	10%
No	54	90%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data collected from field showing response to question 10 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.18 shows that 54 (90%) of the respondents are not happy with their working condition. Only 6 (10%) of the respondents are happy with their working condition.

Q11 Are you happy with the work you are doing?

Table 4.19

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	45	75%
No	15	25%
Total	60	100%

Source: Data collected from field work showing response to question 11 in the questionnaire.

Table 4.19 indicates that 45 (75%) of the respondents are happy with the work they are doing but are not happy with the condition under which they work. 15 (25%) of the respondents said they not happy with the work they are doing.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Summary of Findings

In the course of the study, the researcher discovered that there is no standard system of promotion and reward in Caritas University. Promotion of workers is mostly stimulated by NUC visit. Some workers have worked between 2 and 5 years without promotion. Salaries are not in harmony. People with the same qualification and experience and who started at the same time earn different salaries. Sometimes new comers with the same or less qualification earn higher than those that have been there before them. There is no motivation to workers at all.

Good work are hardly recognized, they are not rewarded. Apart from salaries staff receive no other benefits. The researcher also discovered that majority of workers are not happy with their job (job satisfaction).

The study also revealed that the general working condition in Caritas University does not support Total quality management implementation (TQM).

5.2 Conclusion

Predicated on the findings of this study, the researcher submits as follows:

Total quality management (TQM) implementation is difficult given the absence of motivation via lack of reward for good work. Workers might be coerced to employ covert resistance of all sorts. This will certainly keep productivity down. There is general stagnancy of workers career growth.

5.3 Recommendation

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommended as follows:

There should be standard system and structure of reward administration. This will in turn serve as motivational tool that will provoke high productivity among workers.

There should be a system of promotion of workers that will guarantee a steady growth to good performing workers. People should be made happy while doing their job. This will enhance productivity.

5.4 Limitation of The Study

Some of the staff selected for this study expressed fear in filling or answering the questionnaire. This problem was overcome by assurance that the identity of the respondents is not disclosed.

REFERENCES

- Ahiauзу, A.I. (1999). *The African Industrial Man*. Port Harcourt: CIMRAT Publications.
- Akata, G.O. (2003). *Strategy Performance Management: Your key to business success*. Ibadan: Evil-Coleman.
- Allen, C. (2001). *Integrating the Individual and the Organisation*. New York: Wiley.
- Alwith, B., & Berger, R. (1993). *Work and Authority in Industry*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Aragon, F. (2003). Models of Social Organisation. *Royal Anthropological*. 23, 4.
- Bailey, K.D. (2005). *General Systems Theory*: In Ritzer (ed), *Encyclopedia of social theory*. Oaks, Calif: Sage Press.
- Ball, R.A. (1978). Sociology and General System Theory. *American Sociologist* 13, 65-72.
- Bannister, C.A. (1990). Perspective on the Quality of Working Life. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 48, 1.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Blunt, P. (2003). *Organizational Theory and Behaviour: American Perspective*. London: Longman.
- Brownbrige, V.D. (1996). *Managing Quality: Integrating Quality and Busniss Strategy*. Homeword: Irwin.

Broedling, L.C. (2000). *Forwarding in Varian, T. (ed) Beyond the TQM Mystic: Real world Perspective on Total Quality Management*. New York: Harper and Row.

Buckley, W. (1967). *Sociology and Modern Systems Theory*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Child, J. (1980) *Technical Progress in Barrette et al (ed). Industrial Relations and the wider Society*. London: Macmillan Publishers.

Cole, G.A. (2002). *Human Relations Management*. U.S.A: Mc-Graw Hill.

Crosby, D.B. (2009). *Quality is free; The Art of Walking Quality certain*. New York: New American Library.

Davis, K. (2005). The Myth of functional analysis as a Special Method in Sociology and Anthropology. *American Sociological Review* 24, 757-772.

Deets, W. (2006). *Theory Z: How American Business can meet the Japanese Challenge*. Japan: Wesley Addison.

Deming, W.E. (1982). *Quality, Productivity and Competitive position*. Cambridge, London: Center for advance Engineering study.

Goldhorpe, W.C. (1996). How TQM is Redefining Management and leadership. *Flapping the Network Journal*.

Herrick, G., & Maccoby, J. (1985). *The Sociology of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Homans, G.C. (1967). *The Nature of Social Science*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Word.

Homans, G.C. (1974). *Social Behaviour: Its elementary forms*. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.

Lawrie, D. (1990). Power, Structure and Agency. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour* 15, 131-149.

Marx, K. (1977). *Communism and the Augsburger Allegemeine Zeithung: Selected writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mead, G.H. (1962). *Mind, Self and Society: from the stand point of a social behaviourist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merier, G. (1991). *The New Industrial State*. Penguin: Hommonds Worth.

McClelland, A. (1961). *Labour Process*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Molm, L. D. (1994). Imbalanced Structures, Unfair Strategies: Power and Justice in Social exchange. *American Sociological Review*. 59, 98-121.

Niehoff, C. (2004). *Charting the Journey of Higher Service Quality*. San Jose: C.A. Zenger Miller.

Oliver, N. (2003). *The Japanization of British Industries*. London:Oxford Blachwell Publishers.

Organ, D. et al. (2006). *British Factory Japanese Factory*. London: George Allen.

Omotosho, M. (2002). Winning Strategies for Employee Motivation. *IPM lecture series* 31st Oct.-1 Nov. 2001.

APPENDIX I

Department of sociology,
Faculty of MGT and social Sciences,
Caritas University,
Amorji-Nike,
Enugu.

Dear Respondents,

I am a final year student of the above mentioned institution. I am carrying out a study on the influence of reward administration on total quality management implementation.

You were randomly selected as one of the respondents of this study. The information you will supply is only for academic consumption. Thus, confidentiality is highly assured.

You are therefore, kindly required to truthfully answer the questions below by ticking (✓) in the appropriate box and/or fill the spaces provided.

My regards for your understanding.

Yours Faithfully

Vaaswem Terngu Solomon.

APPENDIX II

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.

1. What is your gender?

a) Male

b) Female

2. Marital status

a) Single

b) Married

3. Status

a) Academic staff

b) Non academic staff

4. What is your age bracket?

a) Below 30

b) 31-35

c) 36-40

d) 41-46

e) 46-50

f) 51 and above

SECTION B

5. How long have you worked in Caritas University?

a) 1-2 years

b) 3-4 years

c) 5-6 years

d) 7-8 years

6. How many times have you been promoted?

a) Once

b) Twice

c) Trice

d) More than trice

7. Have you ever been recognized for doing excellent work?

a) Yes

b) No

8. If yes to question 7 were you rewarded for that?

a) Yes

b) No

9. Apart from you salary, have you ever received any other benefit-financially, or otherwise based on your performance?

a) Yes

b) No

10. Are you happy with your working condition?

a) Yes

b) No

11. Are you happy with the work you are doing?
- a) Yes
- b) No
12. Can the element of teamwork, constancy of purpose and continuous improvement be achieved given the general working condition in Caritas University?
- a) Yes
- b) No
13. Is there any way you have ever been motivated to improve on your performance in Caritas University?
- a) Yes
- b) No
14. Do you know of any system of reward administration in Caritas University?
- a) Yes
- b) No
15. If you are motivated, can you improve on your performance?
- a) Yes
- b) No
16. Do you think that reward for good or bad performance has any relationship with continuous improvement of workers skill and ability?
- a) Yes
- b) No

17. If you have ever been promoted, on what was that promotion predicated upon?

a) Good performance

b) Accreditation and/or NUC visit

c) Normal routine promotion exercise

d) My application requesting for promotion

18. Make a general statement regarding performance appraisal in Caritas University. _____
