

# The employee's motivation and organizational performance management of the University campuses in Misamis Oriental

Joann Dajuya Lim\*

\* Bukidnon State University, Medina Campus, Philippines

## ABSTRACT

The organizational performance of Bukidnon State University (BukSU) is a vital tool to measure its accomplishment in the University Vision. The study presents level of motivation of employees and the level of organizational performance management of BukSU in Misamis Oriental. The research utilized descriptive design. The purposive sampling of participants is employed. Findings show that the level of motivation of employees in hygiene factors is 3.85 or very satisfactory (vs). The level of motivation in motivators is 3.88 or very satisfactory (vs). The overall level of motivation of employees in the University campuses is 3.81 or very satisfactory (vs). This means that most of the employees are motivated to work in the organization. On the other hand, the organizational performance management is 4.13 or very often (vo). This means that the organization has a very good performance management process. The study concluded that the organization has motivated employees to work provided with the benefits as mandated in the Civil Service Commission (CSC) law. The two-motivation factors: the hygiene and motivators have implemented in the organization and leads to the very good organizational performance management (OPM) of BukSU Campuses in Misamis Oriental.

**Keywords:** Motivational Factors, Organizational Performance Management, University Campuses

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational Performance Management (OPM) is a measurement of University achievement of target setting and goal. The consistent conduct of semi-annual performance evaluation of the University is a measurement of organization's implementation of University mandates, quality policy, vision and mission. In

the implementation, the Bukidnon State University (BukSU) Campuses in Misamis Oriental has followed and observed the University guidelines. These guidelines pertain to the University tool for the OPM, thus, this campus ensures that the given tools are practiced and implemented. To measure the campus performance, the researcher has arrived

decision to assess the impact of motivational factors into the OPM.

Performance Management and Measurement' refers to any integrated, systematic approach to improving organizational performance to achieve strategic aims and promote an organization's mission and values [1]. Performance management is the process an organization follows to make sure employees know the roles they play and the objectives they'll need to follow to be successful [2]. With performance management, your employees will be better equipped to complete the duties assigned, and your organization will be healthier as a result [2].

The goal of OPM is to define a process that motivates and inspires managers and employees to perform to the best of their ability [3]. The benefits of performance management include increased employee motivation, improved employee morale, increased retention, and consistency among departments [2]. Hearn (2019) cited the twelve (12) purposes of performance management [4]. These are 1) to provide meaningful, ongoing feedback; 2) to encourage teamwork, collaboration and communication; 3) to ensure everyone is achieving their SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound); 4) making sure are relevant and furthering organizational objectives; 5) to provide continuous support; 6) to identify development areas; 7) to offer recognition and reward; 8) to make sure employees are engaged and happy; 9) to provide employees with a clear career path; 10) to take corrective actions; 11) to determine

how leadership can motivate and coach; 12) to improve your bottom line.

Bartol and Martin (1998) consider motivation a powerful tool that reinforces behaviour and triggers the tendency to continue. In other words, motivation is an internal drive to satisfy an unsatisfied need and to achieve a certain goal [5]. A motivated employee has his/her goals aligned with those of the organization and directs his/her efforts in that direction [6]. Thibodeaux, M. S. (1996) explains organizational effectiveness as the extent to which an organization fulfils its objectives, by using certain resources and without placing strain on its members [7]. The goal model defines organizational effectiveness referring to the extent to which an organization attains its objectives [8], while the system resource model defines it in terms of the bargaining power of the organization and its ability to exploit the environment when acquiring valuable resources [9].

Employees want to earn reasonable salaries, as money represents the most important incentive, when speaking of its influential value [10]. Financial rewards have the capacity to maintain and motivate individuals towards higher performance, especially workers from production companies, as individual may use the money to satisfy their needs [6]. Employees can also be motivated through proper leadership, as leadership is all about getting thing done the right way. In order to achieve these goals, the leader should gain the employees' trust and make them follow him. Nevertheless, in order to make them trust him and complete their tasks properly for the organization, the employees

should be motivated [11]. The leaders and the employees help one another to attain high levels of morality and motivation.

Herzberg (1964) identified two different categories of needs: hygiene factors and motivators, which are independent and influence behavior in different ways [12]. People that are dissatisfied with their jobs are concerned about the work environment, while satisfied individuals feel comfortable with their jobs. The first category (hygiene factors) refers to organizational policies, supervision, working conditions, money security or interpersonal relations. On the other hand, the second category is represented by factors that involve feelings of achievement, professional growth and recognition. These factors do not only have a positive effect on job satisfaction, but they also increase one's total output capacity. When hygiene factors are satisfied, they will eliminate dissatisfaction and work restrictions, but they have no impact on achieving superior performance. On the other hand, enhancing the motivators will help an individual to grow and develop. Therefore, hygiene factors influence an individual's willingness and motivators affect an individual's ability.

Motivation and performance of the employees are essential tools for the success of any organization in the long run [13]. Satyendra (2020) cited that employees constitute the most important organizational asset which is having the highest significance to the organization [14]. She added that their performance has a major impact on the performance of the organization. When the employees act diligently, intelligently, and in apposite manner, then they give

outstanding performance, and because of this, the performance of the organization improves and becomes superior. In fact, there is a close relationship between the employees' performance and the organizational performance with the performance of the employees critically influencing the performance of the organization measured by the parameters of (i) productivity, (ii) profit, (iii) employee turnover, (iv) employee accidents, (v) quality of work life, (vi) product quality, and (vii) customer satisfaction [14].

The literatures cited above display that the employees' motivation factors can affect the organization performance management. This is the study assessed the level of motivation of teaching personnel and Organizational Performance Management (OPM). The campuses have an Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) and Campus Performance Commitment and Review (CPCR) tools to measure the performance of individual and the campus.

The Herzberg theory is also known as the two-factor theory of motivation factors and hygiene factors. The theory maintains the two major factors that influence individual motivation at work, which include "hygiene factors" and "motivators" [15]. Hygiene factors are preventive which include salary, benefits, work policy, and work conditions. If hygiene factors are not acknowledged, dissatisfaction can occur [15]. Contrary to hygiene factors, "motivators" stimulate and aspire employees. Motivators bring the kind of satisfaction and the kind of improvement in performance that the industry seeks from its workforce [12]. Motivation

factors include meaningful work assignments, positive recognition, and a sense of importance to an organization. Furthermore, the researcher theorizes that both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of factory employees are a result of different causes. Suffice it to say, motivators are the source of employee satisfaction while dissatisfaction is the outcome of hygiene factors [16].

Performance measurement is integral to linking the overall agency Mission and the financial decisions that drive its activities [17]. The State of California wrote a staff training handbook entitled "Organizational Performance Management and Measurement" that performance measures are indicators of the degree to which an agency is meeting its stated desired outcomes. In addition, a performance management system deploys the strategic plan and both focuses and aligns agency efforts with customer expectations. Performance measures address resources consumed by the system (inputs), the efficient delivery of program activities (processes), the direct services delivered by a program (outputs), and the results of those services (outcomes).

In addition, the performance management process has seven (7) steps model. These are 1) check your mission, 2) identify core functions, 3) determine outcomes, 4) list activities, 5) develop measures, 6) select vital few measures, and 7) identify sources of data. The handbook elucidate further that measurement should be done because: 1) Measuring performance provides for agency accountability – performance measures let individuals and organizations know how well the agency is doing, and whether it is doing what

it said it would do. 2) Measuring performance encourages government responsiveness – measurement data makes government more responsive to public needs. 3) Measuring performance provides management and others with information on the degree of Mission accomplishment. 4) Measuring performance creates a blueprint for linking budget to outcomes. 5) Measuring performance allows for the tracking of improvements and reveals what is working and what is not. 6) Measuring performance reinforces desired behaviors. 7) Measuring performance is good management since it provides information and accountability at all levels of government. It also helps managers and employees focus on what is important. 8) Measuring performance brings greater clarity to the budget process and provides the customer with a meaningful sense of results that are, and will be, attained with their tax dollar. 9) Measuring performance pulls the agency toward a vision and creates organizational alignment. 10) Measuring performance drives action and promotes results. 11) Measuring performance provides focus and drives organizational capacity.

## **2. METHOD AND MATERIAL**

### *2.1. Research Design*

The study is descriptive research. The location of the research is Bukidnon State University Campuses in Misamis Oriental namely: Medina, Talisayan, and Sugbongcogon. The three (3) campuses located in 1st District (East) of Misamis Oriental, Northern Mindanao.

### *2.2. Participants*

<b>Scale of Intervals</b>	<b>Qualitative Description</b>	<b>Qualifying Statement</b>
4.20 – 5.00	Outstanding (O)	All of the regular teaching personnel are motivated to work in the organization
3.40 – 4.19	Very Satisfactory (VS)	Most of the regular teaching personnel are motivated to work in the organization
2.60 – 3.39	Satisfactory (S)	Some of the regular teaching personnel are motivated to work in the organization
1.80 – 2.59	Unsatisfactory (U)	Few of the regular teaching personnel are motivated to work in the organization
1.00 – 1.79	Very Poor (VP)	Very few of the regular teaching personnel are motivated to work in the organization

The respondents of the study are fifteen (15) regular teaching personnel of BukSU Campuses in Misamis Oriental. The purposive sampling of the participants is employed.

### 2.3. Research Instrument

The instrument utilized by the researcher is a survey questionnaire. The survey questionnaire has three (3) parts; Part One (I) covering the personal information of the participants, Part Two (II) is the questionnaire on "The Motivation of Employees, and Part Three (III) is "An Employees Evaluation of Organizational Performance Management".

### 2.4. Scoring Procedure

The survey questionnaire employed the 5-Point Likert Scale of Rensis Likert. To measure the level of employees motivational factors of BukSU Campuses, below is the scaling.

### 2.5. Treatment of the Data

The study utilized descriptive statistics tools namely: weighted mean, standard deviation, and frequency. In Problem 1, the weighted mean and standard deviations were used to treat the data. Problem 2 employed the frequency count.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

<b>Hygiene Factors Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Qualitative</b>
Company Policies and Administration	3.71	Very Satisfactory
Relations with Supervisor- Technical	3.87	Very Satisfactory
Interpersonal Relation with Supervisor and peers	3.56	Very Satisfactory
Salary	3.99	Very Satisfactory
Job Security	3.98	Very Satisfactory
Working Conditions	3.99	Very Satisfactory
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory</b>

The study utilized the scale of intervals for the level of employees' motivation. The scaling is patterned from the Individual Performance Commitment and Review (IPCR) measurement for evaluation. The following are the scale of intervals with qualitative description and qualifying statement (table 1).

The table 2 presents that the employees' motivation in hygiene factors got an overall mean of 3.85 or very satisfactory. This means that most of the regular employees are motivated to work in the organization. The six (6) factors of hygiene are very satisfactory. The result of the survey questionnaire signifies that the most of the employees are motivated and compensated on their job.

The Article of Expert Program Management (2018) posited the factors under hygiene which include company policies and administration, relations with supervisor-technical, interpersonal relation with supervisor and peers, salary, job security, and working conditions. 1) Company policies: These should be fair and clear to every employee. They must also be equivalent to those of competitors. 2)

Supervision: Supervision must be fair and appropriate. The employee should be given as much autonomy as is reasonable. 3) Relationships: There should be no tolerance for bullying or cliques. A healthy, amiable, and appropriate relationship should exist between peers, superiors, and subordinates. 4) Work conditions: Equipment and the working environment should be safe, fit for purpose, and hygienic. 5) Salary: The pay structure should be fair and reasonable. It should also be competitive with other organizations in the same industry. 6) Status: The organization should maintain the status of all employees within the organization. Performing meaningful work can provide a sense of status. 7) Security: It is important that employees feel that their job is secure and they are not under the constant threat of being laid-off.

Mayhew (2018) cited on her research that Herzberg's findings pretty much confirm the theory that employees don't leave their jobs because of low pay or lack of monetary rewards, the subject of human resources guru Leigh Branham's book [18], "The Hidden Reasons Employees Leave." She added that Branham's survey of nearly 20,000 employees revealed that employees look for jobs elsewhere because they don't feel like their work is valued, they don't trust leadership and supervisors don't provide the kind of support they need to be successful.

The table 3 shows the result of the study of level of employees' motivation in motivators. The result shows an overall mean of 3.77 or very satisfactory (VS). This means that the most of the employees are motivated to work in the organization.

Motivators	Mean	Qualitative Description
Achievement	3.57	Very Satisfactory
Advancement	3.87	Very Satisfactory
Work Itself	3.71	Very Satisfactory
Probability Growth	3.87	Very Satisfactory
Responsibility	3.82	Very Satisfactory
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory</b>

The Article of Expert Program Management (2018) cited that the motivating factors include

- 1) Achievement: A job must give an employee a sense of achievement. This will provide a proud feeling of having done something difficult but worthwhile.
- 2) Recognition: A job must provide an employee with praise and recognition of their successes. This recognition should come from both their superiors and their peers.
- 3) The work itself: The job itself must be interesting, varied, and provide enough of a challenge to keep employees motivated.
- 4) Responsibility: Employees should "own" their work. They should hold themselves responsible for this completion and not feel as though they are being

**Table 4: Level of Motivation of Employees**

Two-Factor Theory	Mean	Qualitative Description
Hygiene	3.85	Very Satisfactory
Motivators	3.77	Very Satisfactory
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>Very Satisfactory</b>

micromanaged.

- 5) Advancement: Promotion opportunities should exist for the employee.
- 6) Growth: The job should give employees the opportunity to learn new skills. This can happen either on the job or through more formal training.

The table 4 summarizes the results of two-factor theory: the hygiene and motivators. It shows

**Table 5: Organizational Performance Management (OPM)**

Statement	Rate
Supervisor is held accountable for doing effective appraisals.	3.93
Employees know how their performance impacts the organization.	3.87
High levels of performance are recognized and rewarded.	3.67
The system is designed for input from all levels in the organization	4.33
The system measures the right things.	4.27
The system measures both the results and how they are achieved	3.93
The employees believe the system is fair	4.40
The system is legally defensible.	4.47
The appraisal process is simple and quick to do.	4.33
Supervisor view the appraisal as a valuable management tool.	4.13
The system supports developmental opportunities.	4.53
Ratings are accurate and reflect actual performance.	4.07
The management is timely in doing appraisals.	4.20
Performers who need improvement are given developmental opportunities.	4.33
Performance problems are dealt with quickly and consistently.	4.53
Supervisors treat the process as on-going versus once a year.	3.67
Employees know what is expected of them at all times.	4.07
Supervisors are rated on how well they do appraisals.	4.13
Performance Standards are consistent across the organization.	4.13
Training in conducting effective evaluations is provided to appraisers	4.07
Training in the performance appraisal process is provided to employees.	4.33
Performance Appraisal meetings are meaningful and productive.	4.20
There is an appeals process in place if the employee disagrees with the appraisal.	4.00
Ratings are based on actual performance and not personal feelings.	4.20
Evaluation states what the employee "should be" doing vs "not" doing	4.13
<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>4.13</b>

that hygiene is 3.85 or very satisfactory (vs) and motivators is 3.77 or very satisfactory. The overall mean of employees' motivation is 3.81 or very satisfactory (vs). Therefore, most of the regular teaching personnel in the University campuses of Misamis Oriental are motivated to work in the organization.

On the other hand, for an evaluation of campus organizational performance utilized the Kardas Questionnaire of Performance Management Evaluation using the following scale with qualitative description:

The table 5 displays the result of 4.13 with qualitative description of very often. This means that the organization has a very good performance management process. The University campuses in Misamis Oriental have meet the acceptable rating of 4.13 or Very Satisfactory (VS) in Campus Performance Commitment and Review (CPCR).

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

The study concludes that:

- a) That, most of the employees are motivated to work in the organization.
- b) That, the University campuses has a very good performance in the organization.
- c) The University has provided employees' benefits as mandated in the law.
- d) The motivation of employees to work in the organization has an impact on the very good performance of an organization.

#### **5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The researcher expresses her heartfelt thanks and profound gratitude to the people who

extended their support and help in making this thesis presentable and successful. Bukidnon State University for all help and support.

#### **6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

NA

#### **7. SOURCE/S OF FUNDING**

No source of funding

#### **8. REFERENCES**

1. Salem, H. (2020). What is Organizational Performance Management (OPM)? Retrieved from: <https://managementhelp.org/organization-alperformance/index.htm>
2. Audenaert, M., Decramer, A., George, B., Verschuere, B., & Van Waeyenberg, T. (2019). When employee performance management affects individual innovation in public organizations: The role of consistency and LMX. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **30(5)**, 815-834.
3. Scheipers, G. (2016). What is organizational performance management? Boogkeers 5 2000 Antwerp Belgium. <https://blog.antwerpmanagementschool.be/en/what-is-organizational-performance-management>
4. Hearn, S. (2019). What Is the Purpose of Performance Management? Clear Review Limited 31-35 Kirby Street London. Retrieved from: <https://www.clearreview.com/what-is-purpose-of-performance-management/>.
5. Martin, D. C., & Bartol, K. M. (2003). Factors influencing expatriate performance



- appraisal system success: An organizational perspective. *Journal of International management*, **9(2)**, 115-132.
6. Dobre, O. I. (2013). Employee motivation and organizational performance. *Review of applied socio-economic research*, **5(1)**.
  7. Thibodeaux, M. S., & Favilla, E. (1996). Organizational effectiveness and commitment through strategic management. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*.
  8. Zammuto, R. F. (1982). Assessing organizational effectiveness: Systems change, adaptation, and strategy. Suny Press.
  9. Manzoor, Q. A. (2012). Impact of employees motivation on organizational effectiveness. *Business management and strategy*, **3(1)**, 1-12.
  10. Sara, J. D., Prasad, M., Eleid, M. F., Zhang, M., Widmer, R. J., & Lerman, A. (2018). Association between Work-Related stress and coronary heart disease: a review of prospective studies through the job strain, Effort-Reward balance, and organizational justice models. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, **7(9)**, e008073.
  11. Baldoni, J., (2005). Motivation Secret. Great Motivation Secret of Great Leaders (www page). URL [http://govleaders.org/motivation\\_secrets.htm](http://govleaders.org/motivation_secrets.htm)
  12. Herzberg, F. (1964). The Motivation-Hygiene Concept and Problems of Manpower Personnel Administrator (271 pp, 3-7).
  13. Dobre, C., Bajenaru, L., Marinescu, I. A., & Tomescu, M. (2019, May). Improving the quality of life for older people: from smart sensors to distributed platforms. In 2019 22nd International Conference on Control Systems and Computer Science (CSCS) (pp. 636-642). IEEE.
  14. Satyendra (2017). Employee Motivation and Organizational Performance. <https://www.ispatguru.com/employee-motivation-and-organizational-performance/>
  15. Holman, D., Johnson, S., & O'Connor, E. (2018). Stress management interventions: Improving subjective psychological well-being in the workplace. *Handbook of well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
  16. Connerley, M. L., & Rynes, S. L. (1997). The influence of recruiter characteristics and organizational recruitment support on perceived recruiter effectiveness: Views from applicants and recruiters. *Human Relations*, **50(12)**, 1563-1586.
  17. Fernandez, S. (2007). What works best when contracting for services? An analysis of contracting performance at the local level in the US. *Public Administration*, **85(4)**, 1119-1141.
  18. Mayhew, C. (2018). Exploration of the links between workplace stress and precarious employment. *Work Stress: Studies of the Context, Content and Outcomes of Stress: A Book of Readings*, Chris Peterson (ed.), Routledge, New York, USA, unnumbered.