

Effect of Knowledge of Task on Organizational Productivity in Nigeria

¹Erigbe, Patience
Ajirioghene PhD &

²Ilori, Adeyinka
Adekunle PhD

¹*Department of Business Administration, College of Management and Social Sciences, Oduduwa University, Ipetumodu, Ile-Ife, Osun State, Nigeria.*

²*Department of Accounting, Babcock Business School, Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun state. Nigeria.*

Abstract

The growth of any organization as well as its survival in a turbulent business environment is a function of well-trained employees. Knowledge of task is imperative for all employee of an organization for them to be more productive. Training is a process designed to equip non-managerial employees with the skill requirements for their category of work in spite of the knowledge they already possess. However, such knowledge form the foundation upon which training is built. The study made use of Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill formular to get it's sample size. Survey design was use, as well as Primary data. A simple regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis. Tested hypotheses showed a significant relationship between employees' knowledge of task performance and productivity in family businesses with a p-value=0.000; r=0.321. This evidence affirmed that knowledge from training enhanced productivity. Result shows that there is a significant relationship between employee knowledge of task and productivity.

Keywords:
Productivity,
Knowledge of Task,
Organization,
Employee,
Performance.

Background to the Study

The growth of any organization as well as its survival in a turbulent business environment is a function of well-trained employees (Montagne, 2008). Employees are the dynamic resources required to realize the aims, goals, mission, objectives and vision of a business enterprise (Murray, 2007). Most organizations are now re-emphasizing the need to train their employees in recent years. Training is expected to generate enthusiasm for creating new ideas, and is mutually beneficial to employer and employees. (Madu-Alabi & Gakure, 2014). The sign of development are positive growth and progress. Development presumably deals with predicted needs and the ability to respond to the needs by appropriate steps in the present (Erigbe & Kabuoh, 2014). Organizations are to support their workers, learning goal, orientation program as this would have positive consequences in the organizations' performance. Career development should be continuous process to keep a leader abreast to changing situations. (Kabuoh & Otsupius, 2015).

Employees need knowledge and skills to perform their tasks effectively, and meet the expected targets. Knowledge changes with time, and should be regularly improved. Lack of updated knowledge of task in the emergence and introduction of advance technology is an impediment to productivity. There is indeed a problem when regular employee training is not given consideration. There is also the general observation by Nwaze (2011) that many organizations in Nigeria are not practically committed to employee training. According to the observation, commitment is only principally on paper and not in practical terms. Using the banking sector as an example, Ayodele (2012) adds that if the manner of recruitment in many banks is controversial, then the issue of training or lack of it is patently scandalous. There are high financial training figures on paper, but a small proportion of executives only benefit from training. The persistent pressure on companies' treasury position as well as the exigency of survival compels many organizations to either reduce the financial vote set aside for training or suspend training temporarily (Editorial, 2011). When some employees are engaged without equipping them with the relevant tools by way of training and having understanding of the needs of customers, the short-fall is performance deficiency among such employees. On the other hand, records have shown that employees are dispatched to the training school for a very short period without any systematic identification of training needs and subsequent evaluation of the impact of training (Ayodele, 2012). In the circumstances prevailing, it is uncertain that any meaningful impact is made on the performance, confidence or skill level of employees who are dispatched to attend an adhoc training programme that is sometimes a purely academic exercise rather than being industrial needs-based training programme.

Objective of the Study

The objective of the study is to determine the relationship between employees' knowledge of task and productivity;

Literature Review

Conceptual Framework

Knowledge of Task Performance

The dynamism of employees is acknowledged particularly when they are adequately motivated. Evidently, since human resources (individuals and their potential) constitute any purposeful organization, the way they are handled must be systematic with caution. They must also be driven to grow. Evidently, any business organization that is unable to develop the skills and knowledge of its workforce, and utilize them effectively, risks extinction (Dale & Fort, 2003).

Manpower development refers to the efforts of an organization to improve employees' ability to perform a job and effectively handle organizational roles. It is an organized procedure by which staff acquires knowledge and skills for a definite purpose (Fikipe, 1980). Fikipe sees development as the process by which managers acquire skills and competences in their present jobs as well as develop capacity for future challenging tasks. But development in terms of employees' advancement on the job builds on training. Development in this context is in relation to helping employees, not only managers, to grow in knowledge, expertise, experience and exposure which could add value to their productive capacity.

This study likens human capital to human resources. Wealth creation or profit maximization by business organizations cannot be realized without the ideal stock of human capital. In simple terms, the human capital must be relevant, well-organized, disciplined, focused and adequately equipped for organizational objectives. Therefore an organization is faced with the challenge of human capital development in a volatile business environment. The challenge becomes a Herculean task for organizations when the educational system does not reflect the needs of industries in its curricula.

According to Joseph (2002), human capital development is the process of acquiring and increasing the number of persons who possess education, skills, experience and the motivation required to achieve set objectives in a corporate setting. Blake (2006) views human capital development slightly differently, although still retaining the common thrust of knowledge and skills emphasis. According to him, "Human capital development is the systematic process of helping individuals to increase their knowledge, improve on their skills, adopt new techniques the ultimate of which is to become more effective and efficient in delivery of production or services..." (Blake, 2006:103).

From the views of Joseph and Blake, it can be inferred that human capital development is another process of adding value to individuals. Not only does it improve the quality of human potential, it leaves a positive impact on the organization of which the individuals are members. The variables of new knowledge, skills, experience, new techniques and motivation are valid components of human capital development.

However, Wessinger (2001) only considers human capital development as purposeful attempt to shape individuals' attitudes in response to target objectives as well as exposure to customized training. Wessinger (2001) believes that education is the primary foundation upon which attitude formation and requisite training can thrive but with objectives. Consequently, human capital development is and, must be objective-driven. Human capital development therefore embodies investment in individuals and their creation abilities.

Broadly, and from above, human capital development is defined as including investment by society in education, investment by employers of labour in training and investment by individuals in their personal value growth. Investment has both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. In other words, human capital formation (development) includes not only expenditure on education and training, but it also includes the development of the right attitudes towards productive/service activity.

Essentially, the ultimate aim of productivity or any productivity programme is to provide better quality of goods and services which are affordable to people. But at the level of industry, human capital development, as a process, prepares employees to accept attitudinal changes and challenges to meet productivity goals, corporate targets and consumers' needs (Willoughby, 2000). The other logic to the imperative of human capital development is the variability of educational value, knowledge and content. For the purpose of illustration, an individual's stock of knowledge can depreciate overtime, but with increasing modern research findings and exposure to challenging industrial cases, employees may be equipped to help an organization translate its objectives into substance. This evidently illustrates human capital development.

Once individuals are engaged by organizations for the performance of certain tasks, the issue of training cannot be ignored. Training provides individuals with the right attitude and job culture. Cole (2001) defines training as any learning activity which is directed towards the acquisition of specific knowledge and skills for the purpose of performing a task. But Lander (2003) sees training as a process of possessing a specific skill for performing a job. From the above definitions, it is instructive to note that the focus of training is the job. The objective of job training is thus to enable an individual employee perform his job in such a way as to meet the expected standards.

Training is a process designed to equip non-managerial employees with the skill requirements for their category of work in spite of the knowledge they already possess. However, such knowledge forms the foundation upon which training is built. Training attempts to ensure that employees adapt themselves to methods of work and other work requirements without compromising quality (Lander, 2003). Training also induces a pattern of job behavior in employees. In simple terms, training is to induce a suitable change in the individual at work. This is against the background that most individuals join an organization with a pre-conceived idea of how the job for which they are employed is done. Consequently, the training they receive is to modify that conception and give them a new orientation in a changing business environment.

Development, on the other hand, is to any learning activity which is directed towards future needs rather than present needs, and is concerned with career growth than immediate performance (Shubbin, 2004). However, Lander as cited above insists that development is the process of enabling managerial employees to improve their ability and competence. Price (2005) has also indicated that systematic human resource development maximizes the human capital of an organization thereby helping the personnel to enhance their competencies. The focus of development appears to be primarily on an organization's future manpower requirements. Not only that, it also focuses on the growth of individuals especially those occupying managerial and sensitive positions. Development is a strategic process of organizational renewal, although a wide variety of approaches is possible, and an attempt to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization.

Basically however, training and development are not just embarked upon. There is a systematic procedure which begins with the identification of training needs. Training needs as reported by Madu (2004) reflect the gap between the knowledge, skills and attitude required by an incumbent employee to execute a given task and his present stock of skills and knowledge. Hameed and Waheed (2011) see training need as a gap between the kind of performance or competence which the employee is expected to possess. Obviously, from the views expressed by made, Hameed and Waheed, the gap in question or need grows out of an operating problem. When the totality of the skills and knowledge for the performance of a job is examined, it may reveal a shortfall. It is this shortfall that signifies the need for training.

According to Apata (2005), the main thrust of any training need analysis is towards identifying the elements of knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes required by the job, taking into consideration the context of the particular organization. The determination of training needs creates the basis for planning an appropriate training programme, choosing the training methods and training contents (Datur, 2010). However, such training needs must align with organizational needs at the time. But, of course, all manpower planning, training and development effort will not produce the desired results if there is no effective reward system which will considerably motivate employees.

Growth and continuity of every organization are incumbent on the quality of human capital (employees). Consequently, in many significant ways, the human capital is unique and will remain the major determining factor in the success or failure of an organization. For this obvious reason manpower planning and development are indispensable pre-requisites. But they cannot be effectual without an attendant reward scheme that responds to employees' aspirations. In the same vein, it strives to ensure that there is no gap or shortfall in skills. It provides the rationale for training and development of employees. The most basic feature in any manpower programme is knowledge of existing jobs in the organization. Manpower planning points at job analysis, which is a detailed and systematic study of all facts about a job (Enwerem, 2006). Such facts embrace duties, abilities, responsibilities, working conditions, skills, knowledge

required to perform the job and relation to other jobs.

While the performance of a corporate organization can be determined and measured, employees' performance ultimately translates to corporate performance. However, employee performance does not just arise, it is conditioned by environmental factors, training, development and attitudes.

Productivity Dimension

There is implicit logic in the philosophy that business organizations are responsible stakeholders in advancing the cause of society, and if this is valid enough, then they have a responsibility to develop their human capital at least for promotion of their economic purpose and perpetual existence. The existing relationship or rapport between society and business organizations suggest that organizations devise means by which they can serve the society better. One of the best means is human capital development with the total involvement of business organizations, and not only through the provision of funds.

Governments and private organizations have dwelt on the imperative of national productivity and corporate productivity respectively. Productivity is not a chance occurrence; it is the product of human capital development and other inherent variables. Puja (2001) has asserted that the components of human capital development invariably drive productivity. Notably, the extent and quality of human capital determine the value of corporate productivity. In the same vein, national productivity is a function of a nation's educational system. All areas of human endeavour experience measures of productivity. Both the private and public sectors thrive on productivity. Without productivity, resources are wasted and there will be economic stagnation. Indeed, productivity is pervasive. Productivity is notably considered as the measurable relationship between output and input (Rhajan, 1995). Productivity is currently seen as an attitude, a way of life, and a measure of human efforts for economic and commercial purposes.

Caleb (1976) defines productivity as the relationship between output of good/services and input of resources, which is expressed in a ratio form. Productivity is the efficient use of resources such as labour, capital, land, materials, energy and information in the production of goods and services. McBeath (1974) views productivity as a measure of production efficiency, and a ratio of output to input. Productivity is the key to a higher standard of living and improvement of the economy. It generates rewards/profits to organizations hence management is more concerned about it. The continued survival of any enterprise is founded on increased productivity, with environment. Productivity is a key concept in national life. Every economy thrives on productivity. The economic survival of individuals depends on their productivity. In real terms, development of rural and urban areas depends on sectoral productivity (Price, 2011).

Due to its central importance to competitiveness and world prosperity, the issue of productivity has become a matter of research and economic interest since the beginning of industrialization. Productivity is perhaps one of the most important basic variables

which govern economic production (Singh, Motwani, & Kumar, 2000; Tangen, 2005). While high productivity is a significant source of competitive advantage for organizations (Grossman, 1993), it also contributes to the general well-being of society. Productivity tends to have significant effect on people's standard of living (Allmon et al., 2000).

Productivity is a commonly used but often poorly defined term that regularly appears in both academic and practical discussions. Definitions of productivity seem to be dependent on the reviewer's point of view and the context in which it is used. Studies in other disciplines examine productivity slightly from different viewpoints (Ghoabadian & Husband, 1990). In general, oral definitions of productivity aim to explain what it means while mathematical definitions are used as basis of measurement. The major objective of focus on productivity is not to explain, but to improve productivity in human organizations (Tangen, 2005).

In general, productivity is often defined as a relationship between output produced by a system and quantities of input factors utilized by the system to produce that output. Here, the output can be any outcome of the process, whether a product or service, while input factors consist of any human and physical resources used in a process. It follows that, in order to increase productivity, the system must either produce more goods or better goods with the same resources, or the same goods with fewer resources. Stated differently, productivity improvement refers to increase in the ratio of goods produced or services delivered in relation to resources used.

Productivity as a concept refers to a purely physical phenomenon and must therefore be defined as such, despite the difficulty that the definition imposes for the measurement of different quantities that do not apply the same standard. Productivity is closely related to value creation, use and availability of resources. This implies that a company's productivity is reduced if its resources are not properly used or if there is lack of resources. On the other hand, high productivity is achieved when activities and resources used in the process add value to the goods produced (Tangen, 2005). Productivity is directed towards the maximization of returns at a minimal cost. Nevertheless, management is usually interested in increasing output and creating wealth. According to Willoughby (2002), in order to increase productivity, it is essential to make some economic choices.

Productivity may describe any of the following lines of action: That is, increasing the level of output while keeping the level of input constant; increasing the level of output while at the same time reducing the level of input; keeping the level of output at a smaller rate; or increasing both, but keeping input at a smaller rate (Wessinger, 2005). Productivity is a critical factor for the continued existence of corporate business organizations. Managers of business organizations expect employees to operate efficiently. Many organizations are created to achieve certain specified goals and objectives. Thus, every effort as well as observed variables is reasonably channeled towards productivity.

Theoretical Review

Scientific Management Theory

In essence scientific management theory attempts to provide more knowledge about how work can be done to realize productivity. A focus of scientific management theory is the systematic selection of employees and their progressive training and development such that employees can handle jobs for which they are best suited mentally, physically and professionally. It is the belief of members of the scientific school of management that with proper co-ordination, friendly co-operation and good disposition from management, employees can perform better. But, it is a function of management to understand the conditions under which employees will be both effective and efficient.

Emphasis is similarly placed on work/organizational ethics. Employers must be familiar with work rules and regulations. It is these rules and regulations that guide their conduct, relationship and condition them towards management's expectation in different circumstances. In essence scientific management theory provides a relational link between management and staff but with primary attention to efficiency in production. According to Ndiokho (1982), the aims of human capital development for any business organization include, but not restricted to:

“Obtaining and retaining the quantity and quality of manpower required to nurture, develop and ensure the survival and successful growth of business now and in future; Making the best and effective use of manpower resources; Being able to anticipate the problems that may likely arise from possible surpluses or shortages of manpower”.

The above aims could be taken as primary targets of human capital development for any business organization. In the light of these aims, it would be appropriate to argue that optimal utilization of available stock of employees is one of the basic concerns of modern management while embarking on the process of human capital development. Cole (2007) takes a slightly different examination of the technical view of human capital development. Accordingly, he likens human capital development to employee development, which is the combination of training and development that employees require to enable them meet organizational targets. It has become a concern of many companies to improve the job-oriented interpersonal skills of employees. Companies want their employees to communicate and convey information effectively, to be able to interpret others' emotions, to be open to others' feelings, to be able to resolve conflicts and to arrive at resolutions. By acquiring these skills, the employees, those in management positions and customers can maintain compatible relationships.

Corporate organizations are interested in employees' performance, which is critical to corporate productivity. At the point of employee engagement, one of the factors for consideration is whether the prospective employee has the requisite ability, experience, core competence and the skills required to perform the tasks embedded in the schedule of duty (Henze, 2006). Performance in essence is the individual's ability to carry out a task or series of tasks as well as meet the expected objective within a given period of time (McGovern, 2009).

Contingency Theory

The most common procedure for assessing productivity changes is the development of certain indices (Singh et al., 2000). Although partial productivity ratios are widely used in industry, they are not robust enough to give comprehensive details of productivity improvement of business organizations (Hannula, 2002).

Many assumptions are made in the work place, based on observations of the workers, and their relationship with management. The types of tasks being performed as well as the types of employees which make up a particular organization set the stage for the types of leadership roles which may be assumed by managers (McGregor, cited in Heil, Bennis & Stephens, 2000). Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y, and William Ouchi's Theory Z have all proven to be useful in the management of employees. Many companies have successfully integrated similar economic and human principles in their management style. The combination of both Theories Y and Z has been shown to be an effective framework for American companies (Hannula, 2002). Indeed, Theory X is still prominent in the business world. Most managers, however, do not apply the management style until given the opportunity to see how their employees feel about the management style that is being used.

A number of studies have been conducted to ascertain the significance of productivity and employees' attitude (Cloninger, 2010). What makes an organization relevant to the environment in which it operates is its productivity as long as it is acceptable to its target market. Irrespective of the theory that is applied, employee performance is the outcome of two major sets of factors (Clause, 2008). The first set includes individuals' aptitudes, abilities and knowledge which need to be combined to produce the best fit for intended outcomes. This is the finding of Clause (2008) in a study. The second set includes attitudes, motives, needs and expectations which an individual brings to the work environment. These factors play an influential role in helping employees to adopt appropriate behaviour.

Armstrong (cited in Qureshi, Shahjehan, Zia-ur-Rehman & Afsar, 2010) acknowledged that an increasing number of organizations resort to performance management system in order to achieve better results and better psychosomatic outputs (Chau, 2008) but performance management system is not being implemented in some organizations (Qureshi et al., 2010).

Methodology

The study made use of Survey design, making use of Questionnaire as the instrument used. Convenience sample technique was used. The minimum sample sizes required for different sizes of population at 95 per cent level of certainty are shown in Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007), at 95% level of certainty was used to determine sample size. For a population of between 4,800 and 5,000 at 5% margin of error, the minimum sample size is 357. The actual sample size formula given by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2007) is adopted as follows:

$$n^a = \frac{n \times 100}{re\%}$$

Where:

n^a is the actual sample size

n is the minimum sample size for a given population

$re\%$ is the estimated response rate

The estimated response rate for the research questionnaire was given as 70%.

$$n^a = \frac{357 \times 100}{70}$$

$$= \frac{35700}{70}$$

$$n^a = 510$$

sample size is 510 respondents.

Result Analysis

Table 1: Productivity

Items	Response Variables						% Responses					
	SA	A	PAD	D	SD	TOTAL	SA	A	PAD	D	SD	TOTAL
1	337	125	25	13	-	500	67	25	5	3	-	100
2	187	288	12	12	-	500	37	59	2	2	-	100
3	125	238	100	12	25	500	25	48	20	2	5	100
4	138	250	112	-	-	500	28	50	22	-	-	100
5	175	250	50	25	-	500	35	50	10	5	-	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 2: Knowledge of Task

Items	Response Variables						% Responses					
	SA	A	PAD	D	SD	TOTAL	SA	A	PAD	D	SD	TOTAL
1	200	200	75	25	-	500	40	40	15	5	-	100
2	88	100	200	88	24	500	18	20	40	18	4	100
3	75	237	88	100	-	500	15	47	18	20	-	100
4	187	238	25	50	-	500	37	48	5	10	-	100
5	175	186	75	64	-	500	35	37	15	13	-	100

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Productivity

In response to Item I, 337 in table 1, respondents (67%) and another 125 respondents (25%) representing a total of 462 respondents claimed that their contribution to their companies are high. Those who provided a contrary response constitute a sample proportion of 5% and 3% for Partially Agree or Disagree (PAD) and Disagree (D) respectively. For item 2, 187 respondents (37%) strongly agreed that they attain their work targets regularly. The same claim was asserted by 288 other respondents (59%) who simple agreed. 12 respondents (2%) expressed partial agreement while 12 others (2%) merely disagreed. There was no expression of strong disagreement. Item 3 was focused on whether

respondents are provided with all the resources required to perform their job. 125 respondents (25%) strongly agreed. It was the same view with 238 respondents (48%).

However, 100 others (20%) could neither wholly agree nor disagree that they are adequately provided with all working resources. The rest of the respondents, a total of 35 respondents or 7% expressed disagreement. Item 4 examined the performance of respondents' companies in relation to the attainment of overall targets. While 138 respondents (28%) indicated strong agreement, supported by 250 respondents (50%) affirming that their companies perform well because they regularly realize their overall targets, 112 other respondents (22%) were not completely certain of their views on their companies' overall target attainment. In response to item 5, a total of 425 respondents (175 respondents in favour of Strongly Agree; 250 respondents in favour of Agree) asserted that their performance is high when morale is high.

Knowledge of Task

Item I in Table 2 was focused on establishing whether employees perform their jobs well as a result of training. 400 respondents (200 respondents for each of Strongly Agree and Agree) perform their job very well because they are well trained, considering their responses. 75 other respondents (15%) provided a partial response, indicating that they neither fully agree nor disagree that they perform their job very well because they are properly trained. On the other hand, 25 respondents (5%) disagreed that they perform their job well as a result of being well trained. No strong disagreement was expressed by any respondent.

With reference to item 2, 88 respondents (18%) and another 100 respondents (20%) were in agreement that they are exposed regular training by their company. While 200 respondents (40%) were in partial agreement, 88 others (18%) disagreed and 24 others (4%) indicated strong disagreement. In essence, it can be acknowledged that a total of 112 respondents are not absolutely exposed to regular training by their company, which is inferred.

The subject of item 3 is provision of opportunity and encouragement to learn on the job. 75 respondents (15%) indicated a strong affirmation that their bosses provide the opportunity and encouragement to learn on the job. Similar affirmation was recorded by 237 other respondents (47%). While 88 other respondents (18%) provided a partial response, 100 others (20%) expressed total disagreement. There was no respondent with an indication of strong disagreement.

In response to item 4 which was designed respondents (18%) provided a partial response, 100 others (20%) expressed total disagreement to obtain data on employees' knowledge of the job performed. 425 respondents with response options of 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree' as reflected in the table above, affirmed that knowledge of the job they do can only be obtained from continuity on the job and job content. Only 25 respondents (5%) expressed partial response. This in essence implies that they neither absolutely agreed nor disagreed. However, 50 others (10%) would not acknowledge that knowledge of their job could be obtained from job continuity and job content.

Item 5 was intended to assert the role of employees' knowledge of the job and bosses' co-operation in job performance. 175 respondents (35%) affirmed strongly that their knowledge of the job will not yield good job performance without the co-operation of their bosses. The same view was upheld by 186 other respondents (37%). Although 75 other respondents (15%) indicated a partial response, 64 respondents (13%) expressed disagreement implying that even without their bosses' co-operation, their knowledge of the job will yield good job performance.

Table 3: Computation of Weighted Mean for Employees Knowledge of Task and Productivity

Items	SA (5)	A (4)	PAD (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	TOTAL	MEAN (X)
1	537(5)=2685	325(4)=1300	100(3)=300	38(2)=76	0	4361	4.361
2	275(5)=1375	388(4)=1552	212(3)=636	100(2)=200	24	3787	3.787
3	200(5)=1000	475(4)=1900	188(3)=564	112(2)=224	25	3713	3.713
4	325(5)=1625	488(4)=1952	137(3)=548	50(2)=100	0	4225	4.225
5	350(5)=1750	436(4)=1744	114(3)=456	89(2)=178	0	4128	4.128
Total Mean Score							20.214

Weighted Mean Score = $20.214/5=4.0428$

The Weighted Mean of 4.0428 is an indication of respondents' unanimity that employees' knowledge of tasks is crucial to organizational productivity. High morale, availability of work facilities and attainment of work targets are factors which contribute to productivity as evident from the result of analysis in this study.

The finding is in line with empirical evidence indicating that employee effectiveness is achieved through investment in customized training on the job (Yahaya, 2001). Choi and Turnbull (2008) in their study also confirmed that a positive correlation exists between employees' performance and the volume of information they have about the job. Some studies (Wang, 2006; Okereke and Igboke, 2011; Rajar, Furqan and Muhammed, 2011) have reported the impact of knowledge obtained through training in relation to jobs for which productivity targets are set.

Consequently, good job performance is a function of knowledge of the job as demonstrated by the job holder. However, empirical evidence reveals that good job performance is the result of multi variables which include both internal and external factors by the employee remains critical factor (Olaniyan and Ojo, 2008). One major implication of the finding of this study on employee knowledge of job is the role of regular training and employees' commitment to build on the knowledge they acquire from performing their tasks regularly if they stay on the job long enough. This is consistent with the findings from a study by Abbas, Hamed and Waheed (2011) who reported that employee performance contributes to organizational productivity.

Test of Hypothesis
 Table 4: Hypothesis

Construct Association	R	T		p-Value	Significant Yes/No	Hypothesis
Employees' Knowledge of Task a Performance and Productivity	0.321	7.554	0.05	0.0006	Yes	Reject H ₀

R=Correlation Coefficient

t=Calculated t-value of the Correlation coefficient

Interpretation

From table 4, given the p-Value of 0.0006 we reject the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance and thus conclude that there is significant relationship between employees' knowledge of task performance and productivity in family-owned businesses.

Discussion

A significant positive relationship exists between employee knowledge of task performance and productivity. The strong positive correlation between employee knowledge of task performance and productivity suggests that knowledge of a job and how it is performed is not only critical input (resource) in the productivity process, but it also largely determines whether productivity targets will be attained (Thang, Thu & Buyens, 2008).

Knowledge from training is significant as it helps employees to improve both performance and productivity. This view is demonstrated in one of the findings of Thang Thu and Buyens, (2008). Although Campbell's (2011) findings indicate that productivity correlates with many inputs variables, the strength of such relationships is neither constant nor strongly reliable.

Evidence by Bole cited in Okereke and Igboke (2011) similarly proves that the acquisition of knowledge or skills for particular tasks enhances job performance.

From another technological perspective, Blau and Meyer (2006) demonstrated validity in their documented evidence showing some consistency in the impact of employees' possession of technological knowledge on work performance as evidence of efficiency. The result affirms that correlation between knowledge of task performance and productivity at the employee level. (Brech, 2005) on one hand, and the inseparable association between knowledge of work process and corporate productivity (Bourne et al, 2005; Chau, 2008).

In the same vein, Lyod's (2011) study of selected medium scale businesses is replete with empirical evidence affirming that a good business productivity is the direct result of efficient demonstration of both knowledge of what to do and good performance. Hence,

both knowledge of task and performance by employees share same good correlation. The researcher equated productivity to performance. While in other studies (Adiwaty & Santoso, 2010; Meyer & Davis, 1999; Khan, 2010), there is a discernible delineation between productivity and performance.

Many studies have focused on several variables in order to establish their relationship with productivity or ascertain their impact on productivity. A deviation from such studies is the study on work process (methodology) and employee productivity in the information technology industry (Atkinson, 2012). Substantial empirical evidence supports the conclusion that work process is inefficient without knowledge of the work process (Atkinson, 2012) and work process contributes significantly to employee productivity in the information technology industry.

The findings of Muzaffar, Salamat and Ali (2012) are in line with Atkinson's (2012) results. Using the Pakistani information technology sector, Muzaffar, Salamat and Ali (2012) confirmed the positive correlation between training programme (knowledge and skills acquired from a training programme) and employee work outcome (productivity). Consequently, there is an observed relationship between employee learning and productivity. In another public sector study, job training and reward were reported to be positively correlated with productivity (Ebiimobowei, Tebepah & Wisdom, 2012).

While Mendes, Ruo and Anderson (2013) discovered no positive relationship between the knowledge of work by foreign doctors in the Philippines and their productivity, Flamin and Mendes (2011) recorded a significant relationship between knowledge of work performance contributed by nurses and their productivity in the health sector of Bahrain. The constraint established in both studies is the disparity in the operational definition of productivity and the restriction of productivity to individual medical workers. Other studies (Perot & Juan, 2010; Atkinson, 2012; Khan, 2010) restricted productivity to the corporate level.

Performance translates to productivity. In another study, Khan and Khan (2011) established a significant correlation between employee training and organizational performance. Generally, organizations show more interest in, and are motivated by the potential as well as actual performance of both prospective and incumbent employees. Among other factors, the performance of any employee is determined more significantly by work knowledge acquired through training (Khan & Khan, 2011; Atkinson, 2012). Knowledge of job task by employees is central to productivity performance in any business organization likewise family-owned businesses. This assertion is buttressed by the outcome of the relational hypothesis between employee's knowledge of task performance and business productivity, which shows that the two decisional variables have significant relationship as indicated by the probability value of 0.0006. It therefore follows from the outcome of the study that employees need to have an in-depth knowledge/understanding of job task and content in order to make significant contribution of business productivity. The significant relational value of productivity and knowledge of task performance was corroborated by the result of static regression

analysis, which indicates that knowledge of task performance is a significant explanatory factors to increase in productivity. Nur (2012) argued that knowledge of job task can be achieved through deliberate job training of employees by management on organizational “modus operandi” and continuous employees oriented programmes designed to maintaining update of dynamics in operational practices of the business. Employees knowledge of job task and content plays a significant role towards increase in productivity of business organization. The importance of job design in boosting individual's productivity and performance have been discussed extensively in few studies (Hameed & Amjad, 2009; Ali & Aroosiya, 2010; Fernando & Ranasinghe, 2010; Dere, 2011).

Conclusion

A significant relationship exists between employee knowledge of task and productivity. Knowledge of task is a function of training, coaching, good supervision and repetitive performance of the job. Increase in knowledge of task \, enable employees to be more efficient and productive.

Recommendations

a) In the first instance, regular training of employees is imperative. Training improves skills and gives insight into new methods of work. Training is a tool that inevitably enhances efficiency and rapid attainment of productivity (Shstry & Kartini, 2012). The development of positive attitudes to work is made possible through appropriate training, coaching and mentoring. While training is recommended, the appointment of trained human resource managers or personnel managers is *sine qua non*. They are in a professional stance to oversee human resource functions. It may also be ideal to invite human resource consultants to handle employee training programmes.

b) In other cases, management consultants may be invited to investigate observed personnel problems upon which decisions will be made based on recommended solution options. Indeed, managers in family-owned business organizations need training and development programmes, depending on their areas of corporate responsibility. Training should therefore not be restricted to junior staff and supervisors alone. Business owners have the tendency of relegating training to the background since they are not always disposed to making financial investment in staff training. This is the result of misconception of training and its benefits. It is appropriate for owners of family businesses to be engaged in personal development and studies on business management and human resource management.

References

- Adeyemo, A. (2004). Productivity in the Public Sector. *Journal of Personnel* 6(3), 17.
- Adiwaty, M.R., & Santoso, B. (2010). The factors influencing employee performance in Pt Hikmah Sejahtera Surabaya. *Journal of Economics, Business and Accountancy Ventura* 13 (3), 107-127
- Allmon, G., Franklin, C., Bedwell, F. & Vikens, S. (2000). Taxonomic perception in workplace culture. *Journal of Psychosomatic Studies* 9 (2&3).
- Ali, H. & Aroosiya, M. (2010). "Impact of job Design on Employees' Performance." <[www.ibimapublishing.com/journals/JOKM/2013/128970...>](http://www.ibimapublishing.com/journals/JOKM/2013/128970...)
- Andre, A. de Waal, & Vincent, P. (2007). The effect of performance management on the organizational results of a bank. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. 14 (5), 56-78
- Anjan, R. (2011). Strategic positioning and capacity utilization: Factors in planning for profitable growth in banking. *Journal of Performance Management* 16, (5), 23-58
- Apata, (2005). Impact of evaluation Standards on training and Development programmes. "A report of MBA study". Netherlands: Business School Netherlands.
- Asiegbu, N. (2004). "Human Resources Development in Nigeria." Lagos: Forebearer Publishers Limited.
- Atkinson, M. (2012). Theorizing performance appraisal from the human perception. *Journal of Work Psychology* 14 (7), 213-242
- Ayodele, B. (2012). "The risks of avoiding Training". *Business Horizon*, (1), 7
- Balogun, A.A. (2011). Private sector Business productivity: The infrastructural Impact. *Journal of African Political Economy* 5(4).
- Basset, G.O. (2010), "Schumpeterian view of entrepreneurs: Work relations perspective". *Journal of Business Management* 22(9).
- Bennis, C. (2001). "Performance Expectation: A theoretical Analysis". *Training Review Update* 2(4).
- Bernolak, C.N. (1997). Determining the parametrics of productivity in public sector establishments. *Journal of Work Study* 16(10).
- Blake, C. (2006). "Motivation of Organizations." London: Smithy Academy.

- Blau, W., & Meyer, K. (2006). Modern Application of the contingency view in the information communication technology industry. *Journal of Computer Studies* 10(3)
- Bourne, M., Kennerley, M., & Franco-Santos, M. (2005). Managing through measures: A study of impact on performance. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology*. 6 (5), 76-86
- Brayfield, A., & Walter, C. (1995). "Identifying employees' satisfying factors in the automobile industry". *Psychological Bulletin*. 52 (5), 84
- Brech, N. (2005). "Principles and Practice of Management". London: Longman Publishers.
- Broman, Y. (2004). Perceptual variants of organizational culture in multinational Companies. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 26(9).
- Caleb, I. (2006). Nigeria's mono-style Economy. *Journal of Political Economy* 2(4), 45-53
- Campbell, T. (2011). Measuring employee efficiency in the automobile industry. *Journal of Production Management* 19 (6), 801-822
- Chau, V.S. (2008). "The Relationship of Strategic performance Management to team strategy, company performance and organizational effectiveness". *Team Performance Management* 14(3&4), 121-131
- Clause, T.S., Jones, K.T., & Rich, J.S., (2008). "ppraising employee performance Education system. *CPA Journal*.
- Cloninger, A.S (2010). "Organizational Culture and Behaviour". Florida: Kenegan Publishers
- Cole, A. (2001). "Personnel Management Training". London: Collins Publishers.
- Cole, G. A. (1988). "Management: Theory and Practice". London: ELBS Publications.
- Cole, G. A. (2006). "Personnel Management" London: ELBS Publications.
- Dale, E., & Fort, F. (2003, May 24). "What do managers do with employees?". *Daily Voice*, 21.
- Daturn, B. (2001). Management Effectiveness: Training approach. *Personnel Management Journal*. 27(3), 43-63

- Dellam, O. (1989). Approaches to retraining quality Staff. *Journal of Human Resources Studies*.16(3), 94.
- Dere, S.N.D. (2011). "A diagnostic exploration of campus recreation using the work design questionnaire".(Master's thesis, Texas State University). Retrieved from<https://digital.library.txstate.edu/handle/10877/3341>
- Drecher, D.L. (2007). "African Political Economy and the West. 2nd edition". New Jersey. Baysyl Educational Publishers.
- Ebimobowei, A., Tebepah, S.F., & Wisdom, S.C. (2012). Human resource development mechanism and the performance of public sector accountants in Nigeria. *Current Research Journal of Social Science* 4 (3), 61-72
- Editorial (2011). "For the Economy, a Compass". *Zenith Economic Quarterly* 7(2), 4
- Erigbe, P & Kabuoh M, (2014) Leadership challenges and manpower development in Nigerian oil Sector. *International journal of entrepreneurial development and science research* 2(1) 104 – 120.
- Fernando, A.,& Ranasinghe, G. (2010). "The Impact of job design and Motivation on employees productivity as applicable in the context of Sri Lankan software engineers: A HR perspective". Paper presented in the International Conference on Business & Information, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.
- Fikipe, B. (1980). "Groundwork in Manpower Development". New Jersey: Dawjones Publications.
- Flamin, K., & Mendes, P. (2011). Work attitude factor in the productivity process. *Journal of Analytical Work Studies* 6 (3), 234-245
- Gaderick, M. (1999). Performance-induced training and goal attainment. *Journal of Behavioural Science* 11 (3), 101-120
- Griffin, R.W., & McMahan, G.C. (1994). "Motivation through job design. Greenberg, J. (ed.), Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science. Hillsdale, .Erlbaum Associates, 32
- Grossman, A. (1993). "Repositioning family business for global Intelligence Economic Forum". SA. Johannesburg.
- Hannula, T. (2002). Gender and performance: A correlational study. *International Journal of Labour Relations* 16(5).

- Harding, H. (2010). "Management Appreciation" London: Pitman.
- Haslinda, A., & Mahyuddin, M.Y. (2009). The effectiveness of training in the Public Service. *American Journal of Scientific Research* 6, 39-51
- Heil, G., Bennis, W., & Stephens, D. (2000). "Douglas McGregor Revisited: Managing the Human Side of the Enterprise." New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Henze, R. (2006). "Vision through human capital". *The Personnel* 3(1), Ser
- Joseph, N. (1992, May 24). "What do managers do with employees?" *Daily Voice* 21.
- Kabuoh, M. N & Otsupius I. (2015). "The Impact of learning-goal orientation on leadership competence in an organization". 3(1) 1-7.
- Khan, M. A. (2010). Effects of human resource management practice on organizational performance – An empirical study of oil and gas industry in Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*. 24, 64-71
- Lander, P.(2003). Human Development in Organizations. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 1(2), 70 - 83
- Lucas, E. (2004). Attitudinal Interference in work Studies. *Journal of Productivity Measurement* 18(3).
- Lunenburg F.C. (2011). Self-efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. *International Journal of Management, Business and Administration*. 14(1), 18-23
- Luthans, F. (1989),. Business growth deriving from the motivational concept. *Journal of Business Development* 23(11).
- Lyod, Z. (2011). Attitudinal Determinants of corporate performance in Latin America. *International Journal of Performance Management* 24 (7).
- Mado-Alabi C.A & Gakure R.W. (2014). Effect of training and development on the performance of garment manufacturing small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Kaduna metropolis. *International journal of development strategies in humanities, management and social sciences*. 4(2), 195-207.
- Madu, C.M. (2004). Training techniques for maximum efficiency. *ASCON Journal of Administration* 4(3), 86-99

- McBeath, G. (2004). "Productivity Through People: A Practical Guide". New York, Preston Press
- McCulom, E. (2001). "Manpower Development". New York: Casey Publishers Inc.
- McGovern, K.L. (2009). Systematic Assessment of corporate Productivity. *Regional Journal of Work Methods*. 8(4).
- McVale, T.(2006). "Organization of Training". New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Medori, K. & Steeple, G. (2000). "Restructuring an organization for effectiveness. In Baiki, J.A. (ed) Organizational Structure New Delhi, Prasahad Publishers.
- Mendes, K. (2003). "The Success of Corporate Business". New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Meyer, E., & Kanov, B. (2009). Performance appraisal conflict and resolution. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. 14 (5), 116-120
- Moyen, W. (2011). Productivity matrix in ancillary production. *Journal of Production Management* 19 (6), 903-915
- Murray, O.S. (2007). "HRM technology dimension and new people Management".. *Occupational Psychology Review* 21(5).
- Muzaffar, M.U., Salamat, H.S.H., & Ali, M.N. (2012). Impact of training on employees' outcome in the IT sector in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 12 (6), 90-107
- Nur, I. Y., Mohamad, N. M., Siti, A. N., & Rusnah, J.(2012). "Job design and knowledge productivity: A conceptual framework; Proceeding of the 19th International Business Information Management (IBIMA)Conference, Barcelona
- Nwaze, C. (2011). "Quarterly and internal control in Banks: Corporate Governance". *Corporate Management*. 5
- Okereke, C.I.,& Igboke, B.N.(2011). Training, Manpower Development and job performance: Perception and relevance among civil servants in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, 3(6), 87-92
- Price, F. (2011). "Human Resources Management". New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Puja, P. N. (2001). "Organisational change and Research". *Personnel*, 54(6), 271-289

- Rhajan, P. (1995). "Economic Development and National Productivity". New Delhi: Prasad Publishers.
- Rice, G. A. (1999). Integrating employees into the business objectives. *Industrial Horizon*. 4(5), 16-25
- Santos, A., & Stuart, M. (2003). "Employee perceptions and their influence on training effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Journal* 13 (1), 27-46
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007) "Research Methods for Business Students". Fourth Edition, England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Shstry, G., & Kartini, G.K. (2012). Human capital response to globalization: Education and information technology. *The Journal of Human Resource* 42 (2), 99
- Singh, H., Motwani, J., & Kumar, A. (2000). "A review and analysis of the state-of-the-art research on productivity measurement". *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 100(5), 78-115
- Stainer, F. (1997). Organizational motivational impact on workforce productive efficiency. *Journal of work study* 16 (10).
- Stephen, G.G., & Cristol, D.S. (2000). Employee attitude surveys: Examining the attitude of non-compliant employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 85 (2), 78
- Tangen, S. (2005). Demystifying productivity and performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance*. 12(3).
- Wessinger, G. (2005). From job design to performance Improvement. *Journal of Behavioural Science* 25(4), 73
- Willoughby, Y. (2002). Productivity and Organizational Culture. *Eastern Journal of Management* 9(4).
- Yahaya, K.A. (2007). Impact of investment in human resource training and development on employee effectiveness in Nigerian banks. *Journal of Human Capital Accounting*. 3 (2), 13
- Yulenson, T. (2002). "Staff Development for Succession". London: Nelson Publishers.