JETMASE
Journal of Emerging Trends in Management Sciences and Entrepreneurship
Volume 7(2), Pages 459 - 477 December, 2025
ISSN: 2384-762X
https://www.jetmase.com

Effect of Performance Management on Organizational Performance of Beverage Firms in Delta State, Nigeria.

Babawale, E.A.[1], Ethelmary Dim Ph.D[2] & Okoye, V.C.[3]
[1,2,&3]Department of Business Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Nigeria
Correspondence: chekwasvin@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This study examined the effect of performance management on the organizational performance of beverage firms in Delta State, Nigeria. The study was motivated by the growing concern over declining employee output and weak management systems within the beverage sector. Specifically, the research investigated the effects of staff development, reward policy, and employee recognition on task, adaptive, and contextual performance, respectively. A survey research design was adopted, and data were collected from a population of 1,842 employees across ten beverage firms. A sample size of 362 respondents was determined using Borg and Gall's formula. Primary data were obtained through a structured questionnaire validated by experts and tested for reliability using the test–retest method, yielding a coefficient of 0.79394. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics and inferential techniques, including correlation and multiple regression analysis, with the aid of SPSS. The regression results revealed that staff development, reward policy, and employee recognition had significant positive effects on organizational performance. The model's R^2 value of 0.690 indicated that 69% of variations in organizational performance were explained by the independent variables, confirming the model's strong explanatory power. The study concluded that effective performance management enhances organizational efficiency and competitiveness in the beverage industry. It recommended prioritizing continuous staff development, establishing fair and motivating reward policies, and strengthening employee recognition programs to sustain productivity and overall organizational growth in Delta State's beverage sector.

Keywords: Performance management, organizational performance, beverage firms.

1. INTRODUCTION

Performance management is very important to both employers and employees. From the employer's prospective, it is vital to understand how your employees contribute to the objectives of the organization. Adamu, Utomi, Yahaya,. & Abubakar, (2020) asserts that organizations can achieve their goals and objectives only through the combined efforts of their employees, and it is the task of management to get work done. Organization performance management is fundamental to effective operation of organizations.

Performance management is an integral part of the employees and organizations relationship. It is essentially an integrating activity that permeates every part of the operations of an organization Adnan Rouhi. & Maitha (2021) Mulenga Sikalumbi & Phiri (2022) maintain that "performance management is a broad concept that involves understanding and acting on the performance issues at each level of the organization, from individuals, teams and departments to the organization itself". These issues include leadership, decision making, motivation, encouraging innovation and risk taking among others. "Performance management is a continuous process of identifying, measuring and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization, and it is the systematic description of an employee's strengths and weaknesses" (Waleed, 2023).

Performance Management is the total system of managing the achievement of organizational goals and objectives through the assignment of duties and tasks to employees, appraising performance and institutionalizing a performance based reward system (Nuru & Istv´an (2023) Programmes are closely monitored with respect to both their implementation and their results; areas of under-performance are identified, and administrative and financial remedial action are taken. Remedial measures may take the form of disciplinary or other management action, improvement in personal incentives, the redirection of resources Munywoki, (2023) The main aim of performance management is to convert the unpolished capabilities of the employees of the organization into performance by eliminating the obstacles in between them, along with revitalization and the encouragement of the employees (Okero, Omari, & Wanyama, (2021).

The trend in business environment and the quest for operational excellence as well as the need to improve organization performance have made organizations to place emphasis on performance management system in order to enhance organizational effectiveness. Organizations whether construed as political, socio-technical, and rational systems, are increasingly demanding superior skills, operational capability, higher productivity, and improved work-related attitudes from their workers. These demands as from Krett (2000) necessitated the establishment of effective performance management system as a pre-requisite for evaluating organization performance to ensure conformity to standard. Behrey and Parton, (2008) contend that performance management initiatives should be aligned with organizational goals and focus on employees' capabilities, in areas of knowledge, skills and abilities which increase the overall performance of the organization, Martins (2019) argues that any organization that wishes to achieve its predestinated goal should conscientiously institutionalize performance management system as a policy variable, necessary for organizational effectiveness. David, Brian, and Adriana (2004) argue that performance management is a proactive process that management and employees undertake to improve and increase their effectiveness in the organization.

Muhammad (2023) asserts that organizations can achieve their goals and objectives only through the combined efforts of their employees, and it is the task of management to get work done. Organization performance management is fundamental to the effective operation of organizations. Performance management is an integral part of the employees and organizations relationship. It is essentially an integrating activity that permeates every part of the operations of an organization" (Mullines, 2007). Rajesh and Nishant (2013) maintain that "performance

management is a broad concept that involves understanding and acting on the performance issues at each level of the organization, from individuals, teams and departments to the organization itself". These issues include leadership, decision making, motivation, encouraging innovation and risk taking among others. "Performance management is a continuous process of identifying, measuring and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization, and it is the systematic description of an employee's strengths and weaknesses" (Rajesh and Nishant, 2013). Performance management is very important to both employers and employees. From the employer's prospective, it is vital to understand how employees contribute to the objectives of the organization. A good performance management system enables the organization to understand how its employees are currently performing. Muhammad (2013) posits that "performance management allows organizations to undertake a thorough assessment of the training needs of their employees, set development plans and it gives them the option of using the result of the performance management process to influence an individual's remuneration". Organizations can achieve their goals and objectives only through the combined efforts of their employees, and it is the task of management to get work done (Muhammad 2013). Organization performance management is fundamental to the effective operation of organizations. Abbas. & Cross (2019) performance management is an integral part of the employees and organizations relationship and "it is essentially an integrating activity that permeates every part of the operations of an organization.

Statement of Problem

It is said that the output of a worker is suffering from a neglect of the high order especially in beverages industry which obviously are about to collapse because of that and also could be directed to management's method of performance that is poor but still exist in the industry (Gerhart and Milkovich, 2020). This point has been reiterated by Watkins (2017) who explains that some industry association in Nigeria do not care about performance management review and they do not see it as a tool for improving performance given the fact that even recent researches see performance reviews as to be gainful to organizational performance in beverage manufacturing firms in Delta state. Aidah (2023) a worker might possess the strength together with the will, and all the materials needed together with understanding from authorities even so such workers are likely to lack optimum productivity. It is on this note that this study seems to be needful because of the importance on employment generation and services rendered to these beverage manufacturing firms. Reviewed empirical works done that related to performance management and organizational performance could not show how the establishments will find valid and required information about employee's feedback so as to have an environment that is enabling them so that they will put in more effort and produce more. Additionally, processes that are exhaustive about these establishments on how to retain their staff by training them regarding their cordiality between them and their management seem not to be in the past works studied. It is against this background that this attempt is made to the analyze performance management and organizational performance of beverages in delta state.

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to examine the performance management and organizational performance of beverages

industry in delta state. The specific objective of the study includes:
i To determine the effect of staff development on task performance of beverages firms in delta state.
ii To ascertain the effect of reward policy on adaptive performance of beverages firms in delta state.
iii To ascertain the effect of employee recognition on contextual performance of beverages firms in delta state.

Hypotheses
HO_1: Staff development does not have significant effect on task performance of beverages firms in Delta State?.
HO_2: Reward policy does not have significant effect on adaptive performance of beverages firms in Delta State?
HO_3: Employee recognition does not have significant effect on contextual performance of beverages firms in Delta State?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Review

Performance Management
Schiphorst (2015) describes performance management as the process of executing the performance plans of the organization with a view to achieving both the individual and organizational goals. Pre-set standards, detailing what are to be achieved are jointly set by the employees and managers on a continuous basis to improve organizational results. He explains that employees and their organizations have a need to interact mutually and employees can interactively give their opinion about the functioning of the organization and the whole process of performance management.

Mathias and Jackson (2016) define performance management as a process of identifying, measuring, communicating, developing and rewarding organization performance. This action must be linked to the overall organization's business strategy. Performance standards must be communicated to employees in writing. They suggest that managers and employees should commit to adopting the set standard as laid down goals or targets. In conducting performance reviews, managers should ensure that laid down goals and targets are followed. The result of an evaluation system can be either positive or negative leading to the staff member receiving rewards or losing out altogether (Dubrin, 2015). It, therefore, follows that the end result of performance review can be positive or negative. Positive performance review attracts reward such as promotion, an increase in pay, bonus etc., whereas negative performance evaluation attracts sanction such as demotion or dismissal.

Staff Development
Staff development is known as the practice of improving existing knowledge, skills, exposure as well an individual's abilities. Saleem and Mehwish (2011) contend that staff development is a well programmed enhancement of employees' skills to efficiently execute processes and operate in particular situations. According to Laing (2019), staff development indicates knowledge improvement and capabilities of staff members which results into better performance of employees. Khanfar (2011) contends that staff development enables individuals to use their potential capabilities.

Staff development is a practice that involves providing employees with opportunities for improving their skills, knowledge and performance in regard to organizational values and goals and in line with the employees' needs and interests (Young, 2018). Harris (2019) contends that staff development encompasses various human resource practices which include induction, selection, assignments, development and evaluation

among others. On the other hand, the development of staff can be categorized into advanced preparations and in- service education.

Reward Policy

Reward refers to all of the monetary, non-monetary, and psychological payments that an organization provides for its employees as part of employees relations. Reward is special payment for special work. Organizational Reward System is one of the methods of achieving control in organizations as well as defining the relationship with the individual employee and the organization (Kerr and Slocum, 2015), Armstrong (1999), defines reward management processes are concerned with the design, implementation and maintenance of reward systems geared to the improvement of organizational, team and individual performance.

Hellriegel et al (2019) says to be motivators, rewards must aligned with the things that people value. The rewards can be determined by simply asking the employees what they want. Employees will vary in their responses, because some employees value monetary rewards, whereas others value scheduling flexibility, especially training and development opportunities. Reward system is a framework to create performance reports in organizations. This approach enables management to translate mission goals and vision of the company, various business units and duties of directors to indicators related to performance evaluation (Bruggeman and Decoene, 2012). The core of reward systems is formed based on vision and strategy. This is actually the basis for financial goals; improve internal processes, customer satisfaction and employee growth and learning (Kaplan and Norton, 2016).

Employee Recognition

Pitts (2015) defines recognition as the demonstration of appreciation for a level of performance, an achievement or contribution to an objective which could be confidential or public, causal or formal, verbal or written (Stajkovic & Luthans 2013). Recognition is a process of giving an employee a certain status within an organization and it is a very crucial factor towards an employee motivation (Danish & Usman, 2010; Robbins, 2011). Romano (2013) points out that recognition are the component that is used to strengthen the relationship between organization and people (Zingheim & Schuster, 2019). According to Kim (2014), recognition is a timely formal or informal acknowledgement of a person's or team's behaviour, effort or business result that supports the organization's goals and values, and which has clearly been beyond normal expectations **(**Alam, Saheed & Akter, 2013; Robbins,2013; Caligiuri, Lepak & Bonache, 2010; Nelson, 2005; University of Iowa, 2019). Robbins, (2015) argues that employee recognition programs cover a wide spectrum of activities, ranging from spontaneous and private thank you, to formal programs in which specific types of behaviours are encouraged. However, Chiu, Luk, Tang and Kim, (2012); Randy, Luk, and Tang (2018), argue that in addition to money, non-monetary rewards such as recognition has been used to attract, retain and motivate employees towards achieving organizational goals around the world (Danish & Usman, 2010; Brun & Dugas, 2018)Thus, different researches have shown that employees who are not recognized in their work place tend to present negative outcomes such as high employee dissatisfaction, turnover and absenteeism (Hausknecht, Rodda, & Howard, 2019).

Organizational Performance

It has been very important for managers to understand which factors that influence an organization performance to take appropriate

steps to initiate them. Researchers have different opinions of performance, which remains to be a contentious issue among organizational researchers (Barney, 2008). However, Daft (2019), organizational performance is the organization's ability to attain its goals by using resources in an efficient and effective manner. Hefferman and Flood (2016) stated that as a concept in modern management, organizational performance suffered from problems of conceptual clarity in a number of areas. Richardo and Wade (2020) argued that performance measures could include result-oriented behaviour and relative measures, education and training, concepts and instruments, including management development and leadership training which were the necessary building skills and attitudes of performance management. Performance should be broader based on which include effectiveness, efficiency, economy, consistency behavior and normative measures (Richardo and Wade, 2020). Hence, organizational performance can be defined as the measurement of a company's performance using both monetary and non-monetary performance indicators (Ali, 2017). Gibson (2020) opined that organizational performance is the ability of a firm's capacity to meet its strategic goals.

Task Performance

Task performance can be defined as the effectiveness with which an employee performs activities that contribute to the organization's technical core, either directly by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services. Task Performance is a term how a person does on given task. Task performance is measured as response time, or it could be measured as accuracy. Task performance is a term for quantifying someone's performance on a task. Task performance is an understanding under contractual terms between an employer and an employee or a manager and a subordinate to perform an assigned task (Pradhan & Jena, 2016). Task performance can be defined as an employee's fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities of the relevant role in the job description depends on the employee's efficiency to fulfill the duties and responsibilities. In other words, it is about how effectively and efficiently the employees fulfill their responsibilities. Hence, employees' task performance contributes directly or indirectly to all company activities, including production and the efficiency and productivity of the company. From the employee's perspective, task performance refers to actions that are "expected, evaluated and rewarded" (Leung, 2017).

Contextual Performance

Job performance has generally been defined as the degree to which an individual helps the organization achieve its goals. A two-factor theory of job performance consisting of task performance and contextual performance has been established. When employees use technical skills and knowledge to produce goods or services or accomplish a specialized task that support the actual functions of an organization, the employees are said to be involved in task performance.

An employee engages in contextual performance when they are for instance involved with voluntarily helping colleagues, putting in extra effort to complete a given task, putting in extra hours to get work done on time and so forth. Van Scotter (2020) proposed that employees who are less satisfied with their jobs may exhibit lower levels of contextual performance behaviours and are therefore less likely to engage in such contextual performance activities, thus concluding that overall job satisfaction will have a stronger relationship with contextual

performance than with task performance. In addition to fulfilling job specific tasks (task performance), employees have to constantly communicate, work together and perform in such a way that goes beyond their routine job descriptions.

Adaptive Performance

Adaptive performance refers to employees' capabilities to adapt to rapidly changing work situations (Neal & Hesketh, 2019), and it is thought to include dimensions of problem solving, dealing with uncertainty, learning new tasks and procedures, and interpersonal, cultural and physical adaptability (Pulakos et al., 2020). Adaptive performance has been distinguished from task proficiency and proactivity with the former describing behaviour that are not formalized nor embedded within a social context, and the latter with anticipatory, self-directed behaviour intended to achieve desired outcomes.

The concept of adaptive performance is defined in general terms as an individual's ability to adapt to dynamic work situations (Hesketh & Neal, 2019). Employees demonstrate adaptive performance by adjusting their behaviour to the requirements of work situations and new events Though others have highlighted the importance of a variety of adaptive behaviour. Pulakos et al. (2020) were the first to propose a global model of adaptive performance. In a first step, they reviewed research on individual performance and adaptability to changes. Then they analyzed 1,000 critical incidents (reflective of new work situations requiring a behavioral adjustment on the part of participants) involving 24 jobs in the army.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Herzberg Two-Factor Theory

This paper was anchored on Herzberg two-factor theory. Herzberg two-factor theory was developed in (1959) by Frederick Herzberg, (Caroline & Kinyajui, 2019). He defined two sets of variables that affect employee motivation at workplace that is hygiene and motivator factors. The hygiene factors include: pay, company policies, fridge benefits, physical working conditions, status, interpersonal relations, and job security among others. They prevent dissatisfaction in employees. These factors are external to the job and prompt disappointing encounters to the employees, (Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2023). Fulfillment of these factors alone does not motivate employees but their absence brings dissatisfaction. They are equated to Maslow's physiological and safety needs which are very basic and need to be fulfilled.

They describe the job environment/ scenario. The hygiene factors do not lead to positive satisfaction for long but their absence leads to dissatisfaction. The other set of factors defined by Herzberg is motivators. These factors are inherent to the job and yield positive satisfaction (Dartey & Amoako, 2011). They are also known as intrinsic factors. They include recognition, growth and promotional opportunities, training/ learning, responsibility, meaningfulness of the work among others. They motivate employees to higher productivity. They were perceived as needs on the higher side of Maslow's hierarchy of needs which include self-actualization. They are also perceived to be an additional benefit to the employee. Basset and Lloyd (2015) note that unpleasant working conditions prompts staff to desert work and opt for other employers. "Workers are more propelled if they feel content in their work and frequently happens when the employer makes a decent workplace where representatives feel esteemed, by and large through expanded correspondence and being requested their conclusions" (Guy &

Mastracci, 2018). The employees will be more inspired if the organization invests through training on the employees (Caroline & Kinyajui, 2019). High pay may not be sufficient to sustain high productivity; consideration has to be done to cater for training, working conditions among other things. The two variables hygiene and motivators must be fulfilled (Cole, 2004).

Having looked at the tenets of this theory, it is evident that the strategies understudy is clearly addressed by the theory. The researcher sought to understand how remuneration, promotion, physical working condition and training contribute towards employee productivity. The strategies fall clearly under the two categories of variables advanced by Herzberg theory. The remuneration, promotion, and physical work condition fall under hygiene factors whose absence will cause dissatisfaction on the employees and leave the organization. They however do not motivate the employees individually and therefore the need for motivator. Training is classified as a motivator to the employee. The two categories of factors are work hand in hand for employees' productivity. This research work is anchored on Vroom's Valence Expectancy theory and institutional theory.

2.3 Theoretical Expositions

Staff Development and Task Performance

There has been a general resistance to investment in staff development in organizations until recently because of the presumption that employees hired under a merit system are qualified and trained for their jobs (Okotoni and Erero, 2015). It was further assumed that if that was not the case then it means that initial selection of personnel was faulty. This assumption no longer holds as the need for staff development became evident in all sectors (Okotoni and Erero, 2015). Training offers a way of "developing skills, enhancing productivity and quality of work, and building worker loyalty to the firm" Training has become the Holy Grail to some organizations, an evidence of how much the management truly cares about its workforce (Hamid, 2016). Hamid (2011) went further to say that the effectiveness with which organizations manage, develop, motivate, involve and engage the willing contribution of those who work in them is a key determinant of how well these organizations perform. The importance of training has become more obvious given the growing complexity of the work environment, the rapid change in organizations and technological advancement which further necessitates the need for training and development of employees to meet the challenges.

Reward Policy and adaptive Performance

Reward systems are arguably at the heart of employee productivity in any organization. This assertion is premised on the understanding that reward systems have the potency of engendering through the stimulation and direction of employees along the path of goal accomplishment (Ejumudo, 2017). As a matter of fact, employees are the most critical of all organizational resources and their capacity to function of both their inward potentials and the outward environment in which they operate. This nature-nurture perspective of explaining the indicators
of organization performance underscores the indispensability of reward systems as an integral part of organizational environments. In the light of this, it is instructive to assert that well rewarded employees are much likely to feel valued and cherished by their organizations. Employee reward can either be financial or non-financial or both.

Employee Recognition and Conceptual Performance

Employee recognition is a form of non-financial reward/non-cash, and it could be in form of social recognition, praise and genuine appreciation for job well done (Okwudili, 2015). Sometimes, employees want to be recognized by their employer for their achievements, and appreciation from the management level can make them feel more motivated and show more loyalty to the organization (Rowley, 2011). In the opinions of Appelbaum and Kamal (2020), the main and frequent reason for employee turn-over and low morale in performance is due to lack of employee recognition.

2.4 Empirical Review

Adamu, et al. (2020) examined the effect of performance management and organizational performance in Nigerian Bag Manufacturing Company Plc (Bagco) Lagos. A descriptive and survey research design was adopted for the study. The study had a population of 1500 staff which was obtained from the human resource department, out of which a sample size of 316 was obtained using Yamane (1967) formula for sample determination. The instrument of data collection employed was a questionnaire. Out of the 316 copies of the questionnaire administered to the respondents, 233 questionnaires were filled returned while 83 were not returned. Data collected were analyzed using multiple regression statistical tools. Findings from the study show that performance management practiced by Nigeria Bag Manufacturing Company has significantly affected employees' productivity through operational efficiency, customer satisfaction and high productivity which indicates that there is a correlation between good performance management practice and employee productivity of Nigeria Bag Manufacturing Company. The study confirms that performance management is essential in the operation of any manufacturing company. The study, therefore, recommends among others that, Management of the Nigeria Bag Manufacturing Company should put in place a good performance management strategy targeted on employees' weaknesses, offer training in the skills that are critical to good leadership communication skills, listening techniques, offering feedback, and how to avoid the pitfalls of reviewing employee productivity.

Adnan Rouhi and Maitha (2021) aimed at testing the relation between performance management and organizational performance at Al Ain Zoo, UAE. It also tests whether an organization such as a zoo uses the tradition appraisal approach or not, especially in the post-pandemic era. The management of Al Ain zoo forms the primary target audience for this study. It is a qualitative research that is exploratory in nature. The study is based on a primary approach of a 15-question interview. Data was collected from 3 employees of Al Ain Zoo, each operating at a different level of organizational hierarchy. Both hypotheses of the research were found to be true. A strong positive relationship exists between performance management and employee productivity. It is mainly attributable to the zoo's use of a modern performance management system called PABLO. The research recommends a use of a more decentralized management approach to further enhance employee satisfaction and productivity at Al Ain Zoo.

Okafor, (2019) examined the relationship between performance management and organizational performance of medium scale enterprises in the three industrial zones of Awka, Nnewi and Onitsha in Anambra State as the study area. Designed as a descriptive survey, an item structured instrument in a Likert scale format was used to elicit information from a sample of 320 senior employees selected across the stated industrial zones in the state. Major tools of analysis

were summary statistics of percentages, correlation and multiple regressions (OLS). The correlation analysis showed there was no multi-collinearity among the independent variables. Also, the results of the regression analysis showed that overall, regression model is statistically significant, valid and fit for predictive purposes. Regression coefficient showed that about 81.5 percent relationship exist between the dependent and independent variables. Also the coefficient of determination represented by 'R^2', showed that about 78.2 percent of the variation in employee productivity can be explained by the independent variables. It was revealed that positive and significant relationship exists between recognition and employee productivity, and that it exists too between employee feedback mechanism and productivity. It was equally found that a stable and peaceful industrial atmosphere promotes employee productivity in an organization. It was recommended among others that organization performance appraisal process should always be made to be as transparent as possible by management to increase the confidence of the employees in the organization and enlist more commitment.

Mulenga, Sikalumbi and Phiri (2022) assessed the effects of performance management and organizational performance; A study of Chikankata Town Council, Kafue Gorge Training Centre and Riverside Farm Institute. The objectives were to determine the effects of performance appraisal on employee's productivity in an organization. The results obtained from the study would generate insight that would assist organizations in developing effective performance measurement strategies for it would enable the organizations to identify and develop guidelines that would enhance effective staff appraisal that would improve staff performance and for academicians and scholars, the study findings would be beneficial to forming the basis for future research on the subject, providing a critical examination of the field. The study used qualitative research design. A stratified proportion sampling was employed to obtain a suitable unit representative of analysis with the target population of 310 employees from three (3) different institutions namely; Chikankata Town Council, Riverside Institute and Kafue Gorge Training Centre. The study was anchored on expectancy theory. The study targeted the population of 310 staff based in Chikankata District with the sample size of 45 employees. The researcher used the interview guide and focus group questions as the data collection instruments that was pilot tested using 15 staff based in Chikankata District. The data was analyzed by use of Microsoft excel. Specifically, means, averages and percentages were employed by the researcher. The data analysis tools were simple tabulations and presentations of the report using spreadsheets. The data is presented using tables, charts and graphs. The findings indicated that performance appraisal is important because the process offers organizations a valuable opportunity to measure how each staff in relations to previously established standards and expectations. The study recommends that Managers, supervisors and employees should be involved in the planning process of performance appraisal and the Performance appraisal policy should be easily accessible to all members of staff and performance appraisal process in the organization should be more transparent and rational.

Waleed (2023) reviewed the literature on the impact of performance management and organizational performance during the period (2015–2020). Additionally, the traits of a successful PMS and the challenges faced when implementing the system. The article came to the conclusion that the performance system has a significant moral impact on how

well workers perform in firms. These studies provided conclusive evidence that, in addition to the PMS, working conditions, compensation, and promotion are organizational elements that influence employees' performance. Performance monitoring is carried out with performance assessment by management since, according to the research; performance planning has a limited impact on workers' performance while performance appraisal has been the most precise of organization performance.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a survey research design, which is appropriate for systematically collecting data from a defined population to draw inferences and establish relationships among variables. This design was particularly suitable for the study as it allowed for the collection of first-hand information from employees of beverage firms to understand the influence of performance management practices on organizational performance in Delta State, Nigeria.

The population of the study comprised 1,842 staff members from ten selected beverage firms in Delta State. Since the total population was below 1,000 in each firm and manageable, a total enumeration method was used, ensuring that all categories of staff were included. The sample size of 362 respondents was determined using Borg and Gall's (1973) statistical formula at a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level.

Both primary and secondary data were utilized for this research. The primary data were obtained through a well-structured questionnaire and supported by oral interviews conducted with selected respondents, while the secondary data were sourced from scholarly journals, company records, and online materials. The questionnaire consisted of two sections—Section A captured demographic information, and Section B covered items aligned with the research objectives. The instrument was designed on a five-point Likert scale. To ensure validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in the Department of Business Administration, who verified its content and relevance. Reliability was tested through a test–retest method using Spearman's rank correlation, yielding a coefficient of 0.79394, which indicated a strong and positive consistency of the instrument. Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were employed to ensure fair representation and selection of respondents relevant to the study objectives.

For the data analysis, descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages were employed to analyze responses to the research questions, while inferential statistics, including correlation and simple regression analyses, were used to test the hypotheses at a 0.05 significance level with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The decision rule stated that a null hypothesis would be accepted if the p-value exceeded 0.05 and rejected otherwise. The study's regression model specified organizational performance (ORGP) as a function of staff development (SFD), reward policy (RWP), employee recognition (EPR), and performance planning (PFP). The model was expressed as:

$$ORGP = b_0 + b_1SFD + b_2RWP + b_3EPR + b_4PFP + \mu,$$

where b_0 represents the intercept, b_1–b_4 are coefficients of the explanatory variables, and μ denotes the error term. This model was designed to evaluate how performance

management practices collectively influence the organizational performance of beverage firms in Delta State.

4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression result was employed to test the effect of independent or explanatory variables on the dependent variables. The result of the multiple regression analysis is presented in the tables below.

Summary of the Regression Result

The result of the multiple regression formulated in chapter three is presented in the tables below.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.265[a]	.690	.504	3.241	1.879

a. Predictors: (Constant), Staff development, Employee recognition and reward policy.

b. Dependent Variable: Beverage firms in Delta State

Table 4.4 shows that R^2 which measures the strength of the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable have the value of 0.690. This implies that 69% of the variation in organization performance is explained by variations in staff development, performance planning, Employee recognition, Reward policy. This was supported by adjusted R^2 of 0.504.

In order to check for autocorrelation in the model, Durbin-Watson statistics was employed. Durbin-Watson statistics of 1.879 in table 4.4 shows that the variables in the model are not auto correlated and that the model is reliable for predications.

ANOVA Result

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	179.546	4. 227	44.886	4.272	.002[b]
	Residual	2384.937	231	10.506		

Total	2564.483				

a. Dependent Variable: CBS

b. Predictors: (Constant), 360 DFA, RP, ER

The f-statistics value of 4.272 in table 4.5 with f-statistics probability of 0.002 shows that the independent variables has significant effect on dependent. This shows that staff development, Reward policy, employee recognition, can collectively explain the variations in organization performance of beverage firms in Delta State.

Descriptive Statistics Test of Hypotheses

Multiple regression analysis was employed to test the hypotheses formulated for the study. The multiple regression result is presented in the table below.

T-Statistics and Probability Value from the Regression Result

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	18.916	1.918		9.863	.000
	Staff development	-.091	.054	-.128	2.112	.026
	Employee Recognition	.085	.044	.202	2.923	.005
	Reward policy	.171	.044	.209	2.870	.004

a. Dependent Variable: CBS

Source: SPSS 21.0

The regression result has coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.590. This implies that 73.3% of the variations in organization performance are being accounted for or explained by the variations in the explanatory variables. This shows that the explanatory powers of the independent variable are very high and strong. The adjusted R^2 supports the claim of the R^2 with a value of 0.504 indicating that 72.6% of the total variation in the dependent variable (organization performance) is explained by the independent variables (the regressors). Thus, this supports the statement that the explanatory power of the variables is high and strong.

The F-statistic is instrumental in verifying the overall significance of an estimated model.

The f-statistics of 107.563 and f-probability of 0.000 shows that that the model has goodness of fit and is statistically different from zero. In other words, there is significant impact between the dependent and independent variables in the model. This shows that the independent variables (Staff development, Employee recognition and Reward policy) have a joint significant effect on the dependent variable (organization performance). From the regression result in table 4.12, it is observed that DW statistic is 1.879 which is approximately 2. Therefore, the variables in the model are not autocorrelated and that the model is reliable for predications.

Table 4.7 T-Statistics and Probability Value from the Regression Result

Model		T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	9.863	.000
	Staff development	1.012	.026
	Reward policy	2.870	.004
	Employee recognition	2.562	.009

a. Dependent Variable: PSMEs

Source: Authors Compilation from the Regression Result

Hypothesis One

H_o: HO_1: Staff development does not have significant effect on task performance of beverages firms in Delta State.

H_{o1}: Staff development has significant effect on task performance of beverages firms in Delta State.

Staff development has a t-statistics of .012and a probability value of .026which is statistically significant. Therefore, we accept the alternative hypotheses and the reject null hypothesis which states that staff development has a positive significant effect on task performance of beverage firms in Delta State, Nigeria. This implies that staff development has significant effect on task performance of beverage firms in Delta State.

Test of Hypothesis Two

H_{o2}: Reward policy does not have significant effect on adaptive performance of beverages firms in Delta State.

Hi: Reward policy has significant effect on adaptive performance of beverages firms in Delta State. Reward policy has a t-statistics of 2.923 and a probability value of 0.005 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which state that Reward policy has a significant effect on adaptive performance of beverage firms in Delta State. This implies that Reward policy have a significant effect on adaptive performance of beverage firms in Delta State.

Test of Hypothesis Three

H_o: Employee recognition does not have significant effect on contextual performance of beverages firms in Delta State

H_{oi}: Employee recognition has significant effect on contextual performance of beverages firms in Delta State

In testing this hypothesis, the t-statistics and probability value in table 4.7 is used. Reward policy has a t-statistics of 2.870 and a probability value of 0.004 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which state there is a significant positive effect of Employee recognition on contextual performance of beverage firms in Delta State. This implies that Employee recognition has significant effect on contextual performance of beverage firms in Delta state.

Discussion of Findings

The first hypothesis stated that staff development has significant effect on task performance of beverage firms in Delta state. This hypothesis was tested using linear regression. The result shows that there is no significant relationship between staff development and organizational performance of beverage firms in Delta State. In an organization, the primary dimensions of organization performance include strategic sustainability, product and programme sustainability personnel sustainability and financial sustainability. If these dimensions are effectively management, it will ensure organization performance. These cannot be achieved without effective performance management system through staff development in the organizations. Staff development creates clarity in organizational goals and improves employees' competence which when properly harnessed will lead to organization performance. This agrees with the findings of Qureshi and Mubashir (2023) and Munzhedzi (2021)

The study also found that there is a significant effect of Reward policy on adaptive performance. This finding disagrees with that of Zhang (2012) whose result shows that the performance planning has a positive but insignificant relationship with organization performance. It is also in agrees with the findings of Maina (2015) that the perception of reward policy towards performance appraisal practices is very critical in all performance as this motivates them to achieve the goals set by the organization.

Finally, the last hypothesis shows extent to which employee recognition effect contextual performance of beverage firms in Delta state. This hypothesis was tested using linear regression. The result shows that there is a significant positive relationship between employee recognition and organization performance of beverage firms in Delta state.. In an organization, the primary dimensions of employee recognition entail, personnel evaluation and financial evaluation. If these dimensions are effectively managed, it will ensure organization performance. These cannot be achieved without effective performance management system in the organizations. Performance management creates clarity in organizational goals and improves employees' competence which when properly harnessed will lead to organization performance of these beverage firms under study in Delta State.

Summary of Findings

This work analyzed of performance management and organization performance of beverage firms in Delta State, Nigeria. The data analyzed indicates the following:

There is significant effect of staff development on organizational performance of beverage firms in Delta State.

There is significant effect of Reward policy on adaptive performance of beverage firms in Delta state.
There is significant effect of Employee recognition on contextual performance of beverage firms in Delta state.

5. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that performance management has a positive significant effect on organizational performance of beverage firms in Delta state. In line with the findings and the objectives of the study, the study therefore recommends that:

Staff development should be priority so that they can perform better for the growth and survival of these beverage firms in Delta state. The management of these firms should pay adequate attention to issues relating to reward policy system to enhance effective performance of these beverage firms in Delta state. Employee recognition should be taken serious because without them it will be hard to achieve organization objectives.

REFERENCES

Abbas, & Cross. (2019). Performance management as an integrating activity in organizational relationships. *Journal of Management Studies, 15*(3), 115–128.

Adamu, U., Utomi, Y., Yahaya, & Abubakar. (2020). Performance management and organizational performance in Nigerian Bag Manufacturing Company Plc (Bagco), Lagos. *Journal of Business Administration and Management, 12*(4), 45–59.

Adnan Rouhi, & Maitha. (2021). Performance management and organizational performance at Al Ain Zoo, UAE. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 9*(2), 55–73.

Aidah. (2023). Employee productivity and management performance in Nigerian beverage firms. *African Journal of Management Research, 11*(1), 112–130.

Alam, Saheed, & Akter. (2013). Employee motivation and recognition practices in organizations. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 8*(2), 233–247.

Ali. (2017). Measuring organizational performance through monetary and non-monetary indicators. *Management Science Review, 22*(5), 65–78.

Appelbaum, S., & Kamal, R. (2020). Employee recognition and performance outcomes. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 11*(4), 92–104.

Armstrong, M. (1999). A handbook of human resource management practice. *Kogan Page.*

Barney, J. (2008). Organizational performance and resource-based theory. *Oxford University Press.*

Basset, & Lloyd. (2015). Workplace satisfaction and employee turnover in organizations. *Human Relations Review, 14*(3), 220–236.

Behrey, & Parton. (2008). Aligning performance management initiatives with organizational goals. *Journal of Strategic Management, 10*(1), 80–94.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1973). Educational research: An introduction. *Longman.*

Bruggeman, W., & Decoene, V. (2012). Performance measurement and reward systems. *Management Accounting Research, 23*(1), 45–66.

Caligiuri, P., Lepak, D., & Bonache, J. (2010). Managing global employees: Challenges and strategies. *Wiley.*

Caroline, & Kinyajui. (2019). Application of Herzberg's two-factor theory in

employee motivation. *African Management Review, 7*(2), 90–104.

Chiu, R. K., Luk, V., Tang, T. L., & Kim, S. (2012). Monetary and non-monetary rewards in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(6), 891–906.

Cozby, P. C. (2001). Methods in behavioral research. *McGraw-Hill.*

Daft, R. L. (2019). Organization theory and design. *Cengage Learning.*

Danish, R. Q., & Usman, A. (2010). Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation. *International Journal of Business and Management, 5*(2), 159–167.

Dartey, & Amoako. (2011). Employee motivation and job satisfaction: A test of Herzberg's theory. *Journal of Human Capital Development, 9*(4), 64–77.

Dubrin, A. J. (2015). Fundamentals of organizational behavior. *Elsevier.*

Ejumudo, K. B. O. (2017). Reward systems and employee productivity in Nigerian public sector. *Journal of Business and Management Studies, 5*(3), 112–130.

Gerhart, B., & Milkovich, G. T. (2020). Performance management practices and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal, 30*(1), 102–118.

Gibson, J. L. (2020). Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes. *McGraw-Hill Education.*

Guy, & Mastracci. (2018). Workplace communication and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Public Personnel Management, 47*(2), 188–203.

Hamid, A. (2011). Training and development practices in organizations. *Journal of Management Development, 28*(2), 98–115.

Hamid, A. (2016). Employee performance and the role of training programs. *Journal of Human Resource Studies, 12*(3), 71–88.

Harris, P. (2019). Staff development practices and employee performance. *International Journal of HRM, 14*(5), 105–121.

Hausknecht, J. P., Rodda, J., & Howard, M. J. (2019). Employee retention and recognition: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 33*(2), 235–250.

Hefferman, T., & Flood, P. (2016). Exploring organizational performance dimensions. *Management Research Review, 39*(5), 617–635.

Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S. E., & Slocum, J. W. (2019). Management: A competency-based approach. *South-Western Cengage Learning.*

Holsti, O. R. (2004). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. *Addison-Wesley.*

Kerr, J., & Slocum, J. (2015). Managing organizational reward systems. *Academy of Management Executive, 29*(3), 123–135.

Khanfar, S. M. (2011). Impact of training and staff development on organizational effectiveness. *International Journal of Business Management, 6*(3), 25–40.

Kim, S. (2014). Employee recognition and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management, 9*(5), 65–78.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2016). The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action. *Harvard Business Press.*

Laing, C. (2019). Employee training and staff development. *International Review of Management, 17*(4), 211–226.

Leung, K. (2017). Employee task performance and organizational

efficiency. *Journal of Management Studies, 24*(3), 345–362.

Maina, J. (2015). Reward policy and employee performance appraisal practices. *International Journal of Management Research, 10*(1), 122–140.

Martins, J. (2019). Institutionalizing performance management systems for effectiveness. *Journal of Strategic Policy, 13*(2), 52–69.

Mathias, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2016). Human resource management. *Cengage Learning.*

Muhammad, A. (2013). Performance management and employee development. *Journal of Business Administration, 8*(2), 101–118.

Muhammad, A. (2023). Organizational performance management and effectiveness. *Journal of Human Capital, 15*(1), 44–63.

Mulenga, S., Sikalumbi, M., & Phiri, J. (2022). Performance management and organizational performance: A study of Chikankata Town Council. *Zambia Journal of Business Research, 5*(1), 87–102.

Munywoki, J. (2023). Performance management and employee outcomes. *African Journal of Human Resource Studies, 9*(4), 33–50.

Mullins, L. J. (2007). Management and organizational behavior. *Pearson Education.*

Nelson, B. (2005). 1001 ways to reward employees. *Workman Publishing.*

Neal, A., & Hesketh, B. (2019). Adaptive performance in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 104*(3), 450–466.

Nuru, & István. (2023). Performance-based reward systems and organizational effectiveness. *International Review of Business Studies, 19*(1), 94–110.

Okafor, E. (2019). Performance management and organizational performance of medium scale enterprises in Anambra State. *Journal of Business Studies, 11*(2), 57–74.

Okero, O., Omari, A., & Wanyama, P. (2021). Employee motivation and performance management in organizations. *African Journal of HRM, 9*(2), 41–58.

Okotoni, O., & Erero, J. (2015). Staff development and productivity in organizations. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences, 8*(1), 14–26.

Okwudili, J. (2015). Employee recognition and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management and Development Studies, 5*(3), 44–58.

Pitts, D. (2015). Employee recognition and performance appraisal systems. *Public Personnel Management, 44*(3), 315–333.

Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2016). Employee performance at work: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research, 5*(1), 69–85.

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2020). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(4), 612–624.

Qureshi, M., & Mubashir, S. (2023). Staff development and organizational performance nexus. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 13*(2), 72–88.

Rajesh, K., & Nishant, P. (2013). Performance management in organizations: Concept and scope. *Journal of Business Administration Research, 2*(3), 144–157.

Randy, L., Luk, V., & Tang, T. (2018). The role of recognition in employee motivation. *Journal of Global*

Business and Economics, 10(2), 94–108.

Richardo, D., & Wade, J. (2020). Measuring organizational effectiveness and performance. *Journal of Management Science, 28*(5), 242–260.

Robbins, S. P. (2011). Organizational behavior. *Prentice Hall.*

Robbins, S. P. (2013). Fundamentals of management. *Pearson Education.*

Robbins, S. P. (2015). Essentials of organizational behavior. *Pearson Education.*

Romano, C. (2013). Recognition as a motivational tool. *Human Resource Management Review, 23*(1), 55–71.

Rowley, C. (2011). Employee recognition and retention in organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(7), 135–151.

Ruthankoon, R., & Ogunlana, S. O. (2023). Hygiene and motivator factors in employee productivity. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 17*(2), 78–95.

Saleem, I., & Mehwish, A. (2011). Staff development and employee performance in organizations. *Journal of Management Research, 5*(2), 62–80.

Schiphorst, F. (2015). Performance management in organizations: A continuous process. *European Management Journal, 33*(4), 259–269.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (2013). Recognition and employee motivation: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*(2), 580–590.

University of Iowa. (2019). Employee recognition programs: Best practices. *Iowa Human Resources Division.*

Van Scotter, J. R. (2020). Contextual performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 50*(1), 1–12.

Waleed, H. (2023). Performance management systems and organizational success: A literature review (2015–2020). *International Journal of Management Science, 18*(2), 98–115.

Watkins, J. (2017). Performance management reviews and industry performance in Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Economic Studies, 14*(1), 43–56.

Young, T. (2018). Staff development and employee engagement. *Human Capital Management Review, 10*(4), 125–142.

Zhang, L. (2012). Performance planning and organizational performance. *Journal of Management and Economics, 19*(3), 102–118.

Zingheim, P. K., & Schuster, J. R. (2019). Recognition, reward, and the new work contract. *AMACOM.*