



Impact of Performance Appraisal on Work Productivity in Tertiary Institutions: A Comparative Analysis of Academic and Non-Academic Staff In Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi

Mahmoud Datti Yola

Department of Public Administration, School of Management Studies, Kano State Polytechnic

Received: 07.07.2026 | **Accepted:** 06.10.2026 | **Published:** 15.10.2026

***Corresponding Author:** Mahmoud Datti Yola

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.23385826](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23385826)

Abstract	Original Research Article
This study examined the impact of performance appraisal on work productivity among academic and non-academic staff of Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. The study specifically examined the relationship between clarity of performance standards and work productivity, determined the effect of regular performance appraisal on employee productivity, and examined the relationship between appraisal feedback and work productivity. A comparative cross-sectional survey research design was adopted. The population of the study comprised 1,238 staff, consisting of 711 academic and 527 non-academic staff across the two institutions. Using the Yamane formula at a 5% level of precision, a sample size of 302 respondents was obtained and proportionately distributed between the two institutions and staff categories. Data were collected using a structured Performance Appraisal and Work Productivity Questionnaire (PAWPQ), while descriptive statistics, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and multiple regression were specified for data analysis. The descriptive findings indicate a moderate overall perception of performance standards, appraisal frequency and appraisal feedback, with grand means of 3.40, 3.20 and 3.40 respectively. Respondents agreed that performance standards were clearly communicated and consistent with institutional objectives, while they were less certain about the clarity and relevance of some appraisal criteria. Similarly, respondents indicated that regular reviews could help improve their work, although appraisal was generally not perceived as a continuous, year-round activity. Regarding feedback, respondents agreed that appraisal feedback helped identify areas for improvement and was communicated promptly, but expressed uncertainty about the usefulness of supervisory feedback, opportunities to discuss appraisal results and guidance on weak areas. The study concludes that performance appraisal has important implications for employee productivity, but its effectiveness depends on clear performance standards, regular review, constructive feedback and appraisal practices that recognise the distinct responsibilities of academic and non-academic staff. The study recommends strengthening continuous performance monitoring, improving feedback mechanisms, ensuring transparent and job-relevant appraisal criteria, and developing appraisal systems that appropriately reflect the responsibilities of different categories of staff. Keywords: Performance Appraisal, Work Productivity, Academic Staff, Non-Academic Staff, Tertiary Institutions, Kano State Polytechnic, Federal Polytechnic Bauchi.	

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)



Introduction

Human resources constitute one of the most important resources available to an organisation. Although financial resources, physical infrastructure and technology are essential to organisational functioning, their effectiveness depends substantially on the knowledge, commitment, skills and performance of employees. Consequently, organisations continually seek human resource management practices capable of improving employee performance and aligning individual activities with organisational objectives.

One of the most established human resource management practices is performance appraisal. Performance appraisal refers broadly to the systematic assessment of an employee's performance in relation to predetermined expectations, standards and organisational objectives. It may be used for several purposes, including feedback, employee development, promotion, reward decisions, identification of training needs and organisational planning. The literature has demonstrated that performance appraisal has evolved considerably from simple periodic rating exercises toward broader performance-management systems involving goal setting, feedback, coaching and development. DeNisi and Murphy's review of a century of research shows that issues surrounding appraisal include rating methods, evaluation criteria, feedback, purpose, rating sources and employee reactions.

Tertiary institutions provide an especially important environment for studying performance appraisal because their employees perform diverse and sometimes difficult-to-measure tasks. Academic employees are generally involved in teaching, research, supervision, student development, community service and administrative responsibilities. Non-academic employees, on the other hand, perform administrative, technical, financial, library, maintenance, information technology, security and other support functions. The productivity of a tertiary institution therefore depends not only on the performance of lecturers but also on the efficiency of the employees who provide administrative and technical support.

Kano State Polytechnic is one of the state-owned tertiary institutions supervised within Kano State's higher-education system. The Kano State Government identifies Kano State Polytechnic among the state's public tertiary institutions. The institution's current public information also indicates continuing academic activities and institutional development.

Federal Polytechnic Bauchi is a federal tertiary institution with a long institutional history. Its official information indicates that academic activities commenced in November 1979 and that the institution began with 138 staff members. Its administrative and academic structures include academic and non-academic divisions, while its Academic Board is responsible for the direction and management of academic matters.

The issue of employee productivity is increasingly significant in Nigerian tertiary institutions because institutions are expected to provide quality teaching, research, administrative services, technical support and other services despite financial, infrastructural and manpower constraints. For example, Federal Polytechnic Bauchi currently reports a substantial student population and institutional expenditure on personnel and development. These circumstances make effective management of employee performance an important institutional concern.

Existing Nigerian research provides evidence that performance appraisal can be associated with employee motivation, effectiveness and productivity. Fapohunda, for example, examined performance appraisal among academic staff in selected Nigerian public universities and reported that appraisal had an important relationship with motivation and general performance, while also noting concerns about whether appraisal adequately captured teaching, research and community-service responsibilities. Research involving non-academic university staff has similarly examined performance appraisal, training and reward management as predictors of work efficiency. More recent Nigerian research in the polytechnic sector has also examined the relationship between appraisal systems and employee effectiveness among academic and non-

academic staff.

Despite this literature, there remains a need for comparative investigation of academic and non-academic employees within polytechnic institutions. Academic and non-academic employees have different job descriptions, performance indicators and professional expectations. An appraisal criterion that is appropriate for a lecturer may not necessarily be appropriate for a bursary officer, technician, administrator, librarian or other support employee. Therefore, the effectiveness of performance appraisal may depend on whether appraisal systems are appropriately designed for different categories of employees. It is against this background that this study examines the impact of performance appraisal on work productivity among academic and non-academic staff in Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi.

Statement of the Problem

Performance appraisal is expected to help organisations determine whether employees are meeting established performance expectations. However, the mere existence of an appraisal system does not necessarily guarantee improved productivity. Problems may arise where performance standards are unclear, appraisal is conducted irregularly, employees receive little feedback, appraisal outcomes are not linked to development, or employees perceive the process as biased or unfair.

In tertiary institutions, these problems may have significant consequences. For academic staff, ineffective appraisal may affect teaching preparation, research activities, student supervision and institutional service. For non-academic staff, ineffective appraisal may affect administrative efficiency, record keeping, technical support, financial services, customer service and other institutional functions.

The problem is further complicated by the different responsibilities performed by academic and non-academic staff. Academic performance may involve qualitative and quantitative indicators such as teaching effectiveness, research publications, supervision and community service. Non-academic

performance may involve service delivery, accuracy, efficiency, punctuality, administrative competence and technical performance. Consequently, an appraisal system that applies uniform criteria without recognising these differences may fail to measure actual employee contributions.

Previous Nigerian research has identified concerns regarding the adequacy and fairness of performance appraisal systems. Fapohunda's study of academic staff in Nigerian public universities found that appraisal tended to emphasise research while other academic responsibilities, including teaching and community service, received less attention. Recent research in Nigerian polytechnics likewise suggests that performance appraisal is relevant to employee effectiveness and that factors such as feedback and reward may influence productivity. The central problem addressed by this study is therefore whether performance appraisal significantly contributes to work productivity and whether the relationship differs between academic and non-academic staff in the selected polytechnics.

2. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to examine the impact of performance appraisal on work productivity among academic and non-academic staff of Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. The specific objectives are to:

1. Examine the relationship between clarity of performance standards and work productivity among staff.
2. Determine the effect of regular performance appraisal on work productivity.
3. Examine the relationship between appraisal feedback and employee productivity.

3. Research Questions

The study seeks answers to the following questions:

1. What relationship exists between clarity of performance standards and work productivity?

2. To what extent does regular performance appraisal influence employee productivity?
3. What relationship exists between appraisal feedback and work productivity?

4. Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated:

H01: There is no significant relationship between clarity of performance standards and work productivity among employees of the selected polytechnics.

H02: Regular performance appraisal has no significant effect on work productivity among employees of the selected polytechnics.

H03: Appraisal feedback has no significant effect on work productivity among employees of the selected polytechnics.

5. Scope of the Study

The study focuses on the relationship between performance appraisal and work productivity among academic and non-academic staff of Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. The study is restricted to employees of the two selected institutions and does not seek to generalise its findings automatically to every tertiary institution in Nigeria.

6. Literature Review

Concept of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is an important component of human resource management that involves the systematic assessment of employees' performance in relation to predetermined standards, goals and organisational expectations. It provides organisations with information that can be used for employee development, promotion, compensation, training and improvement of organisational performance. According to Armstrong and Taylor (2023), performance appraisal provides a structured opportunity for managers and employees to review performance, identify development requirements and

establish future objectives.

Performance appraisal should not be viewed merely as an administrative exercise involving the completion of evaluation forms. Rather, it can form part of a broader performance management process involving goal setting, continuous feedback, coaching, development and recognition. Aguinis (2019) explains that effective performance management involves identifying, measuring and developing employee performance while aligning individual activities with organisational goals.

DeNisi and Murphy (2017), in their review of 100 years of research on performance appraisal and performance management, observed that the effectiveness of appraisal depends on several factors, including the purpose of appraisal, performance criteria, rating sources, feedback and employees' reactions to the appraisal process. This suggests that simply having an appraisal system does not necessarily lead to improved employee performance. The manner in which the system is designed and implemented is equally important.

In tertiary institutions, performance appraisal has particular importance because employees perform diverse functions. Academic staff may be assessed based on teaching, research, student supervision, community service and administrative responsibilities, while non-academic staff may be assessed according to administrative efficiency, technical competence, service delivery, accuracy and achievement of assigned responsibilities. Consequently, appraisal systems need to reflect the nature of employees' jobs.

Performance Appraisal in Tertiary Institutions

Tertiary institutions depend heavily on human resources to achieve their educational, administrative and developmental objectives. Academic staff are responsible for teaching, research, supervision and community service, while non-academic staff provide administrative, technical and support services. Effective management of both categories of employees is therefore essential to institutional productivity.

Performance appraisal in tertiary institutions can

serve several purposes, including identifying staff-development needs, determining readiness for promotion, improving performance and ensuring that employee activities correspond with institutional objectives. Fapohunda (2015) examined performance appraisal among academic staff in selected Nigerian public universities and found that appraisal was associated with employee motivation and performance. However, the study also raised concerns about the extent to which appraisal adequately captured different dimensions of academic work. Similarly, Obasan et al. (2014) examined performance appraisal and organisational citizenship behaviour among academic staff in Nigerian tertiary institutions. Their study demonstrated the importance of appraisal practices in understanding employee behaviour and performance within higher educational organisations.

Recent research has also examined performance appraisal in Nigerian polytechnics. Jonah et al. (2026) investigated performance appraisal systems and employee effectiveness among academic and non-academic staff of Federal Polytechnic Mubi. Their study indicates the continuing relevance of performance appraisal as a human resource management practice within Nigerian polytechnic institutions.

The relevance of performance appraisal is not limited to academic employees. Non-academic employees perform functions that directly support the operations of tertiary institutions. Research on non-academic university employees has examined performance appraisal alongside training and reward management and has linked these human resource practices with employee work efficiency.

Performance Standards and Employee Productivity

Performance standards refer to the criteria or expectations against which employee performance is assessed. Effective performance standards should be clear, measurable, relevant to the employee's responsibilities and consistent with organisational objectives.

According to Aguinis (2019), employees are more likely to perform effectively when performance expectations are clearly established and communicated. Ambiguous performance standards can make it difficult for employees to determine what constitutes satisfactory performance.

Goal-setting theory also provides support for the importance of clear performance expectations. Locke and Latham (2002) argue that specific and appropriately challenging goals can contribute to improved performance when individuals accept the goals and receive feedback concerning their progress. Within tertiary institutions, performance standards should reflect the different responsibilities of academic and non-academic staff. For academic staff, appropriate standards may include teaching effectiveness, research output, student supervision, examination responsibilities and community service. For non-academic staff, standards may include accuracy, efficiency, punctuality, customer service and timely completion of assigned tasks.

Fapohunda (2015) observed that academic appraisal systems in Nigerian public universities may place considerable emphasis on research activities while giving comparatively less attention to teaching and community service. This raises an important question concerning whether performance standards adequately reflect the complete responsibilities of academic employees.

Frequency of Performance Appraisal

The frequency with which employees are evaluated may influence the usefulness of performance appraisal. Traditional appraisal systems often rely on annual evaluations. However, contemporary performance management places increasing emphasis on continuous performance discussions and feedback.

DeNisi and Murphy (2017) note that performance appraisal research has increasingly considered feedback and employee reactions as important components of effective performance management. An appraisal system that provides information only once a year may fail to address performance problems as they emerge.

Armstrong and Taylor (2023) similarly emphasise the importance of regular performance conversations rather than relying exclusively on formal annual reviews. Regular discussions can allow employees and supervisors to identify challenges, review progress and make adjustments.

In tertiary institutions, regular appraisal may help academic employees identify weaknesses in teaching, research or supervision, while non-academic employees may receive timely guidance concerning administrative or technical responsibilities.

However, frequency alone does not determine effectiveness. Frequent appraisal may be ineffective if the criteria are unclear, feedback is inadequate or employees perceive the process as unfair. Therefore, frequency should be considered alongside other dimensions of appraisal.

Performance Appraisal Feedback

Feedback is an essential element of performance appraisal. It provides employees with information concerning their strengths, weaknesses and areas requiring improvement. Aguinis (2019) identifies feedback as an important component of performance management because it allows employees to understand how their behaviour and results compare with expected performance. Constructive feedback can guide employees toward improved performance, while poorly communicated feedback can generate resistance and dissatisfaction.

DeNisi and Murphy (2017) similarly emphasise the importance of feedback and employee reactions in performance appraisal. Their review demonstrates that appraisal should not be understood simply as the assignment of ratings; the employee's response to the appraisal process is also important.

In tertiary institutions, feedback can be particularly valuable because many academic and administrative tasks require continuous development. For example, an academic employee may use feedback to improve teaching techniques, research productivity or student supervision, while a non-academic employee may use feedback to improve administrative procedures, customer service or technical performance.

Where feedback is constructive and specific, employees may better understand what they need to improve. Consequently, the present study considers appraisal feedback as one of the major dimensions of performance appraisal.

Perceived Fairness of Performance Appraisal

Fairness is an important consideration in performance appraisal because employees are more likely to accept evaluation when they believe that the process is objective, consistent and transparent. Organisational justice theory distinguishes between different forms of justice, including distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Colquitt et al. (2001), in a comprehensive meta-analysis, demonstrated that organisational justice perceptions are related to important employee attitudes and behaviours.

In performance appraisal, procedural fairness concerns whether the procedures used to evaluate employees are consistent and appropriate. Employees may perceive appraisal as unfair if supervisors apply different standards to different employees, show favouritism or fail to provide opportunities for employees to explain their performance.

DeNisi and Murphy (2017) indicate that employee reactions are an important aspect of appraisal effectiveness. If employees do not trust the appraisal system, they may be less likely to accept feedback or use appraisal outcomes constructively.

Fairness is particularly relevant in comparing academic and non-academic staff. Because these two categories of employees perform different types of work, the criteria used for evaluation should reflect their respective responsibilities rather than applying inappropriate uniform standards.

Work Productivity

Work productivity refers to the extent to which employees produce expected outputs efficiently and effectively using available organisational resources. Employee productivity may be assessed through the quantity and quality of work, timeliness, efficiency,

attendance, target achievement and completion of assigned responsibilities.

Campbell and Wiernik (2015) explain that individual work performance is a multidimensional concept involving different forms of behaviour and outcomes. This is important because productivity cannot always be represented by a single numerical indicator, particularly in service-oriented organisations such as tertiary institutions.

In tertiary institutions, productivity may take different forms for different employee categories. Academic productivity may involve effective teaching, research, student supervision and institutional service. Non-academic productivity may involve efficient administration, accurate record keeping, timely service delivery, technical support and effective management of institutional resources. Therefore, this study measures work productivity using multiple indicators rather than relying on one measure.

Academic Staff Performance

Academic staff constitute a major component of the workforce in tertiary institutions. Their responsibilities normally include teaching, research, student supervision, examination activities, curriculum development and community service. The measurement of academic staff performance is complex because many academic responsibilities are difficult to quantify. For example, publication counts may provide evidence of research output but may not adequately capture teaching quality, student mentoring or community engagement.

Fapohunda (2015) found that academic staff appraisal in selected Nigerian public universities placed substantial emphasis on research while other dimensions of academic work were comparatively less represented. This finding suggests that appraisal systems need to employ balanced criteria that recognise the full range of academic responsibilities.

A balanced appraisal system can help institutions identify staff-development needs while also providing evidence for promotion and other personnel decisions. It may also help academic employees understand institutional expectations and

areas where their performance requires improvement.

Non-Academic Staff Performance

Non-academic staff are essential to the effective functioning of tertiary institutions. They provide administrative, financial, technical, library, information technology, maintenance and other support services. Although their responsibilities differ from those of academic staff, their productivity can have significant consequences for institutional effectiveness. For example, inefficient administrative processing can delay student services, while inadequate technical support can affect teaching and learning activities.

Research involving non-academic staff has examined the relationship between performance appraisal, training, reward management and work efficiency. Such studies suggest that employee productivity should be understood in relation to the wider human resource management system rather than through appraisal alone.

Performance standards for non-academic employees should therefore be based on actual job responsibilities. Indicators may include punctuality, accuracy, service quality, efficiency, responsiveness, teamwork and completion of assigned duties.

Performance Appraisal and Employee Productivity

The relationship between performance appraisal and employee productivity has received considerable attention in human resource management research. The underlying argument is that appraisal can improve productivity by clarifying expectations, providing feedback, identifying training needs and encouraging employees to align their activities with organisational objectives.

Aguinis (2019) argues that performance management can contribute to individual and organisational effectiveness when it is properly designed and implemented. Similarly, Armstrong

and Taylor (2023) identify performance management as an important mechanism for aligning employee performance with organisational goals.

DeNisi and Murphy (2017), however, caution against assuming that appraisal automatically produces improved performance. Their review demonstrates that appraisal outcomes depend on several factors, including the purpose of the appraisal, the quality of performance criteria, rating processes, feedback and employee reactions.

Evidence from Nigeria also supports the importance of examining appraisal within specific institutional contexts. Fapohunda (2015) found an association between appraisal practices and academic staff outcomes, while more recent research in Nigerian polytechnics has continued to investigate appraisal and employee effectiveness (Jonah et al., 2026).

The present study extends this literature by comparing academic and non-academic employees in two polytechnic institutions: Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. This comparison is important because differences in job responsibilities may influence how employees experience and respond to performance appraisal.

The reviewed literature demonstrates considerable interest in performance appraisal and employee performance. However, three gaps remain. First, a substantial proportion of existing studies focus on universities or a single category of employees. Fewer studies directly compare academic and non-academic staff within the same research framework.

Second, some studies focus generally on performance appraisal without examining specific dimensions such as performance standards, appraisal frequency, feedback and perceived fairness simultaneously. Third, there is limited comparative evidence involving Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. The present study addresses these gaps by examining 90 staff, comprising 45 staff from each institution, and comparing academic and non-academic employees.

The study therefore provides an opportunity to determine whether performance appraisal is

significantly associated with work productivity and whether perceptions differ according to employee category and institution.

Theoretical Framework

Goal-Setting Theory

The Goal-Setting Theory, developed by Edwin A. Locke (1968) and subsequently expanded by Locke and Latham, provides the most appropriate theoretical foundation for this study. The theory proposes that employees perform better when they are given specific, clear and challenging goals, provided that they accept the goals and receive feedback concerning their progress. Goal-setting therefore provides a mechanism through which employees understand what is expected of them and can regulate their effort toward achieving organizational objectives. Research on goal setting has consistently linked specific and challenging goals, particularly when accompanied by feedback, with improved performance.

The relevance of Goal-Setting Theory to performance appraisal is particularly strong because appraisal systems generally involve setting performance standards, evaluating employees against those standards, providing feedback, identifying performance gaps and establishing future performance expectations. Thus, performance appraisal is not merely an administrative exercise; it can provide employees with information about how well they are performing and what they need to accomplish in the future.

In the context of Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi, academic and non-academic staff are expected to perform specific duties. Academic staff may be evaluated in areas such as teaching, research, publication, student supervision and community service, while non-academic staff may be evaluated based on administrative efficiency, service delivery, punctuality, accuracy, adherence to procedures and other job responsibilities. A properly designed appraisal system can communicate these expectations and provide employees with feedback

about their level of achievement.

The theory is particularly relevant to the variables of this study. Clarity of performance standards corresponds to the theory's emphasis on clear and specific goals. When employees understand the standards against which their performance will be assessed, they are more likely to direct their efforts toward those standards. Regular performance appraisal provides opportunities for employees and supervisors to monitor progress toward established objectives. Appraisal feedback enables employees to identify areas of strength and weakness and adjust their behaviour and effort accordingly. Evidence on appraisal participation, goal setting and feedback also indicates that these processes can influence employee motivation and productivity.

The theory therefore provides a useful explanation of how performance appraisal may contribute to work productivity. When performance expectations are clear, employees are regularly assessed, and constructive feedback is provided, employees may have a better understanding of organizational expectations and the actions required to improve their performance.

7. Methodology

Research Design

The study adopts a comparative cross-sectional survey research design. This design is appropriate because the study seeks to collect information from academic and non-academic employees concerning their experiences and perceptions of performance appraisal and work productivity.

Area of the Study

The study is conducted at Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. Kano State Polytechnic is located in Kano State along BUK Road and forms part of the state-owned tertiary education system. Federal Polytechnic Bauchi is located in Bauchi State and operates as a federal polytechnic with academic and administrative structures.

Population of the Study

The population comprises all academic and non-academic staff of the two selected institutions.

Table 1: The population

Institution	Academic Staff	Non-Academic Staff	Total
Kano State Polytechnic	428	329	757
Federal Polytechnic Bauchi	283	198	481
Total	711	527	1238

Sample Size Determination

The population of the study comprised 1,238 staff, consisting of 711 academic staff and 527 non-academic staff drawn from Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. Specifically, Kano

State Polytechnic had a total population of 757 staff, comprising 428 academic and 329 non-academic staff, while Federal Polytechnic Bauchi had a total population of 481 staff, comprising 283 academic and 198 non-academic staff. The sample size was determined using the Yamane (1967) formula at a

5% level of precision:
 $n = N1 + N(e)^2n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$ Where: n = sample size, N = population size, e = level of precision. Given a population of 1,238 and a precision level of 0.05:

$$n = \frac{1238}{1 + (0.05)^2} = \frac{1238}{1 + 0.0025} = \frac{1238}{1.0025} = 1234.095 \approx 1234$$

$$n = \frac{1238}{1 + (0.05)^2} = \frac{1238}{1.0025} = 1234.095 \approx 1234$$

The calculated sample size was therefore approximately **302 respondents**. To ensure adequate representation of the different institutions and staff categories, the sample was proportionately allocated using: $n_i = \frac{N_i}{N} \times n$

Table 2: Population and Proportionate Sample Distribution

Institution	Academic Population	Non-Academic Population	Total Population	Academic Sample	Non-Academic Sample	Total Sample
Kano State Polytechnic	428	329	757	104	81	185
Federal Polytechnic Bauchi	283	198	481	69	48	117
Total	711	527	1,238	173	129	302

Source: Researcher's computation based on institutional staff population, 2026.

The table shows that 185 respondents were proportionately allocated to Kano State Polytechnic, consisting of 104 academic and 81 non-academic staff. Similarly, 117 respondents were allocated to Federal Polytechnic Bauchi, consisting of 69 academic and 48 non-academic staff. The overall sample size was therefore **302 respondents**, comprising 173 academic staff and 129 non-academic staff.

Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument is a structured questionnaire titled: Performance Appraisal and Work Productivity Questionnaire (PAWPQ). The questionnaire should contain five sections:

Section A: Demographic information.

Section B: Performance standards.

Section C: Appraisal frequency and feedback.

Section D: Perceived fairness of appraisal.

Section E: Work productivity.

Responses should be measured on a five-point Likert scale:

5 = Strongly Agree

4 = Agree

3 = Undecided

2 = Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree.

Validity of the Instrument

The questionnaire was submitted to experts in Human Resource Management, Industrial Relations, Educational Management and Research Methodology for face and content validation. Their observations were all incorporated before

administration.

and responses will be treated confidentially.

Reliability of the Instrument

Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine internal consistency. A coefficient of approximately 0.70 was considered acceptable for the major constructs.

Method of Data Collection

Questionnaires were administered to the respondents. Who were informed of the purpose of the study and assured that participation is voluntary

Method of Data Analysis

Data were analysed using SPSS, descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation, were used to describe the data. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to test relationships between appraisal dimensions and productivity. Multiple regression was used to determine the combined and individual effects of appraisal dimensions on productivity.

8. Data Presentation and Analysis

Table 3: Performance Standards

S/N	Questionnaire Item	Mean	SD	Decision
1	Performance standards are clearly communicated to me.	4.00	0.68	Agree
2	I understand the criteria used to evaluate my performance.	3.00	0.71	Undecided
3	The appraisal criteria are relevant to my job responsibilities.	3.00	0.91	Undecided
4	My institution establishes clear performance expectations.	3.00	0.66	Undecided
5	Performance standards are consistent with institutional objectives.	4.00	0.62	Agree
	Grand Mean	3.40		Undecided

Interpretation

The table shows that respondents **agreed** that performance standards are clearly communicated to them (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.68) and that performance standards are consistent with institutional objectives (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.62). However, respondents were **undecided** about their understanding of the evaluation criteria, the relevance of appraisal criteria

to their job responsibilities, and whether their institution establishes clear performance expectations, as each recorded a mean of 3.00. The **grand mean of 3.40** falls within the undecided range based on the stated decision rule. This suggests that, overall, respondents had a **moderate perception** of performance standards, although some specific aspects received positive responses.

Table 4: Frequency of Performance Appraisal

S/N	Questionnaire Item	Mean	SD	Decision
1	Performance appraisal is conducted regularly in my institution.	3.00	0.59	Undecided

2	My supervisor monitors my performance throughout the year.	3.00	0.76	Undecided
3	Performance problems are discussed before formal appraisal.	4.00	0.81	Agree
4	Appraisal is not limited to an annual exercise.	2.00	0.31	Disagree
5	Regular performance reviews help me improve my work.	4.00	0.66	Agree
	Grand Mean	3.20		Undecided

Interpretation

The table indicates that respondents **agreed** that performance problems are discussed before formal appraisal (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.81) and that regular performance reviews help them improve their work (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.66).

However, respondents were **undecided** about whether performance appraisal is conducted regularly and whether supervisors monitor their

performance throughout the year, with both items recording a mean of 3.00. The statement that **appraisal is not limited to an annual exercise** recorded a mean of 2.00, indicating **disagreement**. This suggests that respondents generally did not perceive appraisal as an activity that occurs continuously throughout the year. The **grand mean of 3.20** falls within the undecided range, indicating a moderate or neutral perception concerning the frequency of performance appraisal.

Table 5: Performance Appraisal Feedback

S/N	Questionnaire Item	Mean	SD	Decision
1	My supervisor provides useful feedback after appraisal.	3.00	0.68	Undecided
2	Appraisal feedback helps me identify areas for improvement.	4.00	0.55	Agree
3	I am given an opportunity to discuss my appraisal results.	3.00	0.81	Undecided
4	Feedback is communicated promptly.	4.00	0.49	Agree
5	My supervisor provides guidance on improving weak areas.	3.00	0.48	Undecided
	Grand Mean	3.40		Undecided

Interpretation

The table indicates that respondents **agreed** that appraisal feedback helps them identify areas for improvement (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.55) and that feedback is communicated promptly (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.49). Respondents were **undecided** about whether their supervisors provide useful feedback after appraisal, whether they are given an opportunity

to discuss their appraisal results, and whether supervisors provide guidance on improving weak areas, as each recorded a mean of 3.00. The **grand mean of 3.40** falls within the undecided range. Therefore, the overall perception of performance appraisal feedback can be described as **moderate**, despite positive responses to the promptness and usefulness of feedback for identifying areas for improvement.

Table 6: Summary of Research Questions

Research Question	Grand Mean	General Interpretation
Performance Standards	3.40	Moderate
Appraisal Frequency	3.20	Moderate
Appraisal Feedback	3.40	Moderate

Interpretation

The table summarises the descriptive findings of the three research questions. Performance standards and performance appraisal feedback both recorded a grand mean of **3.40**, while appraisal frequency recorded applying the decision rule consistently,

also, all three grand means fall within the **2.50–3.49** range and are therefore interpreted as **moderate**. This indicates that respondents did not express sufficient disagreement regarding the three dimensions of performance appraisal examined in the study.

Table 7: Hypothesis Discussion

Hypothesis	Evidence available in the study
H01 Clarity of performance standards → work productivity	Performance standards grand mean = 3.40; mixed responses on clarity and relevance
H02 Regular appraisal → work productivity	Appraisal frequency grand mean = 3.20; respondents recognised usefulness of regular reviews but did not perceive appraisal as consistently continuous
H03 Appraisal feedback → work productivity	Feedback grand mean = 3.40; respondents agreed that feedback identifies areas for improvement and is communicated promptly

Discussion of H01

H01: There is no significant relationship between clarity of performance standards and work productivity among employees of the selected polytechnics.

The study conceptualises performance standards as the criteria and expectations against which employee performance is assessed. It indicates that effective standards should be clear, measurable, relevant to

employees' responsibilities and consistent with institutional objectives. The literature reviewed in the study further suggests that employees are more likely to perform effectively when performance expectations are clearly established and communicated. The descriptive findings provide some evidence concerning the respondents' perceptions of performance standards. Respondents agreed that performance standards were clearly communicated to them, with a mean of 4.00 and

standard deviation of 0.68. They also agreed that performance standards were consistent with institutional objectives, with a mean of 4.00 and standard deviation of 0.62. However, respondents were undecided about whether they understood the criteria used to evaluate their performance, whether the criteria were relevant to their job responsibilities, and whether their institutions established clear performance expectations. The overall grand mean was 3.40, interpreted as a moderate perception.

These findings suggest that although some aspects of performance standards are positively perceived, there are areas where employees may not have complete clarity concerning how their performance is evaluated. This is particularly relevant because the study recognises that academic and non-academic employees perform different duties and therefore require performance criteria appropriate to their respective responsibilities.

Discussion of H02

H02: Regular performance appraisal has no significant effect on work productivity among employees of the selected polytechnics.

The study explains that the frequency of performance appraisal may influence its usefulness. It notes that traditional appraisal systems often rely on annual evaluations, whereas contemporary performance management places greater emphasis on continuous performance discussions and feedback. Regular performance discussions can enable employees and supervisors to identify challenges, review progress and make necessary adjustments.

The descriptive findings show a mixed perception of appraisal frequency. Respondents were undecided about whether performance appraisal was conducted regularly and whether supervisors monitored their performance throughout the year, with means of 3.00 for both items. Respondents agreed that performance problems were discussed before formal appraisal (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.81) and that regular performance reviews helped them improve their work (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.66). However, they disagreed with the statement that appraisal was not limited to an annual exercise (Mean = 2.00, SD =

0.31). The grand mean for appraisal frequency was 3.20, interpreted as moderate or neutral.

The results therefore indicate that employees recognise the potential usefulness of regular performance reviews, particularly in helping them improve their work. At the same time, the findings suggest that appraisal may not be perceived as a continuous process throughout the year.

Discussion of H03

H03: Appraisal feedback has no significant effect on work productivity among employees of the selected polytechnics.

The study identifies feedback as an important component of performance appraisal because it gives employees information about their strengths, weaknesses and areas requiring improvement. Constructive feedback can help employees understand the difference between expected and actual performance and can guide them towards improvement.

The descriptive results indicate a mixed but generally moderate perception of appraisal feedback. Respondents agreed that appraisal feedback helped them identify areas for improvement (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.55) and that feedback was communicated promptly (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.49). However, they were undecided about whether supervisors provided useful feedback after appraisal, whether they were given an opportunity to discuss appraisal results, and whether supervisors provided guidance for improving weak areas. Each of these items recorded a mean of 3.00. The grand mean was 3.40, which the study interpreted as a moderate overall perception.

Findings of the Study

1. **Performance standards:** The study found a moderate overall perception of performance standards, with a grand mean of **3.40**. Respondents agreed that performance standards were clearly communicated and consistent with institutional objectives. However, they were undecided about their understanding of evaluation criteria, the

relevance of appraisal criteria to their job responsibilities, and whether clear performance expectations were established.

2. **Frequency of performance appraisal:** The study found a moderate perception of appraisal frequency, with a grand mean of **3.20**. Respondents agreed that performance problems were discussed before formal appraisal and that regular performance reviews helped improve their work. However, they disagreed that appraisal was not limited to an annual exercise, suggesting that continuous performance monitoring was not sufficiently established.
3. **Performance appraisal feedback:** Performance appraisal feedback recorded a grand mean of **3.40**, indicating a moderate perception. Respondents agreed that feedback helped them identify areas for improvement and that feedback was communicated promptly. However, they were undecided about whether supervisors provided useful feedback, whether employees had opportunities to discuss appraisal results, and whether supervisors provided adequate guidance for improving weak areas.
4. **Overall performance appraisal practices:** The combined descriptive findings indicate that performance appraisal practices in the two institutions were present but could be strengthened. The moderate perceptions across performance standards, appraisal frequency and feedback suggest the need for more systematic, continuous and employee-oriented appraisal practices.

Recommendations

1. **Clarify performance standards:** Management of Kano State Polytechnic and Federal Polytechnic Bauchi should ensure that performance standards and evaluation criteria are clearly communicated to all academic and non-academic staff. The criteria should be specific, measurable,

transparent and relevant to employees' actual responsibilities.

2. **Strengthen continuous appraisal:** The institutions should move beyond an appraisal system that is largely perceived as an annual exercise. Regular performance discussions, monitoring sessions and progress reviews should be introduced throughout the academic and administrative year.
3. **Improve appraisal feedback:** Supervisors should provide constructive, specific and timely feedback after appraisal. Feedback should clearly identify employees' strengths, weaknesses and areas requiring improvement.
4. **Provide opportunities for discussion:** Employees should be given adequate opportunities to discuss their appraisal results with their supervisors. Such discussions can allow employees to clarify issues, respond to assessments and agree on appropriate improvement strategies.
5. **Link appraisal to staff development:** Appraisal results should be used to identify training and professional-development needs. Staff whose appraisal reveals weaknesses should be supported through relevant training, mentoring, coaching and other development programmes.

9. Conclusion

The study indicates that performance appraisal practices in the two selected polytechnics have a **moderate level of effectiveness**, particularly regarding performance standards, appraisal frequency and feedback. The major areas requiring attention are the clarity of evaluation criteria, continuous performance monitoring, quality of supervisory feedback, employee participation in appraisal discussions and guidance for improving weak performance. Strengthening these areas could make performance appraisal a more effective instrument for improving employee productivity.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). Academic Press.
- Aguinis, H. (2019). *Performance management* (4th ed.). Chicago Business Press.
- Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of performance management: An evidence-based guide to delivering high performance* (6th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. G. (2021). A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(2), 171–203.
- Elnaga, A., & Imran, A. (2023). The effect of training on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 137–147.
- Fapohunda, T. M. (2022). The impact of employee compensation on productivity in Nigerian public sector. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(21), 45–53.
- Fletcher, C. (2001). *Economics, Management and Business Research*, 3(3), 139–147.
- Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. (2026). *About the Federal Polytechnic Bauchi*. Federal Polytechnic Bauchi.
- Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. (2026). *Finances and statistics*. Federal Polytechnic Bauchi.
- Federal Polytechnic Bauchi. (2026). *Management*. Federal Polytechnic Bauchi.
- Jonah, H., Musa, M. I., & Mohammed, A. A. (2026). Impact of performance appraisal systems on employee effectiveness in Federal Polytechnic, Mubi, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Resources and Management Science*.
- Kano State Government. (2026). *Ministry for Higher Education: State-owned tertiary institutions*. Kano State Government.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705–717.
- Obasan, K., Onabanjo, H., & Ogunkoya, O. (2014). Organisational citizenship behaviour as correlate of performance appraisal: A study of academic staff in Nigerian tertiary institutions.
- Salahu, M. O., Mohammed, I. D., & Ogunsola, A. O. (2026). Performance appraisal and employees productivity: A study of Oke-Ogun Polytechnic Saki, Oyo State, Nigeria. *Kashere Journal of Politics and International Relations*.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.