

## **An Assessment of Performance Evaluation Feedback in Governmental Secondary School, Jos North L.G.A Plateau State**

**Zekeri Momoh\***

**Okafor, Genevieve Chinwendu\*\***

**Michael Kolo\*\*\***

### **Abstract**

The aim of this study is to assess the level of Performance evaluation feedback in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area. However, both primary and secondary sources of data collection were employed. The primary sources of data were obtained through administering 210 structured questionnaires to teachers in all 21 governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area (Nigeria). While the secondary sources of data were obtained from text books, journals and internet sources. The three hypotheses study were tested using Chi-square at 0.5% significance level. On the whole, alternative hypotheses of the study were upheld which states that teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area are satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they got. Secondly, that teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area get feedback from performance evaluation and that there are diverse opinions on when performance evaluation should be conducted among teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area.

**Key words:** Performance evaluation, feedback, Jos North,

### **1. Introduction**

Performance appraisal is often used interchangeably with performance assessment, evaluations, and performance review or employee appraisal. Performance evaluation process is an aspect of performance management system.

The term 'performance management' was first used in the 1970s, but it did not become a recognized process until the second half of the 1980s. The performance appraisal is a unique and very important aspect of career development which entails a regular review of the performance of employees in the organization (Caruth & Humphreys, 2008), but goes further to communicate feedback to the employees (Sole, 2009).

---

\* Global Network for Peace and Anti-corruption Initiative (GNPAI), Jos - Nigeria.

Email: momohzekeri@gmail.com

\*\* University of Jos, Jos-Nigeria,

Email: Genygr8@yahoo.com

\*\*\* University of Jos, Jos-Nigeria,

Email: kolomichael83@gmail.com

Performance evaluation involves improvement in an organization and the personnel capabilities. It entails determining and communicating to employees on how they are performing their job and ways of making improvement. Thus, the information provided by the appraisal system is useful in three major areas, namely: compensation, placement and training and development (Seniwoliba, 2014). Performance evaluation ensures that there is improvement in employees' performance by identifying their strengths and weaknesses. It also helps to identify those with potentials for greater responsibilities and help them in deciding on an equitable compensation system.

An employee performance evaluation serves as a means for management to evaluate and provides feedback on employee job performance, including steps to improve on their deficiencies as needed. The feedback mechanism serves as a means of identifying their strengths and weaknesses (Roberson & Stewart, 2006; Schraeder, Becton & Portis, 2007). Some scholars posit that to improve employees' performance it is important to identify the areas of improvement and weaknesses through feedback and assistance which assures the employee's involvement, improvement and commitment to improving his or her performance (Macey et al, 2009).

Moreover, for an organization to survive, it needs to continually inform employees of their worth, values, strength, recognize them for a job well done and set a record of open-minded and fair-minded feedback. This record of feedback in evaluation can be provided verbally, but in many cases, legal experts counsel employers to maintain written records in order to provide themselves with greater legal protections. One of the prominent methods of performance evaluation is the use of 360-degree feedback which can also be adopted in evaluating the performance of an individual. This degree affords the management of organizations the opportunity to assess the performance of an individual employee through his/her interaction with different co-workers or departments, external customers, and the employee (Salau et al, 2014).

On the whole, over years, the Plateau State Ministry of Education has adopted the Annual Performance Evaluation Form (APEF) as a means of assessing the work performance of teachers in governmental secondary schools in the state. The Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) is usually conducted every December in order to assess the performance of its teachers. It is against this backdrop that this study seeks to assess performance evaluation feedback in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Performance Evaluation**

'Performance evaluation' in Human Resource Management literature is interchangeably used as 'performance appraisal' or 'performance assessment'. However, in this study we shall use it as 'performance evaluation'. Performance appraisal is a discrete, formal, organizationally sanctioned event, usually not occurring more frequently than once or twice a year, which has clearly stated performance dimensions and/or criteria that are used in the evaluation process (Angelo & Pritchard 2006 cited in Seniwoliba, 2014).

Seniwoliba, (2014) conceived performance appraisal as an evaluation process, in which quantitative scores are often assigned based on the judged level of the employee's job performance on the dimensions or criteria used, and the scores are shared with the employee being evaluated. He added that an objective method of judging the relative worth or ability of an individual employee in performing his or her task is needed. He further stated that if performance appraisal is objectively done, the appraisal can help distinguish between a hard worker and a lazy one. A better performance appraisal system, therefore, should focus on the individual and his or her development in order to make him or her achieve the desired performance or output.

Lansbury (1988) defines performance appraisal as the process of identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of employees in the organization, so that the organizational goals and objectives are more effectively achieved, while at the same time benefiting employees in terms of recognition, receiving feedback, catering for work needs and offering career guidance.

Devries et al. (1981) define performance appraisal as a process by which an organization measures and evaluates an individual employee's behavior and accomplishments for a finite period. In the same vein, Carrol and Scheider (1982) see performance appraisal as the process of identifying, observing, measuring, and developing human performance in organization.

Moulder (2001) states that performance appraisals are valued for defining expectations and measuring the extent to which expectations are met. Seniwoliba, (2014) argues that Moulder goes on to state that appraisals can make clear to employees where they are having success and where they need to improve performance. Seniwoliba, (2014) further stresses that Moulder indicates that appraisals are useful in setting goals and in fostering improved communications among work groups and between employees and supervisors.

### **Components of Performance Evaluation**

Performance evaluation systems contain two basic systems: a. Evaluation system. b. Feedback system

#### **a. Evaluation System**

The focus of the evaluation system is to identify the performance gap (if any in an organization). This gap is the shortfall that occurs when performance does not meet the standard set by the organization especially if it is not acceptable.

#### **b. Feedback System**

The main objective of the feedback system is to inform the employee about the quality of their performance. However, the information flow is not exclusively one-way. The appraisers also receive feedback from the employee about job problems.

## 2.2. Approaches To Performance Evaluation

DeCenzo and Robbins (2010) identified three approaches for measuring performance appraisal. These are absolute standards, relative standards and objectives. Under the absolute standards method of performance evaluation employees are compared to a standard, and their evaluation is independent of any other employee in a work group. The absolute methods include: the essay appraisal, the critical incident appraisal, the checklist, the graphic rating scale, forced choice and behaviourally anchored rating scales. While by the relative standards method employees are compared against other individuals. These methods are relative standards rather than absolute measuring devices. The most popular of the relative method is group order ranking, individual ranking and paired comparison. The third method is the objectives' method in which employees are evaluated on how well they accomplished a specific set of objectives that have been determined to be critical in the successful completion of their job. This approach is often known in Human Resource Management literature as Management by Objectives (MBO) which converts organizational objectives into individual objectives (Seniwoliba, 2014).

However, the 360-degree evaluations are a prominent method of performance evaluation. It involves evaluating input from multiple levels within the firm as well as external sources. There are numerous authors who propose definitions of the 360-degree feedback process. Feedback from multiple sources or '360-degree feedback' is a performance appraisal approach that relies on the input of an employee's superiors, colleagues, subordinates, sometimes customers, suppliers and/or spouses (Yukl & Lepsinger, 1995; Seniwoliba, 2014).

Hoffman (1995) explains that 360-degree feedback is an approach that gathers behavioural observations from many layers within the organization and includes self-assessment. The 360-degree evaluation can help one person be rated from different sides and by different people, which can give the wider perspective of the employee's competencies (Shrestha, 2007). It has been used for human resource development, appraisal and pay decisions (Armstrong, 1998; Stone, 2002; Seniwoliba, 2014).

Lastly, Tornow (1993) observes that in 360-degree feedback programmes, feedback about a target individual is solicited from significant others using a standardized instrument. Jones and Bearley (1996) refer to 360-degree feedback as the practice of gathering and processing multi-rater assessments on individuals and feeding back the results to the recipients.

## 2.3. Tools of Performance Evaluation

Public and private organizations alike have employed the following tool for the performance evaluation of its employees among which are the use of rewards to appraise the employees for a job well done; training especially when some employees are found to be deficient in the performance of their duties; pay increases and promotions, especially when high performances are recorded for employees. It must be supported with a basis for pay increases and promotions; feedback is crucial because it serves as a means for management to evaluate and provides

feedback on employee job performance, including steps to improve on their deficiencies as needed and Demotion, Termination, Redeployment, Transfer and Retrenchment when necessary.

#### **2.4. Performance Evaluation Feedback in Governmental Secondary Schools in Jos North Lga**

In the literature of Human Resources Management and Performance Management a lot of studies have been conducted on an evaluation of performance evaluation, but no such study has been conducted on performance evaluation feedback in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area. It is against this background that this study seeks to fill this gap created in the literature so as to make contribution in this endeavor.

### **3. Research Questions**

1. Are teachers satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get?
2. Do teachers get feedback from performance evaluation?
3. How often should performance evaluation be conducted?

#### **3.1. Hypotheses**

##### ***Null Hypotheses (Ho)***

Ho: Teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area are not satisfied with performance evaluation feedback.

Ho: Teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area do not get feedback from performance evaluation.

Ho: There are no diverse opinions on when performance evaluation should be conducted.

##### ***Alternative Hypotheses (H1)***

H1 Teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area are satisfied with performance evaluation feedback

H1: Teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area get feedback from performance evaluation

H1: There are diverse opinions on when performance evaluation should be conducted.

#### **4. Significance Of The Study**

This study is important as it seeks to fill the gap created in the literature as no study has been conducted on the assessment of performance evaluation feedback in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area. It is against this backdrop this study is important to the Plateau State Ministry of Education, Researchers and Scholars who would want to know performance evaluation feedback of teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area have fared.

#### **5. Objectives And Scope Of The Study**

This study seeks to assess performance evaluation feedback in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area.

#### **6. Research Methodology**

##### **Research Design**

Descriptive research design was used for this research based on adoption of survey method.

##### **Sampling Design**

Probability sampling method was adopted to choose the sample in the study. Random sampling techniques was adopted to collect data from the entire twenty one (21) governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area as at August 2016.

##### **Sample Size**

The total sample size of the study comprises of 10 Teachers from the Twenty One (21) Governmental Secondary Schools in Jos North Local Government Area as at August 2016.

##### **The Rating Scale Format**

The Likert rating scale also known as the Summated rating scale developed by Renaise A. Likert in 1932 in his work "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes" was used.

##### **Data Collection Method**

A self-designed questionnaire was constructed by the researcher to collect relevant information from the respondents. This survey questionnaire involved two sections: 'A' and 'B'. Section A was designed to obtain personal data of the respondents, while Section B was made up of Questions and options of individual opinions by respondents on the subject of the research study. The Secondary data were collected through text books, journals and internet sources.

### Data Analysis Method

The data collected from the sample were analyzed by using descriptive statistics from the statistical tools. The demographic factor such as age, gender and experience were taken to the assessment of performance evaluation feedback in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area as at August 2016.

## 7. Results and Discussions

**Table 1.** Social Characteristic of Respondents

Years of service	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than a year	57	28.8
1-3years	34	17.2
4-6 years	27	13.6
7-9 year	25	12.6
More than 10 years	55	27.8
	198	100
Grade Levels		
0-6	57	28.8
7-10	118	59.6
11-16	23	11.6
Total	198	100
Educational Qualifications		
NCE/OND/ND	68	34.3
HND/PGD/PDG.E	14	7
B.Sc./B.A/B.Ed	114	57.6
M.Sc.	2	1
Total	198	100
Gender		
Male	110	55.6
Female	88	44.4
Total	198	100
Age		
25-30	76	38.4
31-40	69	34.8
41-50	40	20.2

51 and above	13	6.6
Total	198	100
Marital status		
Single	73	36.9
Married	120	60.6
Widow	3	1.5
Widower	1	0.5
Divorced	1	0.5
Total	198	100

Table 1 shows that 57 of the respondents representing 28.8% have spent less than a year as a teacher; 34 of the respondents representing 17.2% - between 1 and 3 years; 27 of the respondents representing 13.6% - 4-6 years; 25 of the respondents representing 12.6% between 7 and 9 years, while 55 of the respondents representing 27.8% - more than 10 years. Therefore, more of the respondents spent less than a year as a teacher in their respective schools followed by 55 respondents who have spent more than 10 years as a teacher in their respective schools.

Besides, 57 of the respondents representing 28.8% are between grade level 0 and 6; 118 of the respondents representing 59.6% - between grade level 7 and 10, while 23 of the respondents representing 11.6% - between grade level 11 and 16. Therefore, the majority of the respondents are between grade level 7 and 10. Also, 68 of the respondents representing 34.3% hold a NCE/OND/ND certificate; 14 of the respondents representing 7% hold a HND/PGD/PDGE certificate; 114 of the respondents representing 57.6% hold a B.Sc./B.A/B.Ed. degree, 2 of the respondents representing 34.3% hold an M.Sc./Master degree while none of the respondents hold an M.Phil. /Ph.D. degree. Therefore, the majority of the respondents hold a B.Sc./B.A/B.Ed. degree.

Moreover, 110 of the respondents representing 55.6% are male, while 88 of the respondents representing 44.4 % are female. Thus, most of the respondents are male. Also, 76 of the respondents representing 34.4% are aged between 25 and 30; 69 of the respondents representing 34.8% are aged between 31 and 40; 40 of the respondents representing 20.2% are aged between 41 and 50; while 13 of the respondents representing 6.6% are aged between 51 and above. Therefore, it can be said that the majority of the respondents are aged between 25 and 30 followed by respondents aged between 31 and 40.

Lastly, 73 of the respondents representing 36.9% are single; 120 of the respondents representing 60.6% are married; 3 of the respondents representing 1.5% are widows; 1 of the respondents representing 0.5% is a widower; while 11 of the respondents representing 0.5% are divorced. Therefore, most of the respondents are married.



**Table 2.** Are you satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback you get?

Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage
Satisfied	45	22.8	22.8
Not really satisfied	140	70.6	93.4
Dissatisfied	13	6.6	94.9
Aggregate	198	5.08	100

Table 2 shows that 45 of the respondents representing 22.8 % are satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get and 140 of the respondent representing 70.6 % are not really satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get, while 13 of the respondents representing 6.6 % are dissatisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get. Thus, not too many are totally satisfied, however, few are dissatisfied.

**3X3 Contingency Table**

45	139	13	197
66	66	66	198

$$X^2 = \frac{\sum (O-E)^2}{E}$$

$$\frac{(45-66)^2}{66} + \frac{(139-66)^2}{66} + \frac{(13-66)^2}{66}$$

$$X^2 = 6.68 + 80.7 + 42.6 = 129.9$$

$$X^2 = 129.9$$

$$Df = (R-1)(C-1)$$

$$(3-1)(2-1) = 2$$

$$X^2 = 129.9$$

$$X^2 = (\text{table value at } 0.05, df, 2) = 5.991$$

**Decision Rule 1:** Reject  $H_0$  if  $X^2$  calculated is  $> X^2$  table value

2: Accept  $H_0$  if otherwise

**Interpretation:** Since the calculated value 129.9 and the table value is 5.991, the calculated value is greater than the table value. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that teachers in governmental

secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area are satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get.

**Table 3** Do you get feedback from performance evaluation?

Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage
Always	44	22.1	22.1
Sometimes	142	71.4	93.5
Never	13	6.6	100
Total	199	5.08	

Table 3 shows that 44 of the respondents representing 22.1 % are of the opinion that they always get feedback from performance evaluation and 142 of the respondent representing 71.4 % are of the opinion that they sometimes get feedback from performance evaluation while 13 of the respondents representing 6.6 % are of the opinion that they never get feedback from performance evaluation.

**3X3 Contingency Table**

44	142	13	199
66	66	66	198

$$X^2 = \frac{\sum E(O-E)^2}{E}$$

$$\frac{(44-66)^2}{66} + \frac{(142-66)^2}{66} + \frac{(13-66)^2}{66}$$

$$X^2 = 7.33 + 87.5 + 42.6 = 137.4$$

$$X^2 = 137.4$$

$$Df = (R-1)(C-1)$$

$$(3-1)(2-1) = 2$$

$$X^2 = 137.4$$

$$X^2 = (\text{table value at } 0.05, df 2) = 5.991$$

**Decision Rule 1:** Reject  $H_0$ , if  $X^2$  calculated is  $>$   $X^2$  table value

2: Accept  $H_0$ , if otherwise

**Interpretation:** Since the calculated value **129.9** and the table value is 5.991, the calculated value is greater than the table value. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area get feedback from performance evaluation.

**Table 4.** In your opinion performance evaluation should be conducted?

Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Annually	67	33.5
Bi-annually	41	20.5
Quarterly	60	30
Monthly	32	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4 shows that 67 of the respondent representing 33.5 % are of the opinion that performance evaluation should be conducted annually, 41 of the respondent representing 20.5 % THAT evaluation should be conducted bi-annually, while 60 of the respondents representing 30 % - that performance evaluation should be conducted quarterly and 32 of the respondent representing 16% are of the opinion that performance evaluation should be conducted Monthly.

**3X3 Contingency Table**

67	41	60	32	200
50	50	50	50	200

$$X^2 = \frac{E(O-E)^2}{E}$$

$$\frac{(67-50)^2}{50} + \frac{(41-50)^2}{50} + \frac{(60-50)^2}{50} + \frac{(32-50)^2}{50}$$

$$X^2 = 5.78 + 16.2 + 2 + 6.48 = 30.46$$

$$X^2 = 30.46$$

$$Df = (R-1) (C-1)$$

$$(3-1) (2-1) = 2$$

$$X^2 = 30.46$$

$$X^2 = (\text{table value at } 0.05, df, 2) = 5.991$$

**Decision Rule 1:** Reject  $H_0$ , if  $X^2$  calculated is  $> X^2$  table value

2: Accept  $H_0$ , if otherwise

**Interpretation:** Since the calculated value **30.46** and the table value is **5.991**, the calculated value is greater than the table value. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that there are diverse opinions on performance evaluation conducted among teachers in governmental secondary schools in Jos North Local Government Area.

## 8. Summary of Discussions and Findings

Research on teacher evaluation in Nigeria is unavailable. There is some research, touching the issue indirectly. For instance, Oyedeji (2015) research, based on literature and document study, has revealed that the state of education in Nigeria does not correspond to the efforts done for its improvement. It mentions the non-involvement of stakeholders, especially teachers, in the policy formulation process as one of the causes of the situation. Okoli, Okbondah & Ekpefa-Abdullahi (2015) also emphasize the fallen standards both in students' and teacher preparation, naming insufficient funding, lack of personnel, poor facilities, and poor supervision. Egbune (2013) studied 105 teachers' and administrator's perceptions from six randomly sampled Delta State Central Senatorial District schools in Nigeria. The respondents stated that teacher peer assessment and feedback in their schools practically does not exist.

Internationally, there are many researches dealing with teacher performance evaluation (Brown et al., 2015; Dagal & Zembat, 2017; Spina, Buckley, & Puchner, 2014). Unfortunately, the majority of them deal with the reliability and validity of the assessment system used and not with teacher attitude to the provided feedback, so their results are hardly comparable with the given study.

From the study we discovered that 45 of the respondents representing 22.8 % are satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get and 139 of the respondents representing 70.6 % are satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get while 13 of the respondents representing 6.6 % are satisfied with the performance evaluation feedback they get. Although the situation with feedback is not bad, but its improvement is necessary. Had the evaluation feedback been adequate, the general dissatisfaction with the education outcomes (Egbune, 2013; Okoli et al, 2015; Oyedeji, 2015) would be difficult to explain.

Secondly, 44 of the respondents representing 22.1 % are of the opinion that they always get feedback from performance evaluation and 142 of the respondents representing 71.4 % are of the opinion that they sometimes get feedback from performance evaluation while 13 of the respondents representing 6.6 % are of the opinion that they never get feedback from performance evaluation. This means that feedback should be provided more stably.

67 of the respondents representing 33.5 % are of the opinion that performance evaluation should be conducted annually, 41 of the respondent representing 20.5 % - that performance evaluation should be conducted bi-annually, while 60 of the respondents representing 30 % - that performance evaluation should be conducted quarterly and 32 of the respondent representing 16% are of the opinion that performance evaluation should be

conducted monthly. This means that performance evaluation, to satisfy the majority of teachers, should be conducted up to 4 times a year. If we compare the results with Hall et al. (2009) study, we will see that a significant increase in the frequency of teacher assessment causes both positive and negative changes in their work quality and job satisfaction. Thus, monthly assessment is definitely too much, while 2-4 times a year should be normal.

## 9. Recommendation

Teacher assessment on performance in governmental secondary schools in Jos North L.G.A Plateau State is basically satisfactory for the teachers involved, however, there are some dissatisfied teachers, so the quality and frequency of feedback should be improved.

## References

- Armstrong, M. (1998). *Performance Management: The New Realities*. London: CIPD.
- Brown, E.L., Suh, J., Parsons, S.A., Parker, A.K., Ramirez, E.M. (2015). Documenting teacher candidates' professional growth through performance evaluation. *Journal of Research in Education*, 25, 1, p. 35-47.
- Carrol, S.J. & Schneier C.E. (1982). *Performance Appraisal and Review Systems*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Caruth, D.L. & Humphreys, J.H. (2008). Performance appraisal: Essential characteristics for strategic control. *Measuring Business Excellence* 12(3), p.24-32.
- Dagal, A.B. & Zembat, R. (2017). A developmental study on evaluating the performance of preschool education institution teachers with 360 degree feedback. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5, 6, p. 220-231.
- DeCenzo, D.A. & Robbins, S.P. (2010). *Fundamentals of Human Resource Management*. Hoboken, N.J., USA: Wiley & Sons.
- Devries, D.L., Morrison, A.M., Shillman, S.L., & Gerlach M.L. (1981). *Performance Appraisal on the Line*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Egbune, (2013). *Examining the Five Dimensions of Professional Learning Communities in Nigerian Schools: A Study of the Perceptions of Educators in Delta State Schools*. Doctoral Dissertation. Minneapolis, Minnesota, US: Capella University.
- Hall, A. T., Zinko, R., Perryman, A. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2009). Organizational citizenship behavior and reputation: Mediators in the relationship between accountability and job performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(4), p. 381-392.
- Hoffman, E.J. (1995). Ten reasons why you should be using 360-degree feedback. *HR Magazine*, 40(4), p. 82-86.

- Jones, J.E. & Bearley, W.L. (1996). *360° Feedback: Strategies, Tactics and Techniques for Developing Leaders*. Armhurst, MA: HRD Press.
- Lansbury, R. (1988). Performance human resource management. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 26, p. 46–54.
- Moulder, E. (2001). Performance appraisals for local government employees: Programs and practices. Special Data, 1, Washington, D.C.: International City /County Management Association.
- Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage*. Malden, WA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Okoli, N.J., Okbondah, L., & Ekpefa-Abdullahi, J.Y. (2015). Preparing teachers for the contemporary Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6, 14, p. 129-134.
- Oyedeji, S.O. (2015). Lapses in education policy formulation processes in Nigeria: Implications for the standard of education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6, 29, p. 195-202.
- Roberson, Q.M. & Stewart, M.M. (2006). Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97(3), p. 281-298.
- Salau, P.O., Oludayo, F.O., Omoniyi, C.O., & Akinbode, J.O. (2014). Modelling the relationship between performance appraisal and organizational productivity in Nigerian Public Sector. *Economics, Management, Innovation*, 6, 2, p. 2-16.
- Schraeder, M. Becton, J., & Portis, R. (2007). A critical examination of performance appraisals. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 21(1), p. 20-25.
- Seniwoliba, J.A. (2014). Assessing the performance appraisal concept of the local government service in Ghana. *Academic Journals*, 8, 15, p. 599-611.
- Shrestha, S. (2007). Improving employee performance appraisal method through web-based appraisal supports system: System development from the study on Thai companies. *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems*, E90–D (10), p. 1621-1629.
- Sole, F. (2009). A management model and factors driving performance in public organizations. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 13(4), p. 3-11.
- Spina, N., Buckley, P. & Puchner, L. (2014). Shifting practices in teacher performance evaluation: A qualitative examination of administrator change readiness. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review of Doctoral Research*, 1, 2, p. 113-128.
- Stone, R. (2002). *Human Resource Management*. 4th ed., Brisbane: Wiley and Sons.



Tornow, W. (1993). Perceptions or reality: is multi-perspective measurement a means to an end? *Human Resource Management*. 32(2, 3), p. 221-229.

Yukl, G. & Lepsinger, R. (1995). How to get the most out of 360° feedback. *Training*, 32(12), p. 45-50.