

**ASSESSMENT OF APPRAISAL MECHANISM ON EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY IN
ADAMAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, MUBL. NIGERIA**

Jude Amos Midala¹ and Minnessi Kibikiwa Glenn²

Post graduate Student, Department of Public Administration Adamawa State University, Mubi

Department of Public Administration, Adamawa State University, Mubi

akimjude@gmail.com, glenn788@adsu.edu.ng

DOI: 10.64290/aijpam.v3.i3.30

Abstract

This study assessed the performance appraisal mechanism and its influence on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi. The study was premised on the concern that although performance appraisal is expected to improve employee performance, weaknesses in appraisal procedures, limited staff participation, and inadequate feedback may reduce its effectiveness in achieving institutional productivity. The study specifically identified the performance appraisal mechanisms adopted for staff appraisal and examined their impact on employee productivity. The study was anchored on Goal-Setting Theory, which explains how clear performance expectations, feedback, and defined objectives can improve employee performance. A quantitative research design was adopted, using primary data collected through a structured Likert-scale questionnaire administered to academic staff. From a population of 377 permanent academic staff, 190 respondents were selected using stratified random and multistage sampling techniques. Data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviation. The findings revealed that the University adopts formal appraisal mechanisms based on periodic assessment, established performance criteria, supervisory evaluation, and assessment of teaching, research, publications, and community service. The findings also showed that appraisal positively enhances productivity by clarifying performance expectations, providing feedback, identifying training needs, encouraging goal setting, and strengthening staff commitment. The study recommends greater staff participation in appraisal and improved use of appraisal outcomes for feedback, training, recognition, and performance development.

Keywords: Performance Appraisal, Employee Productivity, Goal-Setting Theory, Staff Performance, Adamawa State University.

Introduction

Performance appraisal has become an important mechanism through which higher education institutions monitor employee performance, communicate institutional expectations, and identify areas requiring improvement. However, its contribution to employee productivity depends on how appraisal procedures are designed, administered, and connected to actual workplace responsibilities. In universities, where academic and non-academic employees perform different but interdependent functions, appraisal practices raise questions about the adequacy of performance standards, the

fairness of assessments, the quality of feedback, and the extent to which appraisal outcomes inform employee development and institutional improvement (Aguinis, 2023; Al-Ababneh, 2021). The relevance of these issues is particularly evident in the context of Adamawa State University, Mubi (ADSU), where academic employees are responsible for teaching, research, supervision, and related academic activities, while non-academic employees support administrative and other institutional operations. These different responsibilities require appraisal mechanisms that reflect the nature of employees' duties and provide meaningful information about their performance. The central concern is not merely whether appraisal exists within the university, but whether its implementation provides clear performance expectations, credible assessments, constructive feedback, and opportunities for improvement. Research on performance appraisal suggests that employee engagement, commitment, and organizational performance may be associated with the quality of appraisal practices, although such outcomes depend on the conditions under which appraisal is implemented (Yusoff et al., 2021; Karia & Omari, 2022).

At ADSU, the existence of performance appraisal procedures does not, by itself, establish their effectiveness in improving employee productivity. Appraisal outcomes may differ according to the clarity of performance criteria, the consistency of assessment, the relationship between supervisors and employees, and the extent to which employees receive feedback on their performance. Inadequate communication, inaccurate assessments, and perceived unfairness have been identified as factors that can weaken the contribution of appraisal systems to employee performance (Ahmed et al., 2021; Otoo et al., 2022; Sani & Okafor, 2020; Dauda & Idris, 2023). These concerns provide a basis for examining whether appraisal practices at ADSU are adequately aligned with the responsibilities of academic and non-academic employees and whether they support improvements in productivity. The distinction between appraisal procedures and their actual contribution to productivity is central to this study. Contemporary appraisal approaches emphasize measurable performance expectations, continuous feedback, goal setting, and employee participation. Methods such as Management by Objectives (MBO), 360-degree feedback, and behaviour-based assessment provide different ways of assessing employee performance and linking individual responsibilities to organizational objectives (Adeoye & Osekita, 2022; Onyango & Atambo, 2023). Nevertheless, the adoption or existence of an appraisal method does not necessarily demonstrate that it produces improved employee performance. Its contribution must be examined in relation to how employees experience the appraisal process, how assessments are conducted, and whether appraisal findings are used to address performance gaps and employee development needs (Thomas International, 2020; Eke et al., 2021).

The need for this examination is further underscored by the limitations of relying on general claims about the benefits of performance appraisal. Although previous research has associated appraisal practices with employee motivation, engagement, and organizational performance, these relationships cannot automatically be assumed to exist in the same form across institutions or

employee categories (Yusoff et al., 2021; Ali et al., 2023). Academic and non-academic employees at ADSU perform different functions and may therefore experience appraisal standards, assessment procedures, feedback, and development opportunities differently. A study that examines the university as a single organizational setting without distinguishing these employee categories may not adequately explain whether appraisal practices address their respective performance requirements. The research gap addressed by this study concerns the need for institution-specific and employee-category-sensitive evidence on the relationship between performance appraisal practices and employee productivity at ADSU. Although performance appraisal and employee performance have previously been examined in relation to the university, the existence of such research does not establish that all relevant aspects of appraisal implementation and productivity have been adequately addressed. In particular, the extent to which appraisal mechanisms, assessment procedures, feedback, and performance-related development opportunities are associated with the productivity of academic and non-academic employees requires further examination within the university's institutional context. This study therefore focuses on the appraisal mechanisms used at ADSU, Mubi, and investigates their relationship with employee productivity across the two broad employee categories. By examining these issues within the university, the study seeks to provide evidence that can clarify the contribution of appraisal practices to employee productivity and inform improvements in institutional human resource management.

Statement of the Problem

Employee productivity is an important concern in higher education institutions, where the performance of academic and non-academic employees contributes to teaching, research, administration, student services, and institutional development. Performance appraisal provides a mechanism through which institutions assess employee performance, communicate expectations, identify developmental needs, and provide feedback. However, the existence of an appraisal system does not necessarily establish that it contributes to improved employee productivity. The central concern is whether appraisal practices are accurately implemented, aligned with employees' responsibilities, and used to support performance improvement (Osei & Ackah, 2022; Aguinis, 2023). At Adamawa State University, Mubi (ADSU), the performance of academic and non-academic employees is assessed within an institutional environment involving different job responsibilities and performance expectations. Academic employees engage in teaching, research, student supervision, and scholarly activities, while non-academic employees perform administrative, technical, and support functions. These differences make the appropriateness of performance standards, the consistency of assessment, the quality of feedback, and the fairness of appraisal procedures important issues for examination. Nevertheless, the presence of appraisal procedures or the existence of institutional challenges does not, on its own, establish whether the appraisal mechanism contributes to employee productivity.

The specific problem addressed by this study concerns the extent to which performance appraisal mechanisms at ADSU are implemented in ways that support employee productivity. Questions arise regarding whether employees are assessed against clear and relevant performance expectations, whether appraisal outcomes accurately reflect their work responsibilities, whether supervisors provide constructive feedback, and whether appraisal results are linked to training, recognition, and opportunities for professional development. These issues are relevant because weaknesses in appraisal implementation may limit the usefulness of appraisal outcomes for identifying performance gaps and supporting employee improvement. However, the extent to which such weaknesses exist at ADSU, and their relationship with employee productivity, requires empirical investigation rather than assumption. The problem also requires attention to the distinction between appraisal-related factors and other conditions that may influence employee productivity. Issues such as inadequate electricity supply, limited internet access, excessive workload, and insufficient research time may affect the ability of employees to perform their duties. However, these conditions represent potential contextual influences on productivity and do not, by themselves, demonstrate that the performance appraisal mechanism is ineffective. The present study therefore focuses specifically on appraisal-related factors, including appraisal accuracy, goal setting, feedback, fairness, and employee satisfaction, while recognizing that employee productivity may also be influenced by other institutional conditions. This distinction is necessary to ensure that the investigation remains centred on the relationship between performance appraisal and employee productivity. Although previous studies have examined performance appraisal and employee performance in different organizational and educational contexts, the existence of such studies does not establish the extent to which their findings explain the appraisal-productivity relationship at ADSU. The need for further investigation lies in obtaining institution-specific evidence on how appraisal mechanisms operate within the university and whether their implementation is associated with the productivity of academic and non-academic employees. In particular, the relationship between appraisal accuracy, goal setting, feedback, fairness, employee satisfaction, and productivity requires examination within the institutional context of ADSU. This study seeks to address this empirical and contextual issue by examining performance appraisal mechanisms and their influence on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi. The findings will provide evidence for assessing existing appraisal practices and identifying measures that may support more effective employee performance management and institutional development.

Research Question

The following research questions guide the study thus:

- i. To what extent does performance appraisal accuracy affect employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi?
- ii. To what extent does performance appraisal feedback affect employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi?

Objectives of the Study

The aim of the study is to assess the appraisal mechanism on employee productivity in Adamawa State University, Mubi. The specific objectives are to:

- i. To assess the effect of performance appraisal accuracy on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi.
- ii. To examine the effect of performance appraisal feedback on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi.

Literature Review

Conceptual Clarification

Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal is generally conceptualized as a structured process through which an organization evaluates employee performance in relation to predetermined responsibilities, standards, and organizational expectations. Although scholars broadly agree that appraisal involves the assessment of employee performance, they differ in the emphasis placed on its purpose and operational character. Some conceptualizations emphasize measurement and organizational decision-making, while others increasingly view appraisal as a developmental and communicative process. This distinction is important because an appraisal system may fulfil an administrative requirement without necessarily contributing to improved employee productivity. The conceptual issue, therefore, is not simply whether an organization conducts appraisal, but whether the appraisal process generates accurate performance information and provides feedback that employees can use to improve their work.

Aguinis (2023) adopts a relatively broad performance-management perspective, viewing performance management as a process of identifying, measuring, and developing individual and team performance in alignment with organizational objectives. From this perspective, appraisal is connected to a wider cycle of performance measurement and development rather than being treated as an isolated annual assessment. The strength of this conceptualization lies in its recognition that employee assessment should have a developmental and organizational purpose. However, its broad scope also makes it less specific for examining particular appraisal practices at the employee level. It does not, by itself, establish how the accuracy of an assessment or the quality of feedback should be distinguished and measured when investigating employee productivity. In contrast, Adeoye and Osekita (2022) place greater emphasis on the systematic assessment of employees against predetermined standards. Their conceptualization highlights the importance of established criteria in determining whether employee performance can be evaluated consistently. This provides a useful basis for understanding appraisal accuracy, since an assessment can only be considered meaningful where employee performance is evaluated against identifiable and relevant standards. Nevertheless, a standards-based approach may become overly procedural if it treats appraisal primarily as measurement. Accurate measurement alone does not necessarily lead to improved performance if

employees are not informed about the results or given sufficient guidance on how identified deficiencies can be addressed.

The developmental perspective provides an important counterpoint to a purely measurement-oriented conception. Eke et al. (2021) emphasize goal setting, continuous feedback, performance review, and employee development, reflecting a movement away from appraisal as a periodic rating exercise toward a more continuous process of performance improvement. Yusoff et al. (2021) and Karia and Omari (2022) similarly emphasize feedback and ongoing performance communication. These perspectives contribute an important dimension to the appraisal debate by suggesting that the value of assessment depends partly on what happens after performance has been assessed. However, an emphasis on continuous feedback can also overlook the quality of the information on which that feedback is based. Feedback derived from an inaccurate or poorly conducted assessment may reinforce rather than correct weaknesses in employee performance. Thus, accuracy and feedback should not be treated as competing conceptions; they represent interconnected stages of an effective appraisal process. Ali et al. (2023) extend the discussion by conceptualizing performance appraisal as a strategic human resource management instrument that can assist organizations in identifying performance deficiencies and making workforce-related decisions. This perspective differs from the developmental approach because it gives greater attention to the organizational uses of appraisal outcomes. Its contribution is particularly relevant to institutions where appraisal results may inform decisions concerning training, development, recognition, and workforce management. However, a strategic orientation may give insufficient attention to the employee's experience of the appraisal process. If employees consider assessments inaccurate or the feedback inadequate, the strategic objectives of the appraisal system may not translate into improved individual performance.

The differences among these perspectives indicate that performance appraisal has both a measurement dimension and a developmental dimension. The measurement perspective is concerned with the accuracy and credibility of judgments about employee performance, whereas the developmental perspective emphasizes the communication and use of those judgments to facilitate improvement. These dimensions are complementary rather than mutually exclusive. An appraisal system may produce reliable assessments but have limited developmental value when feedback is absent or ineffective. Conversely, frequent feedback may have limited value when the underlying assessment does not accurately reflect employee performance. The effectiveness of appraisal therefore depends on the extent to which accurate assessment is translated into useful performance information and communicated to employees in a manner that supports improvement.

This distinction is particularly relevant in a university environment. Academic and non-academic employees perform different functions and may consequently be assessed against different performance expectations. For academic employees, relevant indicators may include teaching, research, publication, student supervision, and related academic responsibilities, whereas non-academic employees may be assessed according to administrative, technical, professional, or support

responsibilities. A conceptualization that treats appraisal merely as a uniform administrative procedure may therefore fail to capture the importance of job-specific performance standards and the communication of appraisal outcomes. The issue for the present study is consequently whether appraisal practices provide sufficiently accurate assessments and meaningful feedback across these different categories of employees.

The literature also suggests that the existence of formal appraisal procedures should not be equated with appraisal effectiveness. Mbiti et al. (2019) and Onyango and Atambo (2023) associate effective appraisal with performance expectations, organizational objectives, employee development, and performance improvement. However, these elements do not operate independently. Clear standards are necessary for accurate assessment, while accurate assessment provides the basis for meaningful feedback; feedback, in turn, provides employees with information that can guide subsequent performance. The conceptual relationship can therefore be understood as a process in which performance standards provide the basis for appraisal accuracy, appraisal accuracy informs feedback, and effective feedback provides an avenue through which appraisal can contribute to employee productivity. Based on this synthesis, the present study does not conceptualize performance appraisal simply as the existence of a formal staff assessment system. Rather, it conceptualizes performance appraisal as a structured organizational process involving the accurate assessment of employee performance against relevant standards and the provision of timely and constructive feedback on the assessment outcomes. This conceptualization is narrower than broad performance-management approaches but is more directly aligned with the variables examined in the study. Accordingly, appraisal accuracy and appraisal feedback constitute the two appraisal dimensions examined in relation to employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi. This conceptual position provides the basis for empirically assessing whether employees' perceptions of the accuracy of appraisal and the quality of feedback are associated with their reported level of productivity.

Employee Productivity

Employee productivity is commonly understood in relation to the amount and quality of work produced in relation to the resources, time, and effort invested in producing it. However, conceptualizations of productivity differ in the emphasis they place on output, efficiency, effectiveness, and the achievement of organizational objectives. A narrow output-oriented conception treats productivity primarily as the quantity of work completed, whereas a broader conception considers the quality and timeliness of outputs and the efficient use of organizational resources. This distinction is particularly important in higher education because employees produce both measurable and less easily quantifiable outputs. Consequently, employee productivity cannot be adequately understood solely in terms of the volume of tasks completed.

Atah et al. (2023) and Okure (2023) associate employee productivity with workforce output and institutional effectiveness, emphasizing the contribution of employees to the achievement of

organizational objectives. This perspective is useful because it connects individual productivity to broader institutional outcomes rather than treating employee output as an isolated phenomenon. However, an institutional-output perspective can obscure differences in the nature of employees' work. For example, the productivity of an academic employee cannot necessarily be measured using the same immediate output criteria applied to an administrative employee. Teaching quality, research, student supervision, and scholarly contribution may develop over different periods, whereas administrative productivity may be more directly observable through the timely processing of records, service delivery, and completion of assigned tasks. Thus, productivity requires indicators that reflect the nature of the employee's responsibilities. This difference reveals an important conceptual debate between quantity-oriented and quality-oriented approaches to productivity. A quantity-oriented approach has the advantage of providing observable measures such as the number of tasks completed, publications produced, students served, or records processed. Nevertheless, quantity alone may provide an incomplete assessment because higher output does not necessarily indicate higher productivity if the quality of work is poor or substantial resources and time are required to achieve it. Conversely, an exclusive emphasis on quality may make productivity difficult to measure consistently, particularly where outputs are subjective or emerge over a relatively long period. A more comprehensive conceptualization therefore combines quantity with quality, timeliness, and efficiency.

Employee productivity should also be distinguished from employee performance. Although the two concepts overlap, they are not identical. Employee performance generally refers to the extent to which an employee fulfils assigned duties and meets expected behavioural or performance standards, whereas productivity places greater emphasis on the relationship between outputs and the resources, time, and effort used to generate those outputs. An employee may therefore perform assigned duties satisfactorily without necessarily demonstrating high productivity if the tasks require excessive time or resources. At the same time, productivity cannot be reduced entirely to efficiency because an employee who completes a large volume of work quickly but produces poor-quality outcomes cannot reasonably be regarded as highly productive. The distinction suggests that productivity is better conceptualized as a combination of effective task accomplishment and efficient production of valuable outputs. The higher education context further complicates this conceptualization. Academic and non-academic employees contribute to institutional objectives through substantially different forms of work. Academic productivity may involve teaching effectiveness, research activities, scholarly publications, student supervision, and community engagement, while non-academic productivity may involve administrative efficiency, service delivery, record management, technical support, and the timely completion of assigned responsibilities. Atah et al. (2023) and Okure (2023) provide support for understanding productivity in relation to institutional and employee outcomes, but their broad treatment also illustrates the difficulty of relying on a single productivity indicator across different categories of university employees. A meaningful assessment

therefore needs to recognize the diversity of institutional roles while maintaining common principles of quality, efficiency, timeliness, and effective task accomplishment. Another dimension of the conceptual debate concerns the factors that produce productivity. Employee productivity is not determined exclusively by individual effort or ability. Skills, motivation, leadership, organizational culture, working conditions, training, technological resources, and human resource practices can all influence employees' capacity to produce expected outputs. Evidence from Nigerian tertiary institutions associates productivity with organizational and technological conditions, suggesting that employee output is partly shaped by the environment within which work is performed (Atah et al., 2023; Okure, 2023). However, acknowledging these influences does not mean that every organizational constraint should be treated as a measure of productivity. Rather, it reinforces the need to distinguish between productivity as an outcome and the organizational factors that may contribute to or constrain that outcome.

This distinction is important for the present study because performance appraisal is being examined as a potential human resource mechanism associated with employee productivity. The conceptual relationship should not be interpreted to mean that appraisal is the sole determinant of productivity. Instead, appraisal may provide employees with information about expected standards, the quality of their work, and areas requiring improvement. In particular, accurate appraisal can provide a credible basis for judging whether employees are meeting relevant performance expectations, while effective feedback can communicate the results of that assessment and indicate areas for improvement. The potential contribution of appraisal to productivity therefore depends not simply on the existence of an appraisal procedure but on the quality and usefulness of the information generated through the process. The literature consequently supports a multidimensional understanding of employee productivity while also demonstrating the limitations of treating all dimensions as equally applicable to every occupational group. For the purposes of this study, productivity is not conceptualized as the mere quantity of work completed or as a direct synonym for employee performance. Rather, it is understood as the extent to which academic and non-academic employees effectively and efficiently accomplish their assigned responsibilities, producing work of the expected quality within appropriate time and resource constraints. This conceptualization incorporates quality, quantity, timeliness, efficiency, and effective accomplishment of assigned duties as observable dimensions of productivity while allowing the specific indicators to reflect the different responsibilities of academic and non-academic employees. Based on this conceptualization, the present study treats employee productivity as the dependent variable and performance appraisal accuracy and performance appraisal feedback as the principal appraisal-related explanatory dimensions. The conceptual position adopted is that accurate assessment provides credible information about employee performance, while meaningful feedback communicates that information in a form that can guide subsequent improvement. The study therefore examines whether employees' perceptions of appraisal accuracy and feedback are associated with differences in employee productivity at

Adamawa State University, Mubi. This approach recognizes the multidimensional nature of productivity while maintaining a clear analytical distinction between the appraisal mechanisms being examined and the productivity outcomes to which they may be related.

Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on Goal-Setting Theory, originally developed by Edwin A. Locke and later expanded through the work of Gary P. Latham. The theory posits that specific and challenging goals, when accompanied by appropriate feedback, enhance employee performance (Locke & Latham, 2002; Latham, 2021). Goals influence performance by directing attention towards relevant tasks, mobilizing effort, strengthening persistence, and encouraging the development of task-relevant strategies (Locke & Latham, 2019). These principles are particularly relevant to performance appraisal because the effectiveness of appraisal depends substantially on the clarity of performance expectations, the establishment of measurable objectives, and the provision of feedback. Evidence further indicates that employees tend to perform better when objectives are clear, measurable, time-bound, and, where possible, developed with employee participation, as participation can strengthen commitment and motivation (Pearsall & Christian, 2020; Schmidt, 2022). Feedback is also central to the theory because it enables employees to assess their progress, adjust their efforts, and realign their performance with established goals (Jackson & Ruderman, 2023).

Despite its usefulness, Goal-Setting Theory has been criticized for its emphasis on individual performance and its limited consideration of collective and culturally oriented work environments (Ali & Kim, 2021). The pursuit of highly specific and challenging goals may also generate stress, encourage unethical conduct, or result in goal fixation, particularly in high-pressure settings (Ordóñez et al., 2020). In addition, the theory gives relatively limited attention to emotional and interpersonal factors that may influence performance appraisal, especially where feedback is sensitive or negatively perceived. Nevertheless, its relevance to this study remains strong because performance appraisal at Adamawa State University, Mubi, involves setting clear expectations, establishing measurable performance standards, assessing employee achievement, and providing feedback. Employees are more likely to improve their performance when they understand what is expected of them and receive regular assessments of their progress against defined objectives (Adegbite & Salami, 2024). Thus, Goal-Setting Theory provides an appropriate framework for explaining how appraisal accuracy, goal setting, feedback, fairness, and employee satisfaction may influence employee productivity by promoting clarity, motivation, performance adjustment, and alignment between individual efforts and institutional objectives.

Methodology

Research Design

The study will adopt a descriptive survey research design to assess employees' perceptions of performance appraisal accuracy, appraisal feedback, and employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi. The design is appropriate for describing existing conditions and patterns within a

defined population without manipulating variables (Adams & McGuire, 2021; McCombes, 2023). Data will be collected through a structured questionnaire and analysed using frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation to describe respondents' characteristics and assessments of the study variables.

Study Area

Adamawa State University (ADSU), Mubi, is a public university established in 2002 by the Adamawa State Government to expand access to higher education and promote academic excellence, technological advancement, research, and socio-economic development in northeastern Nigeria. Located in Mubi, a major commercial and educational centre in northern Adamawa State, the university has developed into a significant institution serving students from across Nigeria and other parts of West Africa (ADSU Academic secretary, 2025). As of 2025, ADSU has over 10,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students and offers programmes in agriculture, sciences, education, arts, social and management sciences, environmental sciences, and law. The university is organised into seven faculties with more than 40 academic departments, supported by units such as the General Studies Unit, Entrepreneurship Development Centre, ICT Directorate, and Postgraduate School. Its administrative structure includes the Registry, Bursary, Directorate of Academic Planning, Research and Development, Quality Assurance, Human Resource Development Centre, Internal Audit, Security, and Legal Services units (ADSU Academic secretary, 2025).

The university's mission and vision emphasise the production of academically excellent and morally responsible graduates, the promotion of research and innovation, and the contribution of higher education to community and national development. Its institutional goals include expanding access to quality education, promoting indigenous research, supporting agricultural and technological advancement, and addressing regional socio-economic challenges through relevant academic programmes (ADSU Academic secretary, 2025). This study is situated within this institutional context and examines the performance appraisal mechanisms used at ADSU, Mubi, and their relationship with employee productivity. It focuses on both academic and non-academic staff and examines key dimensions of appraisal, including rating accuracy, clarity of performance goals, feedback quality, and employee satisfaction. These factors are important in understanding how performance appraisal contributes to individual effectiveness and the achievement of institutional objectives.

Population of the Study

The population of the study comprises 377 permanent academic staff of Adamawa State University, Mubi. The study focuses exclusively on permanent academic staff because they constitute the defined population under investigation. According to data obtained from the Registry Department of the University, the total number of permanent academic staff was 377 as of 2025 (Office of the Registrar, 2025).

Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The sample size for the study will be determined using the Taro Yamane formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where :

n= sample size required

N = number of people in the population

e = allowable error (%)

Substitute numbers in formula

$$n = \frac{377}{1 + 377(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{377}{1 + 377(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{377}{1 + 0.94}$$

$$n = \frac{377}{1.94}$$

$$n = 194.32$$

Therefore, the sample size for the study is 194 respondents.

Sources of Data

The study relies exclusively on primary data. Data were collected firsthand from the respondents through the administration of a structured Likert-scale questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to obtain respondents' views on the performance appraisal mechanisms and their influence on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected through the structured Likert-scale questionnaires were analysed using descriptive statistical techniques. Specifically, frequency (*f*), percentage (%), mean (*X*), and standard deviation (SD) were used to summarize the respondents' demographic characteristics and analyse their responses to the research questions. The frequency and percentage distributions were used to present the characteristics of the respondents, while the mean and standard deviation were used to determine the pattern and degree of respondents' opinions on the performance appraisal mechanisms and employee productivity. The data were coded, entered, and analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 26.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	30-40	53	27.90
	41-50	46	24.21
	51-60	50	26.32
	61 years and above	41	21.58
	Sub-total	190	100.00
Gender	Male	97	51.05
	Female	93	48.95
	Sub-total	190	100.00
Educational Qualification	B.Sc.	54	28.42
	M.Sc.	41	21.58
	Ph.D.	51	26.84
	Others	44	23.16
	Sub-total	190	100.00
Academic Rank	Graduate Assistant	48	25.26
	Assistant Lecturer	51	26.84
	Lecturer II/Lecturer I	38	20.00
	Senior Lecturer	53	27.90
	Sub-total	190	100.00
Duration of Service	0-10 years	46	24.21
	11-20 years	41	21.58
	21-30 years	49	25.79
	31-40 years	54	28.42
	Sub-total	190	100.00
	Overall Total	190	100.00

Source: Field Survey (2026).

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the 190 respondents. The age distribution was relatively balanced, with respondents aged 30-40 years constituting the largest group (27.90%), while those aged 61 years and above accounted for the smallest proportion (21.58%). Gender representation was also nearly equal, with males accounting for 51.05% and females 48.95%.

Regarding educational qualification, B.Sc. holders constituted the largest proportion (28.42%), followed by Ph.D. holders (26.84%), other qualifications (23.16%), and M.Sc. holders (21.58%). In terms of academic rank, Senior Lecturers recorded the highest proportion (27.90%), followed by Assistant Lecturers (26.84%), Graduate Assistants (25.26%), and Lecturer I/Lecturer II (20.00%). With respect to duration of service, respondents with 3-40 years of service formed the largest group (28.42%), while those with 11-20 years constituted the smallest proportion (21.58%).

Therefore, the respondents were diverse in terms of age, gender, educational qualification, academic rank, and years of service. This diversity provides a broad range of experiences and perspectives for assessing the performance appraisal mechanisms and employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi.

Table 2: Effect of performance appraisal accuracy on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi

Performance Mechanisms	Appraisal	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean	Std. Dev.	Remark
Staff performance is appraised through formal periodic assessment by the University and relevant academic authorities.		65 (34.2%)	72 (37.9%)	18 (9.5%)	21 (11.1%)	14 (7.4%)	3.80	1.236	Agreed
The University uses established performance criteria or rating scales to assess staff performance.		58 (30.5%)	76 (40.0%)	20 (10.5%)	22 (11.6%)	14 (7.4%)	3.75	1.185	Agreed
Staff performance is assessed by immediate supervisors or heads of academic departments.		70 (36.8%)	73 (38.4%)	16 (8.4%)	19 (10.0%)	12 (6.3%)	3.90	1.148	Agreed
Academic staff performance appraisal considers teaching, research, publications, and community service.		78 (41.1%)	69 (36.3%)	15 (7.9%)	17 (8.9%)	11 (5.8%)	3.98	1.124	Agreed
Staff members are given opportunities to provide information about their own performance during the appraisal process.		48 (25.3%)	63 (33.2%)	24 (12.6%)	35 (18.4%)	20 (10.5%)	3.44	1.315	Agreed

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Table 2 shows that respondents generally agreed that formal performance appraisal mechanisms are adopted at Adamawa State University, Mubi, as all five items recorded mean scores above the decision benchmark of 3.00. The highest mean score was recorded for the consideration of teaching, research, publications, and community service ($X = 3.98$), followed by assessment by immediate supervisors or heads of departments ($X = 3.90$). Formal periodic assessment ($X = 3.80$) and the use of established performance criteria or rating scales ($X = 3.75$) were also positively assessed. Staff participation in providing information about their own performance recorded the lowest mean score ($X = 3.44$), although it was still agreed upon. Overall, the findings suggest that staff appraisal at the University is primarily structured around formal assessment, supervisory evaluation, established

performance standards, and academic responsibilities, consistent with the view that effective appraisal systems should use clear criteria and regular feedback to support employee performance and development (Aguinis, 2023; Armstrong & Taylor, 2023; DeNisi & Murphy, 2021).

Table 3: Effect of performance appraisal feedback on employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi

Impact of Performance Appraisal Mechanism on Employee Productivity	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean	Std. Dev.	Remark
The appraisal mechanism helps staff clearly understand their performance expectations and job responsibilities.	62 (32.6%)	70 (36.8%)	20 (10.5%)	24 (12.6%)	14 (7.4%)	3.75	1.176	Agreed
Feedback from the appraisal process motivates staff to improve their work performance.	54 (28.4%)	68 (35.8%)	25 (13.2%)	28 (14.7%)	15 (7.9%)	3.62	1.211	Agreed
The appraisal system helps identify individual staff training and development needs.	58 (30.5%)	71 (37.4%)	22 (11.6%)	25 (13.2%)	14 (7.4%)	3.70	1.178	Agreed
The appraisal mechanism encourages staff to set personal performance goals that enhance productivity.	49 (25.8%)	70 (36.8%)	27 (14.2%)	29 (15.3%)	15 (7.9%)	3.57	1.190	Agreed
Recognition received through appraisal increases staff commitment to work.	46 (24.2%)	67 (35.3%)	29 (15.3%)	32 (16.8%)	16 (8.4%)	3.50	1.219	Agreed

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Table 3 indicates that respondents generally agreed that performance appraisal mechanisms positively influence employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi, as all items recorded mean scores above the 3.00 decision benchmark. The strongest perceived impact was the clarification of performance expectations and job responsibilities ($X = 3.75$), followed by the identification of training and development needs ($X = 3.70$) and motivating feedback ($X = 3.62$). Goal setting ($X = 3.57$) and recognition through appraisal ($X = 3.50$) also recorded positive responses. Overall, the findings suggest that appraisal enhances productivity by clarifying expectations, providing feedback, identifying development needs, and encouraging performance improvement, consistent with the argument that effective appraisal systems link employee performance assessment with feedback, motivation, and development (Aguinis, 2023; Armstrong & Taylor, 2023; DeNisi & Murphy, 2021).

Major Findings

- i. The study found that Adamawa State University, Mubi, adopts formal performance appraisal mechanisms based on periodic assessment, established performance criteria, supervisory evaluation, and key academic responsibilities such as teaching, research, publications, and community service. However, staff participation in the appraisal process remains relatively limited.
- ii. The study also found that performance appraisal positively enhances employee productivity by clarifying performance expectations, providing motivating feedback, identifying training needs, encouraging goal setting, and strengthening staff commitment. Clarity of performance expectations recorded the strongest contribution, while recognition had the comparatively lowest influence.

Conclusion

The study concludes that performance appraisal is an important mechanism for enhancing employee productivity at Adamawa State University, Mubi. The University adopts formal appraisal practices, including periodic assessment, established performance criteria, supervisory evaluation, and assessment of core academic responsibilities. The findings further show that effective appraisal enhances productivity by clarifying performance expectations, providing feedback, identifying training needs, encouraging goal setting, and strengthening staff commitment. However, limited staff participation remains a concern. Therefore, a fair, participatory, and well-implemented performance appraisal system can significantly improve employee performance and contribute to the achievement of institutional objectives.

Recommendations

- i. Adamawa State University, Mubi, should strengthen staff participation in the performance appraisal process by allowing employees to contribute to self-assessment and performance discussions. This will improve the transparency, fairness, and acceptance of the appraisal system while promoting greater commitment to institutional objectives.
- ii. The University should improve the developmental use of appraisal outcomes by providing regular feedback, identifying staff training needs, setting clear performance goals, and linking outstanding performance with appropriate recognition. This will enhance motivation, professional development, and employee productivity

REFERENCES

- Adeoye, A. O., & Osekita, D. A. (2022). Human resource practices and employee performance: A study of selected higher education institutions. *Journal of Human Capital Development*, 14(1), 45-58.
- Aguinis, H. (2023). *Performance management* (5th ed.). Chicago Business Press.
- Ahmed, R., Shabbir, M. S., & Khalid, R. (2021). The role of human resource management practices

- in organizational performance. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 10(2), 135-150.
- Al-Ababneh, M. (2021). Performance appraisal and its impact on employee performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2021, 1-10.
- Ali, F., Hassan, M., & Basit, A. (2023). Reimagining performance appraisal practices: Post-COVID realities in academia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(1), 112-128.
- Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (16th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Atah, C. A., Idike, I. M., Godwin, R. Y., Kolo, I., Ititim, D. U., Okpe, O. M., & Orim, O. M. (2023). Modern e-technologies and academic staff job productivity in Nigerian colleges of education. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 14(4), 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.36941/mjss-2023-0024>
- Dauda, Y. A., & Idris, B. A. (2023). Performance management practices and employee productivity in public universities. *African Journal of Business Management*, 17(3), 56-67.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2021). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(1), 1-15.
- Eke, A. O., Nwachukwu, C. E., & Onuoha, B. C. (2021). Effect of performance appraisal on employee engagement in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 12(2), 66-75.
- Karia, N., & Omari, S. (2022). The effect of human resource practices on employee commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 12(1), 28-44.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2019). The development of goal-setting theory: A half-century retrospective. *Motivation Science*, 5(2), 93-105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000127>
- Mbiti, A. M., Arasa, R. M., & Kinyili, J. M. (2019). Influence of performance appraisal on performance of universities in Machakos and Kitui Counties, Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2019.4.5.107>

- Okure, D. U. (2023). Impacts of organisational culture on academic efficiency and productivity in selected private universities in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 77(2), 298–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12397>
- Onyango, O. O., & Atambo, W. O. (2023). Performance appraisal practices and staff productivity in public universities. *International Journal of Management and Business Research*, 13(1), 23–39.
- Ordóñez, L. D., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A. D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2020). Goals gone wild: The systematic side effects of overprescribing goal setting. In *Organizational collaboration* (pp. 21–34). Routledge.
- Osei, E., & Ackah, D. (2022). Performance appraisal and employee productivity in higher education institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 13(4), 56–68.
- Otoo, F. E., Arthur, Y. D., & Ofori, J. (2022). Impact of HRM practices on organizational performance in educational institutions. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 13(5), 47–56.
- Salami, L. A. (2024). Performance appraisal and employees' performance: A study of civil servants in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.807056>
- Sani, A. D., & Okafor, E. E. (2020). Performance appraisal and employee morale in Nigerian public universities. *Journal of Public Administration*, 15(2), 112–128.
- Thomas International. (2020). *The future of performance management*. Thomas International.
- Yusoff, Y. M., Omar, M. Z., & Ahmad, A. (2021). Performance appraisal and employee engagement in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(4), 456–470.
- Office of the Academic Secretary, Adamawa State University, Mubi. (2025).
- Office of the Registrar, Adamawa State University, Mubi. (2025).