



Veritatis Gaudium:
Multidisciplinary Journal of Postgraduate Studies

College of Postgraduate Studies,
Veritas University, Abuja, Nigeria

ISSN: 3043 - 5285

Volume 1, Number 4, August Special Edition, 2026

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.17243.12321

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM AND ACADEMIC STAFF COMMITMENT IN VERITAS UNIVERSITY, ABUJA

Merith Ifeoma Anaba PhD & Chizoba Stephanie Kanu

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Veritas University,
Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between the performance appraisal system and academic staff commitment in Veritas University, Abuja. It focused on three dimensions of commitment: job insight, job resilience, and job identity. A cross-sectional correlational survey design was used. The study population comprised 492 academic staff, from which a sample of 221 was calculated; 214 usable questionnaires were returned, representing a 97.57% response rate. Data were collected with a structured five-point Likert-scale instrument and analyzed using SPSS 20 and AMOS 24. The scales demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from .843 to .921. Confirmatory factor analysis produced mixed but broadly acceptable fit indices ($\chi^2 = 328.662$, $df = 147$, $\chi^2/df = 2.25$, $GFI = .841$, $CFI = .897$, $AGFI = .795$, $TLI = .880$, $RMR = .211$, $RMSEA = .076$). Performance appraisal was positively related to job insight ($r = .522$, $p < .001$) and job identity ($r = .811$, $p < .001$), but its relationship with job resilience was weak and nonsignificant ($r = .111$, $p = .413$). Multivariate analysis showed a significant overall effect on the combined commitment outcomes, Pillai's Trace = .677, $F(3, 210) = 146.992$, $p < .001$. Performance appraisal predicted job insight ($B = .487$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .236$) and job identity ($B = .814$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .658$), but not job resilience ($B = .109$, $p = .103$; $R^2 = .012$). The findings indicate that a transparent, consistent, developmental, and fair appraisal process can strengthen academics' understanding of their roles and identification with their work, but resilience depends on broader personal and organizational resources. The study recommends timely feedback, clearer criteria, staff participation, appraiser training, and separate institutional interventions for resilience.

Keywords: performance appraisal; academic staff; organizational commitment; job insight; job resilience; job identity; higher education

Introduction

Universities depend on academic staff to deliver teaching, research, mentoring, community service, and institutional leadership. These responsibilities are complex because performance is multidimensional and unfolds across different time horizons. Teaching quality may be visible within a semester, while research, curriculum development, postgraduate supervision, and institutional service may take years to mature. A performance appraisal system must therefore translate institutional priorities into credible standards without reducing academic work to a narrow administrative exercise.

Performance appraisal is a structured process for reviewing an employee's achievements, behavior, capabilities, and development needs over a defined period. It supports administrative decisions such as promotion, confirmation, reward, training, and corrective action, but it also performs a developmental function by clarifying expectations and providing feedback. An appraisal system is effective when standards are job-relevant, procedures are consistent, evidence is adequate, appraisers are competent, outcomes are communicated, and employees perceive the process and results as fair (Armstrong, 2022; Aguinis, 2023).

At Veritas University Abuja, academic staff appraisal is conducted annually and is linked to promotion, advancement, recognition, correction, and disciplinary decisions. Assessment criteria include academic and professional qualifications, teaching and professional experience, publications and creative work, academic leadership, administrative experience, contribution to the university and society, and related evidence. The institutional timetable requires appraisal to progress from departmental consideration through faculty and central review. Such a system can coordinate expectations, but its effect depends on how staff experience the process in practice.

Academic commitment is important because universities rely on sustained intellectual effort rather than mechanical task completion. Committed academics are more likely to understand their roles, invest in professional development, identify with teaching and scholarship, support colleagues, and remain engaged with institutional goals. This study represents commitment through job insight, job resilience, and job identity. Job insight concerns understanding one's work, expectations, capabilities, and development direction. Job resilience concerns the capacity to persist, recover, and function under professional difficulty. Job identity concerns the degree to which work and institutional membership form a meaningful part of the employee's self-concept.

Performance appraisal may strengthen these dimensions through several mechanisms. Clear goals and feedback can improve role understanding. Fair recognition and respectful interaction can reinforce reciprocal commitment. Participation in appraisal can increase ownership, while credible outcomes can communicate that academic contributions are valued. Conversely, opaque standards, evaluator bias, delayed results, weak feedback, or a poor connection between evidence and outcomes can reduce trust and weaken commitment.

Evidence concerning appraisal and commitment is positive overall but not uniform. Studies report links with organizational commitment, job satisfaction, engagement, identity, and performance, yet employees may distinguish between the formal existence of appraisal and its perceived effectiveness (Munir et al., 2023; Pepple & Ambilichu, 2024; Su & Baird, 2017). Research in Nigerian higher education remains relatively limited, and many studies treat commitment as one aggregate score. Examining separate dimensions can reveal which aspects of commitment are most responsive to appraisal.

The central problem is therefore not whether Veritas University has an appraisal system, but whether staff experience it as an effective process that supports commitment. The study addresses this issue by estimating the relationships between effective performance appraisal and job insight, resilience, and identity among academic staff.

The study's general objective was to examine the relationship between the performance appraisal system and academic staff commitment in Veritas University Abuja. The specific objectives were to determine how effective performance appraisal relates to job insight, job resilience, and job identity. The corresponding null hypotheses proposed that effective performance appraisal has no significant relationship with each commitment dimension.

The findings provide university management with evidence for improving appraisal criteria, communication, feedback, appraiser preparation, and staff participation. Academic staff can use clearer feedback to understand performance expectations and development opportunities. Human-resource practitioners gain evidence that different commitment outcomes may require different interventions. The study also contributes institution-specific evidence to the literature on performance management in African higher education.

The study was limited to academic staff of Veritas University Abuja across professorial, senior lecturer, lecturer, assistant lecturer, and graduate assistant categories. It examined perceived appraisal effectiveness as the explanatory construct and job insight, resilience, and identity as commitment outcomes. Because the design covered one institution and relied on staff perceptions at one point in time, the findings should not be generalized automatically to other universities or employee categories.

Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Review

Performance appraisal

Performance appraisal is both an evaluative and communicative process. Evaluation compares actual contribution with expected standards. Communication explains judgments, identifies development needs, and agrees on future priorities. These functions should be integrated: ratings without discussion offer limited learning, while discussion without credible evidence may be perceived as arbitrary. Modern performance management places the annual review within a continuing cycle of goal setting, observation, feedback, development, and review (Aguinis, 2023; Armstrong, 2022).

In universities, appraisal is complicated by the diversity of academic work. Publication counts are visible, but research quality and influence vary. Student evaluation may inform teaching review, but it can be affected by course difficulty or expectations. Administrative service is necessary yet often less valued than research. Effective appraisal therefore requires balanced criteria, evidence from appropriate sources, recognition of disciplinary differences, and opportunity for staff to explain context.

Effectiveness of performance appraisal

Appraisal effectiveness refers to the extent to which the system achieves valid, fair, useful, and accepted judgments. Important attributes include objective and job-related criteria, transparent procedures, consistent application, trained appraisers, employee participation, timely review, constructive feedback, documentation, and access to appeal. Distributive fairness concerns the perceived fairness of outcomes, while procedural fairness concerns the methods used to reach them. Interactional fairness concerns whether employees are treated with dignity and receive adequate explanations.

An appraisal system can be technically sophisticated yet ineffective if employees do not trust it. Perceptions of political influence, favoritism, ethnicity, personal conflict, or predetermined outcomes undermine acceptance. Delayed feedback also weakens the connection between behavior and consequence. Effective systems minimize these risks through multiple evidence sources, clear scoring guidance, calibration across units, written justification, and meaningful review mechanisms.

Employee perceptions and the appraisal process

Employee perception mediates the practical effect of appraisal because staff respond to the meaning they assign to the process. When appraisal is interpreted as supportive, it can encourage learning, voice, and goal alignment. When it is interpreted as punitive or symbolic, employees may become defensive, withhold information, or focus on impression management. The appraisal conversation should therefore create psychological safety while retaining accountability.

A coherent process begins with institutional goals and role expectations. Performance standards are then agreed or communicated, evidence is collected throughout the period, performance is compared with standards, and feedback is discussed. The cycle ends with decisions and a development plan that informs the next review. Each stage matters. Unclear goals cannot be corrected by precise ratings, and valid ratings lose value if feedback and follow-up are absent.

Academic staff commitment

Employee commitment describes the psychological connection that influences persistence, involvement, and willingness to support organizational goals. Commitment is not identical to job satisfaction. An employee may be satisfied with particular conditions yet weakly attached to the institution, or committed to academic work while dissatisfied with administrative practice. The study focuses on job-centered expressions of commitment that are relevant to academic roles.

Job insight

Job insight is an employee's understanding of role requirements, personal strengths and limitations, performance standards, and future development. Effective appraisal can increase insight by comparing evidence with expectations and explaining how performance affects institutional goals. Insight enables academics to direct effort, plan professional development, and interpret promotion requirements. Feedback must be specific and actionable; generalized praise or criticism offers little guidance.

Job resilience

Job resilience is the capacity to withstand pressure, adapt to setbacks, and continue functioning effectively. Academic work includes publication rejection, heavy teaching demands, resource constraints, student challenges, and delayed promotion. Appraisal may support resilience when it identifies resources, recognizes progress, and creates development plans. However, resilience also depends on workload, autonomy, collegial support, health, leadership, financial security, and personal coping. Appraisal alone may consequently have a weak direct relationship with resilience.

Job identity

Job identity concerns the degree to which employees define themselves through their work and experience a sense of belonging and meaning. Academic identity is shaped by discipline, teaching, scholarship, professional recognition, and institutional membership. Appraisal communicates what the university values. When criteria recognize meaningful academic contributions and outcomes are perceived as fair, staff may see stronger alignment between personal and institutional identities. Unfair appraisal can produce alienation.

Outcomes and risks of commitment

Commitment can improve effort, citizenship behavior, knowledge sharing, retention, and willingness to accept responsibility. In universities, these outcomes can strengthen student support, programme development, research collaboration, and governance. Excessive commitment can also carry risks, including overwork and difficulty disengaging from professional demands. Institutions should therefore seek sustainable commitment supported by fair systems and realistic workloads rather than dependence on employee sacrifice.

2.2 Empirical Review

Appraisal and job insight

Empirical studies generally indicate that clear appraisal standards and developmental feedback improve employee understanding and performance. Fapohunda (2021) identified multiple dimensions of academic appraisal in Nigerian universities, underscoring the need to recognize teaching, research, and service. Nyaoga and Magutu (2020) found that effectiveness in university appraisal depends on clarity, fairness, feedback, and the use of results. These mechanisms should improve job insight by showing staff how evidence is interpreted and where development is required.

Research outside universities similarly links appraisal perception with employee outcomes. Adepoju and Akinbo (2022) found that performance evaluation influenced job satisfaction in a Nigerian public agency. Ozigi and Onyeukwu (2022) emphasized appraisal fairness in relation to employee performance. These findings support the view that appraisal does more than allocate ratings: it conveys information about standards, value, and future opportunity.

Appraisal and job resilience

The relationship with resilience is less direct. Appraisal feedback may help employees identify coping resources and development needs, but formal review cannot remove workload, career uncertainty, inadequate research support, or personal stress. Some studies associate supportive human-resource practices with commitment and engagement (Aboramadan et al., 2020), yet the specific effect of appraisal on resilience is rarely isolated. A nonsignificant relationship is therefore theoretically plausible when resilience is shaped primarily by wider working conditions.

Appraisal can even become a stressor if criteria are unclear or outcomes threaten career progression. Employees may direct energy toward documentation and self-presentation rather than recovery and adaptation. Developmental appraisal should therefore be complemented by mentoring, workload management, research support, employee assistance, and inclusive leadership.

Appraisal and job identity

Appraisal can strengthen job identity by validating academic contribution and locating individual work within institutional purpose. Kyeremeh and Pimpong (2018) linked performance appraisal with staff commitment in higher education. Pepple and Ambilichu (2024) further showed that the appraisal-commitment relationship can operate through job satisfaction. When staff believe that the institution recognizes credible academic work, they are more likely to identify with both their role and the organization.

The opposite is also possible. Narrow indicators can encourage academics to prioritize countable outputs over meaningful teaching or scholarship. Identity is strengthened when criteria reflect the full role, allow disciplinary differences, and recognize service and mentoring alongside publication. The quality of institutional values embedded in appraisal is therefore as important as measurement precision.

Research gap

Three gaps motivate the study. First, evidence from Nigerian private universities remains limited. Second, many studies use aggregate commitment measures and cannot show whether appraisal relates differently to insight, resilience, and identity. Third, few institution-level studies combine correlations, multivariate effects, reliability evidence, and confirmatory factor analysis. This study addresses these gaps within Veritas University Abuja.

2.3 Theoretical Review

Equity theory

Equity theory proposes that employees compare their contributions and outcomes with relevant others. Appraisal affects this comparison because it determines recognition, promotion, increment, and development opportunity. Staff who believe that similar contributions receive inconsistent treatment may experience inequity and reduce commitment. Transparent criteria, comparable evidence, and reasoned outcomes can strengthen perceived fairness. The theory is highly relevant to appraisal acceptance but does not fully explain identity or reciprocal relationships.

Social exchange theory

Social exchange theory views employment as a continuing exchange of resources and obligations. When the university provides fair treatment, useful feedback, recognition, and development, staff may reciprocate through commitment and discretionary effort. Unfair or dismissive appraisal signals weak organizational support and may reduce reciprocity. This theory provides the principal explanation for why appraisal effectiveness should influence commitment.

Goal setting theory

Goal-setting theory argues that specific, challenging, accepted goals improve performance when accompanied by feedback and capability (Locke, 2022; Latham & Locke, 2020). Appraisal clarifies goals, evaluates progress, and identifies future targets. Participation can improve acceptance, while feedback helps employees adjust strategy. The theory directly explains job insight, although it is less complete as an explanation of emotional attachment or resilience.

Social identity theory

Social identity theory explains how individuals derive part of their self-concept from group membership. Appraisal can signal whether academic contributions are valued and whether the employee is a respected institutional member. Fair recognition strengthens belonging and identity; exclusion or biased evaluation weakens them. The theory is particularly relevant to the strong relationship expected between appraisal and job identity.

Theoretical position and conceptual framework

The study is anchored primarily in social exchange theory and supported by equity, goal-setting, and social-identity perspectives. Effective appraisal represents an organizational investment and fairness signal; staff reciprocate through greater commitment. Clear goals and feedback improve insight, while recognition and value congruence strengthen identity. Resilience may receive a weaker effect because it depends on resources outside the appraisal exchange.

Table 1 Conceptual expectations

Outcome	Expected relationship	Principal mechanism
Job insight	Positive	Clear standards, feedback, and development direction
Job resilience	Positive but contingent	Support, coping resources, and wider work conditions
Job identity	Positive	Recognition, belonging, and value alignment

Methodology

3.1 Research Design and Setting

The study used a quantitative, cross-sectional correlational survey design. It sought to determine the relationships between perceived effectiveness of performance appraisal and job insight, job resilience, and job identity among academic staff of Veritas University Abuja. Correlational analysis was appropriate because the variables were measured as existing perceptions without experimental manipulation.

3.2 Population Sample and Data Collection

The population comprised 492 academic staff recorded as of 31 January 2026. Taro Yamane's formula at a 5% error margin produced a sample of 221. Structured questionnaires were distributed to academic staff across ranks. Of the 221 questionnaires, 214 were returned and analyzed, representing a response rate of 97.57%; seven questionnaires were unreturned.

Primary data were collected with a self-administered questionnaire. The instrument focused on study variables rather than demographic characteristics because many pilot respondents omitted demographic questions and those variables were not central to the hypotheses. Responses used a five-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.3 Measurement Validity and Reliability

The performance-appraisal scale contained 12 items addressing objectives, measurement, bias, feedback, strengths and weaknesses, motivation, appraiser competence, institutional alignment, awareness, consistency, fairness, and timeliness. Commitment scales covered job insight, resilience, and identity. Items were adapted from related instruments, including Nyaoga and Magutu (2020) and Meyer et al. (2023), and reviewed for face and content validity by the supervisor and senior faculty. Internal consistency was assessed with Cronbach's alpha. The performance-appraisal scale achieved $\alpha = .881$ across 12 items. The three commitment scales achieved α values of .921, .871, and .843. All values exceeded .70, indicating satisfactory internal consistency. Confirmatory factor analysis assessed the four-construct measurement structure. Common-method influence was examined with a common latent factor; adjusted loadings remained positive, although the differences indicated some method influence, particularly among job-identity indicators.

3.4 Data Analysis

SPSS 20 was used for descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations. AMOS 24 was used for confirmatory factor analysis and multivariate modeling. Correlations evaluated the three hypotheses, while multivariate multiple regression assessed the overall effect of performance appraisal on the combined commitment outcomes and its univariate effects on each dimension. Statistical significance was evaluated at the 5% level.

3.5 Ethical and Design Considerations

Participation was voluntary, and responses were treated confidentially and analyzed in aggregate. Because the study relied on self-reported perceptions collected at one time, causal interpretation is limited. The high response rate reduces but does not eliminate response bias. Common-method influence should also be considered when interpreting the strong associations.

Results and Discussion

4.1 Response Rate and Measurement Model

A total of 214 usable questionnaires were analyzed from 221 distributed, yielding a 97.57% response rate. Confirmatory factor analysis produced $\chi^2 = 328.662$ with 147 degrees of freedom and $\chi^2/\text{df} = 2.25$. RMSEA was .076, within a commonly accepted range. CFI (.897) and TLI (.880) were close to

.90, while GFI (.841), AGFI (.795), and RMR (.211) were weaker. The model is therefore better described as mixed or marginal-to-acceptable rather than uniformly strong.

The source reports significant indicator loadings and acceptable convergent and discriminant validity. Reliability was satisfactory across all scales. The common latent factor analysis found mean absolute loading differences of .160, with larger differences for job-identity indicators. This result suggests that common-method influence was present but did not eliminate the measurement relationships. The especially strong job-identity association should consequently be interpreted with appropriate caution.

Table 2 Reliability and model-fit summary

Measure	Result	Interpretation
Performance appraisal alpha	.881	Satisfactory
Job insight alpha	.921	Satisfactory
Job resilience alpha	.871	Satisfactory
Job identity alpha	.843	Satisfactory
χ^2/df	2.25	Acceptable
CFI / TLI	.897 / .880	Near conventional .90 benchmark
RMSEA	.076	Acceptable
RMR	.211	Weak fit indicator

4.2 Correlation Results

Effective performance appraisal had a moderate positive relationship with job insight ($r = .522$, $p < .001$) and a strong positive relationship with job identity ($r = .811$, $p < .001$). The relationship with job resilience was weak and nonsignificant ($r = .111$, $p = .413$). The null hypotheses for job insight and job identity were rejected, while the null hypothesis for job resilience was retained.

Table 3 Correlations between appraisal and commitment

Outcome	r	p	Decision
Job insight	.522	< .001	Significant positive
Job resilience	.111	.413	Not significant
Job identity	.811	< .001	Significant positive

Note. N = 214. Two-tailed tests.

4.3 Multivariate and Regression Results

The multivariate analysis showed a statistically significant overall effect of performance appraisal on the combined commitment outcomes, Pillai's Trace = .677, $F(3, 210) = 146.992$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .677$. At the univariate level, appraisal significantly predicted job insight and job identity but did not predict job resilience. The reported R^2 values indicate that appraisal explained 23.6% of job-insight variance, 65.8% of job-identity variance, and only 1.2% of job-resilience variance.

Table 4 Effects of performance appraisal on commitment outcomes

Outcome	B	SE	t	p	R ²	Decision
Job insight	.487	.060	8.084	< .001	.236	Significant
Job resilience	.109	.067	1.637	.103	.012	Not significant
Job identity	.814	.040	20.187	< .001	.658	Significant

4.4 Discussion

Performance appraisal and job insight

The positive association with job insight indicates that an effective appraisal process helps academic staff understand expectations, strengths, weaknesses, and development priorities. The regression coefficient confirms that appraisal contributes meaningfully after the outcome is modeled directly. This finding is consistent with goal-setting theory: standards and feedback focus attention and help employees evaluate progress. It also supports evidence that effective university appraisal depends on clarity, feedback, and development (Fapohunda, 2021; Nyaoga & Magutu, 2020).

The practical implication is that appraisal should produce specific information. Staff need to know how teaching, research, supervision, service, and leadership evidence was judged; what is satisfactory; what requires improvement; and what support is available. A final score without a development conversation is unlikely to generate comparable insight.

Performance appraisal and job resilience

The weak nonsignificant relationship with job resilience indicates that appraisal effectiveness alone does not determine whether academics persist and recover under pressure. Resilience depends on workload, autonomy, research facilities, collegial relationships, leadership support, financial conditions, health, and personal coping. Appraisal may identify resilience needs but cannot substitute for the resources required to address them.

This result should not be interpreted as permission to make appraisal ineffective. Poor appraisal can add stress and undermine trust. The finding instead shows that resilience requires a distinct support architecture, including mentoring, workload review, research support, employee assistance, professional-development access, and psychologically safe leadership. A developmental appraisal can connect staff to these resources but is only one component.

Performance appraisal and job identity

The strongest relationship was between appraisal and job identity. Appraisal communicates the activities and values the institution recognizes. When staff see that meaningful teaching, scholarship, service, and leadership are evaluated fairly, they are more likely to experience alignment between their professional self-concept and institutional membership. Social exchange and social identity perspectives both support this interpretation.

The size of the relationship also requires caution. Both appraisal and identity were measured through the same questionnaire, and the common-method analysis found relatively stronger influence among identity indicators. Even so, the pattern is theoretically coherent and statistically consistent across correlation and regression. Management should strengthen identity by using balanced criteria, respectful feedback, transparent outcomes, and recognition of diverse academic contributions.

4.5 Theoretical and Managerial Implications

The findings support social exchange theory by showing that staff respond differently to the quality of an organizational practice. Fair and useful appraisal is associated with reciprocal insight and identification. Goal-setting theory explains the job-insight pathway, while social identity theory explains why recognition and value alignment have a strong relationship with job identity. The absence of a resilience effect sets a useful boundary: exchange and identity mechanisms do not automatically create coping capacity.

Managerially, the evidence favors a differentiated approach. Appraisal should be designed to clarify work and strengthen identity, while resilience should be supported through separate but connected systems. Appraiser training, cross-unit calibration, timely release of outcomes, documented evidence,

staff participation, feedback meetings, and appeal procedures can improve appraisal credibility. Mentoring, workload support, research infrastructure, and well-being programmes should address resilience directly.

Conclusion

The study concludes that effective performance appraisal is significantly associated with academic staff commitment, but the effect differs across commitment dimensions. Appraisal has a meaningful positive relationship with job insight and a particularly strong relationship with job identity. It does not have a statistically significant relationship with job resilience. The significant multivariate result shows that appraisal matters for the combined outcome, while the univariate results identify the specific dimensions driving that effect.

The central implication is that appraisal is most effective as a system of clarification, recognition, and developmental communication. It can help academics understand their work and identify more strongly with professional and institutional goals. Resilience, however, depends on wider resources and conditions. University management should therefore improve appraisal without expecting it to solve every commitment or well-being challenge.

Recommendations

1. Publish concise, role-relevant appraisal criteria that explain how teaching, research, supervision, service, leadership, and professional development are weighted.
2. Train heads of department and committee members in evidence-based rating, feedback, bias awareness, difficult conversations, and documentation.
3. Hold a structured feedback meeting after each appraisal so academic staff understand the evidence, rating, strengths, development priorities, and available support.
4. Release appraisal outcomes within the established timetable and provide a transparent review or appeal process for disputed evidence and decisions.
5. Use calibration meetings across departments and faculties to improve consistency while allowing justified disciplinary differences.
6. Connect appraisal outcomes to individualized development plans, mentoring, research support, and relevant training rather than using appraisal mainly for promotion or sanction.
7. Address job resilience through workload management, supportive leadership, research infrastructure, well-being services, flexible support during difficulty, and collegial mentoring.
8. Evaluate the appraisal system periodically through anonymous staff feedback and monitor whether changes improve trust, insight, identity, and developmental outcomes.

Limitations and Future Research

The study covered one private university and academic staff only, which limits generalizability. Its cross-sectional design cannot establish whether appraisal causes commitment or committed employees evaluate appraisal more positively. Self-report measurement creates possible social-desirability and common-method effects. Demographic and employment characteristics were not included, preventing examination of differences by rank, tenure, faculty, age, or employment status. Future research should compare academic and nonacademic staff, public and private universities, and institutions across Nigerian regions. Longitudinal designs should observe commitment before and after appraisal cycles. Multi-source data can combine staff perceptions with appraisal records, promotion outcomes, turnover, absenteeism, teaching indicators, and research activity. Researchers should also test mediators such as perceived justice, feedback quality, job satisfaction, trust, and engagement, and moderators such as rank, tenure, workload, and supervisor support.

References

- Aboramadan, M., Albashiti, B., Alharazin, H., & Dahleez, K. A. (2020). Human resources management practices and organizational commitment in higher education: The mediating role of work engagement. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(1), 154–174.
- Adepoju, I. A., & Akinbo, T. M. (2022). Examining the effect of performance evaluation on employee job satisfaction in a Federal Government agency in Nigeria. *South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics*, 16(4), 59–70.
- Aguinis, H. (2023). *Performance management* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Armstrong, M. (2022). *Armstrong's handbook of performance management: An evidence-based guide to performance leadership* (7th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Fapohunda, T. M. (2021). Dimensions of university academic staff performance appraisal in selected public universities in Nigeria. *Journal of Global Economics, Management and Business Research*, 3(3), 139–147.
- Kanu, I. A. (2017b). Igwebuike and the question of superiority in the scientific community of knowledge. *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(1), 103–110.
- Kanu, I. A. (2017c). Igwebuike as an Igbo-African ethic of reciprocity. *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(2), 153–160.
- Kanu, I. A. (2017d). Igwebuike philosophy and the issue of national development. *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(6), 16–50.
- Kanu, I. A. (2017e). Igwebuike as an Igbo-African philosophy of inclusive leadership. *Igwebuike: An African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 3(7), 165–183.
- Kyeremeh, D. D., & Pimpong, M. (2018). Performance appraisal and staff commitment in higher education. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 7(2), 1–14.
- Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2020). Goal setting: A motivational technique that works. *Organizational Dynamics*, 8, 68–80.
- Locke, E. A. (2022). Motivation through conscious goal setting. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 5, 117–124.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (2023). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538–551.
- Munir, S., Aziz, A., Saladin, M., & Muhammad, A. S. (2023). Fairness of performance appraisal and organisational commitment. *Asian Social Science*, 9(2), 121–128.
- Nyaoga, R. B., & Magutu, P. (2020). The effectiveness of performance appraisal system in private universities in Kenya. *African Journal of Business and Management*, 1(5), 123–134.
- Ozigi, O. A., & Onyeukwu, P. E. (2022). Performance appraisal fairness on employees' performance in the Nigeria Television Authority Abuja, Nigeria. *Journal of International Business Research and Marketing*, 7(3), 22–35.
- Pepple, D. G., & Ambilichu, C. A. (2024). Performance appraisal and employee commitment: The mediating role of job satisfaction. *European Management Review*, 21(1), 237–250.
- Su, S., & Baird, K. (2017). The association between performance appraisal systems, work-related attitudes and academic performance. *Financial Accountability & Management*, 33(4), 356–372.
- Ujebe, N., Ogbonnia, C. E., & Nwafor, M. E. (2023). People performance measures and commitment of academic staff in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Policy and Development Studies*, 14(2), 189–202.