

**RETHINKING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL: FROM MEASURING
PERFORMANCE TO DEVELOPING PEOPLE**

Dr. Ike Godfrey Nwabali
Department of Office and Information Management
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
ike.nwabali@iau.edu.ng 08163638103.

Abstract

Previous employee performance appraisal heavily focus on backward-looking metrics and annual scoring. This compliance-driven approach often triggers employee anxiety and reduces collaboration. This study advocates for a developmental paradigm that transforms performance appraisal from a static measurement exercise into a strategic vehicle for growth and agility. This paper theoretically examines the rethinking employee performance Appraisal: From measuring performance to developing people The study was anchored on Goal-Setting Theory by Locke & Latham, 2002, and Self-Determination Theory by Deci & Ryan, 2000. It concludes that technology can support this shift by enabling real-time feedback, tracking development goals, and personalizing learning. However, technology alone is not enough. The human elements such as trust, empathy, meaningful conversations, and alignment with organizational values are what transform appraisal from a bureaucratic exercise into a growth experience. The paper concludes by recommending amongst others that HR should equip managers with skills in active listening, asking developmental questions, and giving constructive feedback.

Keywords: *Rethinking Employee performance appraisal, measuring performance*

Introduction

The management and valuation of employees has undergone a radical change in the modern business environment. Traditionally, organisations viewed employees as transactional resources whose daily performance had to be monitored, assessed and controlled through strict management systems. At the heart of this traditional mindset is the annual performance review, an organisational mechanism to look back at past behaviours, assign numerical ratings and decide on salary increases or promotions. Yet, in the rapidly changing world of business today, a single-minded focus on past errors has sparked a workplace crisis. Traditional assessments tend to create a lot of stress around technology and evaluation, create internal competition that's counterproductive and do little to help employees develop. Corporate specialists therefore argue that only looking at the past is out of date. To ensure the sustainability of the business, the assessment of employees must change profoundly, from a rigid system of measuring performance to a continuous collaboration orientated to the future and centred on the development of the employee.

Rethought Performance Appraisal is the constructive evaluation based on three main dimensions and their associated workplace metrics that reduces inflexible retrospective grading and encourages ongoing dialogue, emotional security and career-oriented guidance. The first dimension is Continuous Feedback Dialogue, which replaces the dreaded annual review with friendly, continuous developmental discussions. This is evaluated by the frequency of manager-employee interaction and the openness of the dialogue. The second is Strengths-Based Goal Setting, which aligns an employee's natural talents with future responsibilities, as opposed to penalising them for past mistakes. This is gauged by trends in achievement of employee goals and flexibility of goals. The third dimension is Evaluation Psychological Safety. This is the degree to which an employee feels safe to raise workplace challenges and exhibit vulnerability in evaluations without the fear of negative consequences. This is measured by team trust metrics and employee confidence in managerial fairness.

The main purpose of developing this supportive framework is to improve three major dependent variables determining long-term organisational success. The first dependent variable is Sustainable Employee Job Performance which relates to long term, high quality output rather than short bursts of productivity. This is measured by total task completion rates and active participation in corporate milestones. The second dependent variable is Collaborative Innovation Climate that measures the willingness of teams to share knowledge, take risks on the creative side and support each other without fear of negative evaluations. This is measured by team collaboration and rate of implementation of innovative ideas. The third dependent variable is Organisational Sustainability which refers to a company's long-term capability to attract top talent, develop internal leadership pipelines and maintain overall organisational stability. This is measured by yearly employee retention numbers.

Research confirms that filling out evaluation forms alone will not lead to real institutional advancement and there is strong support for the move toward human development. Performance management research suggests a procedure can contribute to lasting organisational stability only if it directly helps people to improve their daily work practices and long-term competencies. According to a study carried out on performance management frameworks at Green-Energy International Limited, Ikuru Town, appraisal processes are ineffective if viewed as disciplinary assessments. They are effective only when they improve the skills and productivity of the human resource engaged. Moreover, Amadi, Chukuladi, and Onwukwe (2024) investigated the influence of leadership decisions on employees and found that the manager's supportive behaviour plays a significant role in changing the work environment through increasing employees' commitment and creating the feeling of real value among the staff. This points out that real productivity cannot be forced through authoritative supervision but is rather fostered by supportive and collaborative inclusion, a view supported by Gloria, Cynthia, and Maurice Ikuru (2024) who observed that inclusive decision-making greatly improves long-term employee performance.

Historical evaluation trends also demonstrate the impact of systemic structural changes on employees' careers. In the words of Njoku and Josiah (2022), traditional appraisal methods of rigid historical performance assessments are often incompatible with equitable promotion systems, causing internal discord rather than talent development. Resolving this tension requires a change in the evaluation paradigm to directly relate metrics to the quality of output. Oniyide and Agboola (2024) showed that a modern, well-structured performance appraisal is a direct measure of employee productivity. They established that genuine organisational performance is greatly enhanced when appraisals are viewed as development tools, not punishment. Despite these findings, there is a substantial gap in current organisational research. Today, the literature of human resources is divided into two distinct worlds. Traditional corporate research focuses on how to improve numerical scoring frameworks to optimise quantitative metrics. Conversely, literature on training and development looks at employee learning completely separate from the formal evaluation process. Very few people are looking at how the revision of the appraisal system can be the main driver for human development. For years management methodologies have treated performance evaluations as a legal proceeding, completely ignoring the psychological and growth experiences of the people being evaluated. Such disparity is dangerous in today's economy in which turning people into statistics results in a considerable amount of employee disengagement, an absolute lack of trust in the workplace, and high turnover among star employees.

This research directly addresses this missing link. This study provides organisations a practical model to improve productivity, whilst protecting their human essence by instituting a formal model that demonstrates the effect of a revised, growth-oriented assessment on our dependent variables. It aims to transform performance evaluation from a dreaded bureaucracy into a meaningful development-oriented collaboration. Hence, this study aims to research the fundamental aspects of

a revised performance evaluation framework, and to examine the effectiveness of the framework in transforming organisational emphasis from performance measurement to personnel development in the current work environment.

Statement of the Problem

Ideally, modern workplace employee assessment frameworks would align with individual development and empathetic leadership. Organisations strive to evolve sophisticated assessment frameworks to maintain high productivity and competitiveness. They want to make sure that their workforce is not burdened by assessments, but also that they are building the skills that they need for what is coming in the future. Well-executed performance assessments can be a powerful tool to promote collaboration by fostering regular feedback discussions, capitalising on strengths to establish goals, and offering psychological safety during assessments. This is to ensure that technology, managerial decisions, and performance reviews are genuine tools for human progress and not means of treating employees as mere instruments. But unfortunately this link has been completely cut off by conventional office arrangements. Historically, the focus on numerical evaluations and mechanical measurements has made the evaluation process a cold, backward-looking analysis. Employees are often seen as insignificant components of a data system, resulting in severe exhaustion, destructive internal competition and a profound sense of detachment from management (Amadi, Chukuladi and Onwukwe, 2024). Further, Njoku and Josiah (2022) argued that absence of human touch in assessments and rigidity of the scoring systems were inconsistent with the principles of fair internal development systems and did not motivate staff. Moreover, to make things worse, managers often lack the tools to give explicit and tangible direction. Corporate data indicates that managers spend very little time on team development and thus employees are unclear about what is expected of them (Deloitte Insights, Global Workplace Study, 2025). The old ways of governance are no longer sufficient. Just thinking about past mistakes will not make the tense, disconnected atmosphere employees experience during assessment periods any easier. If this problem is not resolved, it will create serious problems for the enterprises and long-term viability of the organization. The use of a mechanical, unfeeling process will undoubtedly lead to lessened confidence in the work-place and greater employee alienation, thereby impairing the daily output of human participants.

Furthermore, an audit-centric review system stifles team creativity and leads to higher attrition rates among top performers. "This will make it difficult for organisations to promote a positive link between employee input and overall corporate success, neglecting the organic productivity increases that come when assessments are viewed as tools for development rather than punishment," Oniyide and Agboola (2024) cautioned. According to Nwokeocha (2024), this type of structural failure ultimately hinders the development of sustainable capabilities because static evaluations cannot be a reliable basis for validating talent acquisition, institutional training needs, or collaborative team goals.

This study directly confronts this dilemma by exploring a Reimagined Performance Appraisal Framework as a critical enabler of progression. Gloria, Cynthia and Maurice Ikuru (2024) state that the perspective of evaluation in research can lead to lasting employee job performance as opposed to traditional business models that see performance evaluation, team collaboration and training as separate endeavours. Mishra (2024) observes that it is essential to change from traditional episodic structures to continuous development-oriented feedback processes to enable real-time learning and lasting coherence in complex settings. This study addresses this issue by examining the ways in which components of a redefined performance assessment can facilitate a shift in organisational focus from performance evaluation to talent development in contemporary work settings.

There is a great deal of research on the assessment of employee performance. However, there is a significant lack in the literature of the comprehensive and unified methodology for harmonising the

reevaluation of employee performance. Murphy and DeNisi (2023) provide a historical overview of appraisals, largely as tools of administrative monitoring. They focus on the reliance of organisations on historical data, evaluation frameworks and distribution of incentives. Their research highlights the rigidity of these metrics and the need to better the “mathematics” of the evaluation rather than the development of the evaluated individual. Arvey and Murphy (1998) contended that assessments in occupational psychology should be accurate and also the biases of the assessors should also be taken into account. They emphasise the value of contextual assessments, including collaboration and fit within the organization. However, their work is more an empirical assessment of equity than a progressive stance to promote continuous professional development. In a recent study, Dasanayaka et al. (2021) pointed out that the traditional appraisal validity is inherently flawed, as it assesses the performance of an individual without considering the overall well-being of the workplace. However, most of the recommendations are conceptual in nature and this results in a scarcity of practical guidance on how managers can effectively turn their daily review process from a detached assessment to an engaged, empathetic coaching process.

Researchers have explored structural metrics (Murphy and DeNisi, 1998), systemic bias (Arvey and Murphy), and environmental validity (Dasanayaka et al., 2021), but there is little empirical evidence on the impact of re-evaluating employee performance appraisals and its components (such as ongoing feedback conversations, strength-based goal setting, and psychological safety assessment) on performance. The present study seeks to address this shortcoming.

Aim and Objectives

The aim of this paper was to examine the rethinking employee performance Appraisal: From measuring performance to developing people

The specific objectives are:

1. to determine how continuous feedback dialogue relates with measuring performance to developing people
2. To ascertain how strength based goal setting influences measuring performance to developing people
3. To Identify how Evaluation psychological safety relates with measuring performance to developing people

Conceptual Review

The Concept of Rethinking Employee Performance Appraisal

Reconceptualising employee performance assessment is a deliberate move away from the traditional performance evaluation model, where a supervisor assesses a subordinate once or twice a year on a pre-established list of competencies, to one that is focused on ongoing conversations, individual strengths and a perceived sense of security throughout the evaluation process. The traditional model has been under constant scrutiny in the human resource literature: research shows that employees generally dislike performance appraisal feedback and that feedback using traditional rating scales is often unreliable, inconsistent across appraisers, and not reflective of real job experiences (Cleveland et al., as cited in Meijer, Bosch, & Nieuwenhuis, 2020). These structural shortcomings, combined with a well-documented human tendency to attribute one's own failures to external causes and others' shortcomings to internal traits, lead to the fact that traditional assessments often trigger defensiveness rather than genuine developmental insight (Ross, 1977, as cited in Meijer et al., 2020).

Increasingly, this discontent is being seen as the driver of a more radical transformation in performance management in a body of scholarly and professional writing. In a recent analysis, this change is described as a transition from retrospective and annual assessments to dynamic, technology-based continuous feedback systems that improve performance assessment through increased engagement, transparency, and developmental opportunities (From Annual Reviews to

Continuous Feedback, 2025). The transition is being led by leading companies such as Deloitte, Microsoft and Adobe who are moving away from annual reviews to frequent reviews, instant feedback and flexible goal-setting methods (From Annual Reviews to Continuous Feedback, 2025). Some organisations have taken even more radical measures. Adobe, for instance, is known to have removed its formal performance management system completely in 2012, relying on continuous dialogue instead (Robinson, 2013, as cited in Academia.edu review, 2025). This study suggests that rethinking employee performance assessment requires a fundamental retooling of the appraisal system based on three interconnected elements: replacing occasional reviews with continuous feedback conversations; moving from a deficiency-based critique to a strengths-based goal setting; and turning an atmosphere of judgement and stress into genuine psychological safety in the appraisal process. Each of these components addresses a specific, well-documented deficiency in the traditional appraisal system and, taken together, are argued to create a fundamentally different, more developmental relationship between employees and the organisations that assess them.

Dimensions of Rethinking Employee Performance Appraisal

Based on the above conceptual framework, the rethinking of employee performance assessment is analysed from three aspects: continuous feedback conversation, strength-based goal setting and evaluation psychological safety. They include the frequency and nature of feedback exchange, content and orientation of feedback, and the emotional and relational climate within which the evaluative process takes place.

Continuous Feedback Dialogue

Continuous feedback dialogue refers to the ongoing sharing of performance-related information between supervisors and staff members in a casual manner, rather than restricting this interaction to a single formal evaluation at the end of a cycle. Research on continuous performance management suggests that the shift is being driven by organisational agility, the need for employee engagement, and by the availability of real-time analytics that enable regular, data-driven conversations at scale (From Annual Reviews to Continuous Feedback, 2025). The literature provides convincing evidence. Only 20% of employees state that their current performance review system motivates them to perform at their best. This finding confirms the assertion that continuous feedback and communication between managers and employees are critical in clarifying expectations, addressing performance issues in a timely manner, and encouraging continuous growth and development rather than waiting months to inform an employee of a problem or achievement (The Future of Performance Management, 2024, as cited in Kaplan & Norton, 1996; Kotter, 1995).

Strengths-Based Goal Setting

Strengths-based goal setting changes the evaluative conversation from a deficit-based model, where an employee's primary growth potential is to fix their weaknesses, to a model informed by positive psychology, emphasising sustained performance improvement through identifying, understanding and intentionally building on an employee's natural strengths. The evaluation dialogue has been found to be effective in focusing on the existing successes, which helped employees to understand their unique strengths and how they can better develop and utilise these abilities in the future (Roberts et al., 2005 cited in Bouskila-Yam & Kluger, 2011). An example of this aspect in action is Bouskila-Yam and Kluger's (2011) case study on Strength-Based Performance Appraisal at SodaStream. They made use of the feedforward interview method, the reflected-best-self exercise and a conscious 3:1 ratio that prioritises positive feedback over negative, while still allowing for corrective feedback concerning genuinely preventive, safety-critical actions. Empirical research grounded in this conceptualisation has demonstrated that strengths-based evaluations enhance employees' perception of supervisory support and their motivation to develop, partly through the

satisfaction of basic psychological needs for competence and connection, which Self-Determination Theory considers crucial for lasting motivation (Meijer, Bosch, & Nieuwenhuis, 2020).

Evaluation Psychological Safety

Psychological safety refers to the extent to which employees feel safe to speak up freely, admit mistakes, ask questions, and disclose real difficulties in the evaluation process without fear of humiliation, retaliation, or damage to their reputation. Edmondson's (1999) seminal work on psychological safety in work teams, first conducted in hospital nursing units, yielded a paradoxical finding that has become foundational in the area: the higher-performing teams in her study disclosed more errors than their lower-performing peers, not because they made more mistakes, but because a more secure environment allowed them to report their errors, enabling faster learning and correction. Today's appraisal conversations assume that psychological safety does not lower performance standards. Rather, it raises standards by enabling early problem identification and rapid learning, if there are clear goals and real accountability—not instead of, but in addition to (Umbrex Psychological Safety Framework, 2026). Formal appraisal systems have found well-structured evaluation methods to reduce rating biases and enhance psychological safety. Appraisals conducted badly, based on fear and criticism, can result in employee disengagement and a sense of inequity (Business Psychology, 2025).

The Concept of Measuring Performance

Performance as a basic organisational concept is the extent to which an individual, team or organization achieves expected outcomes, measured by task execution, quality, innovation, or total contribution toward organisational goals. In traditional performance evaluation research, performance has frequently been considered in a narrow manner, as a static assessment at a point in time according to predefined standards (DeNisi & Smith, 2014). The literature reviewed in this study promotes a much broader and dynamic understanding of performance not only in terms of an employee's ability to meet quotas in a given period but also the sustainability of such achievements over time without compromising the employee's wellbeing, its contribution to the organization's innovative capacity, and its overall impact on the organization's long-term sustainability.

This wider perspective is indicative of an increasing recognition in performance management that a reliance solely on financial or output-based measures is insufficient, and that performance evaluation should take into account the different objectives of different stakeholders and the wider strategic objectives of the company. Performance for this study is defined and measured by three interrelated outcomes – sustainable employee job performance, collaborative innovation climate, and organisational sustainability – which represent a growing scope of influence from the individual, to the team, and finally to the institution.

Measures of Measuring Performance

The three performance indicators used in this study are representative of the individual, team and organization levels at which the effect of changed performance evaluations is predicted to be seen.

Sustainable Employee Job Performance

In the academic literature, the term E-SuPer refers to the ability of an employee to perform their job at a high level for an extended period of time without negatively impacting their health, motivation or engagement (e.g., [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]). This concept completely rejects the idea of employees as sprinters who can be pushed to short bursts of productivity and instead promotes an analogy of marathon runners where great performance and employee wellbeing are seen as two sides of the same coin. This perspective addresses organisational challenges such as an ageing workforce, longer working lives and a reduced inflow of younger workers, highlighting the need for organisations to maintain the productivity of current workers throughout their extended careers,

rather than accepting early-career burnout as an acceptable cost of high performance (Employee Sustainable Performance, PMC, 2021).

Collaborative Innovation Climate

Collaborative innovation climate refers to the shared perception of employees that the organization promotes innovation by encouraging experimentation, sharing ideas and finding solutions together rather than assigning all innovation responsibilities to one function (e.g. research and development department). Studies of the organisational climate of innovation show that a supportive climate, consisting of organisational ethos, team support, leadership support, job flexibility, and adequate resourcing, is positively related to employee innovative behaviour, with psychological ownership of one's tasks fully mediating the relationship. In a positive environment for innovation, workers experience credibility and respect, which consequently foster a stronger sense of belonging and responsibility for the organization, resulting in greater engagement and increased willingness to propose innovative ideas.

Organizational Sustainability

The most extensive of the three measures is organisational sustainability, the ability of an entity to achieve its economic, social and environmental objectives on a sustainable basis, rather than simply concentrating on short-term financial profits at the expense of its employees or its wider social and ecological impacts. A recent exhaustive review states that employee collaboration is critical to the advancement of organisational sustainability through improvements in efficiency, innovation and resilience. The review also states that operational sustainability is achieved when economic, social and environmental goals are pursued in a way that actively supports the collaborative culture within the organization (Fostering Organisational Sustainability Through Employee Collaboration, 2024). This results in a virtuous cycle, whereby sustainability efforts raise collaboration, which in turn influences the effectiveness of other sustainability initiatives, thus leading to an organization that is increasingly resilient, efficient, and socially responsible over time (Fostering Organisational Sustainability Through Employee Collaboration, 2024).

Theoretical Review

The aforementioned constructs are supported by two theoretical frameworks, namely, Goal-Setting Theory and Self-Determination Theory. Each is discussed in terms of why it is included, how it relates to current research, and what assumptions underlie it.

Goal-Setting Theory (Locke & Latham, 2002)

This hypothesis suggests that when people are given clear and difficult goals, they work harder and develop more. When you are fully aware of your goals, and the goal is neither too easy nor impossible to achieve, your focus deepens, your efforts increase, and your determination grows. Feedback is important; knowing how you're progressing keeps you motivated. Justification: Goal-Setting Theory states that specific and difficult goals with appropriate feedback lead to higher performance than easy or general goals. Feedback enables employees to see their progress and change their behaviour accordingly. This theory offers a rationale for the inclusion of continuous feedback dialogue and strengths-based goal setting in reimagined performance evaluations and explains why regular, targeted feedback processes are more effective in promoting ongoing effort than an annual review. Implication: The theory suggests in the setting of the current study, that continuous feedback conversations would increase sustainable employee performance by keeping goals visible, precise and up-to-date, allowing employees to adjust their efforts in near real-time, rather than realising months later that they have deviated from their objectives. The theory suggests that employees are rational actors who respond consistently to explicit goals and accurate feedback, and it claims that the difficulty of goals and the frequency of feedback are

largely independent of an employee's basic psychological needs, a proposition that Self-Determination Theory, to be discussed below, complicates.

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000)

This theory states that people do their best and grow naturally when 3 basic needs are met, they are;

1. Autonomy- Feeling like you have choice and control over your work
2. Competence - Feeling capable and good at what you do
3. Relatedness - Feeling connected and valued by others

When those 3 are present, motivation comes from inside ,you — "I want to do this" — not just from salary, rewards, or fear.

Justification: Self-Determination Theory argues that the greatest and most lasting human motivation occurs when three basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—are met, and that external assessment methods can either support or undermine these needs depending on how they are implemented. This hypothesis is essentially in line with strengths-based goal setting. Studies based on Self-Determination Theory indicate that strengths-based evaluations increase perceived supervisor support and motivation for improvement by satisfying employees' needs for competence and relatedness during the appraisal discussion (Meijer, Bosch, & Nieuwenhuis, 2020).

Implication:

For organisations re-evaluating their appraisal procedures, the theory suggests that focusing feedback on current strengths rather than on rectified weaknesses is more likely to produce long-term motivational benefits, as it enhances competence rather than diminishes it.

Assumptions: The theory assumes that the satisfaction of psychological needs is a real universal motivation rather than a culturally specific tendency . Evaluative interactions are important social contexts that can effectively facilitate or impede the needs of a single dialogue .

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000)

This theory states that people do their best and grow naturally when 3 basic needs are met, they are;

1. Autonomy- Feeling like you have choice and control over your work
2. Competence - Feeling capable and good at what you do
3. Relatedness - Feeling connected and valued by others

When those 3 are present, motivation comes from inside ,you — "I want to do this" — not just from salary, rewards, or fear.

Justification: Self-Determination Theory holds that human motivation is strongest and most sustainable when three basic psychological needs, autonomy, competence, and relatedness, are satisfied, and that external evaluation processes can either support or undermine these needs depending on how they are delivered. This theory directly underpins strengths-based goal setting, since research grounded explicitly in Self-Determination Theory shows that strengths-based appraisal increases perceived supervisor support and motivation to improve by satisfying employees' needs for competence and relatedness during the appraisal interview itself (Meijer, Bosch, & Nieuwenhuis, 2020).

Implication: For organizations rethinking their appraisal processes, the theory implies that framing feedback around existing strengths, rather than around corrected deficits, should produce more durable motivational gains, because it affirms competence rather than threatening it.

Assumptions: The theory assumes that psychological need satisfaction is a genuine, cross-situational driver of motivation rather than a culturally specific preference, and that appraisal interactions are powerful enough social contexts to meaningfully support or thwart these needs in a single conversation.

Relationship Between the Dimensions and Measures

The three dimensions of reimagined performance evaluation, considered together, correspond to the three performance indicators at their levels of analysis. Ongoing feedback conversations, generally about the employee's own daily work, are the best predictors of lasting job performance. The Goal-Setting Theory states that regular and accurate feedback enables employees to adapt their efforts to realistic goals over time and avoids the build-up of stress that occurs when problems are not resolved for long periods, which is precisely the mechanism that puts sustainable performance in danger in the E-SuPer literature. Because feedback happens only once a year, employees are more likely to view performance management as a stress inducer and not a support system. This is not sustainable as the concept suggests. The theoretical background for strength-based goal setting most closely relates to a collaborative innovation environment. According to self-determination theory, strengths-based approaches address employees' needs for competence and social relatedness, thereby increasing their sense of capability and camaraderie with coworkers—factors that the innovation climate literature identifies as essential for employees to take the interpersonal risk of proposing and advocating new ideas. Evaluation systems that are directed at correcting deficiencies tend to direct an employee's attention to self-protection rather than to the exploratory and idea-sharing behaviours that are required for a collaborative innovation environment. However, the evaluation of psychological safety is ultimately most closely linked to organisational sustainability. According to The Psychological Safety Theory, if the employees are not afraid to reveal their real problems and failures during the assessments, the organization has a more correct knowledge of how it functions and this information is important for the continuous changes that are necessary for the sustainability of the company's economic, social and environmental dimensions. Another dimension to this relationship is the Social Exchange Theory. According to the norm of reciprocity, when organisations offer safety and equity to their employees during assessments, they are more likely to receive continuous discretionary effort and sustained commitment, which are key to the success of sustainability initiatives. The wide-ranging theoretical analysis suggests that a re-evaluation of employee performance evaluations is not merely a stylistic issue, but rather a structural shift inducing important consequences: changes to individual feedback discussions affect team innovation climates, which in turn affect organisational sustainability, as long as the concurrent pursuit of continuous discussion, strengths-based approaches and psychological safety is maintained. The introduction of regular feedback as a reform, without removing the fear of criticism, can only increase the number of cases of a punitive environment for employees, but not change the constructive nature of the evaluation process.

CONCLUSION

This article argues that the traditional approach to performance measurement, which is limited to the measurement of results and the assigning of scores, has become outdated in the setting of modern organisations. An approach orientated toward measurement will only see employees as numbers on a performance chart. It values judgement more than help, past achievement more than potential growth, compliance more than commitment. This often leads to lowered morale, fear of feedback and little impact on actual performance. Performance evaluation, when re-conceptualised as a developmental tool, becomes a continuous loop of mentorship, feedback, education and synchronisation. The focus moves from "What mistakes did you make?" to "How can we help you develop? This methodology considers the employees as valuable human capital with inherent potential, and not only as resources to be evaluated.

Technology can help this transition by giving immediate feedback, keeping track of development goals and personalising the learning experience. But technology is not enough. The human factors like trust, empathy, meaningful dialogue and congruence with organisational principles make appraisal not just a bureaucratic exercise but a developmental journey. Performance assessment is basically a yardstick to tell us where we are. "Where we can go depends on the cultivation of individuals. Those who engage in this re-evaluation will not evade their responsibility. On the flip side they will have more accountability by investing in the people who are accountable for the performance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. HR should equip managers with skills in active listening, asking developmental questions, and giving constructive feedback.
2. Goals should be set jointly by manager and employee and linked to both business needs and personal career aspirations. Include "learning goals" and "stretch goals" alongside performance targets.
3. Leaders should share their own development areas during appraisal cycles. When leaders admit growth needs, it signals to staff that appraisal is safe and is about development, not punishment.

REFERENCES

- Amadi, E. O., Chukuladi, O. S., & Onwukwe, J. (2024). Leadership styles and office manager's job commitment in selected oil companies in Rivers State, Nigeria. *BW Academic Journal*, (9), 12-25.
- Arvey, R. D. & Murphy, K. R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 141–168.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
- Bouskila-Yam, O., & Kluger, A. N. (2011). Strength-based performance appraisal and goal setting. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(2), 137–147.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.001>
- Business Psychology. (2025). Performance appraisal systems. <https://business-psychology.iresearchnet.com/industrial-psychology/performance-appraisal-systems/>
- Dasanayaka, S. W. S. B., De Alwis, G., & Jayarathne, P. G. S. A. (2021). Rethinking the performance evaluation framework: Shifting from resultados to environmental enhancements. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(14), 2911–2934.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Deloitte Insights. (2025). Global Human Capital Trends: Employee performance management optimization. *Deloitte Development LLC*, 1-12.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Smith, C. E. (2014). Performance appraisal, performance management, and firm-level performance: A review, a proposed model, and new directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 127–179.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.873178>

- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
- Fostering organizational sustainability through employee collaboration: An integrative approach to environmental, social, and economic dimensions. (2024). ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386479836>
- From annual reviews to continuous feedback: Evolving performance appraisal systems in 2025. (2025). International Journal of Research in Management. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/397094695>
- Gloria, C., Cynthia, C. E., & Maurice Ikuru, E. N. (2024). Inclusive decision-making and employee job performance in federal universities in South-South, Nigeria. *BW Academic Journal*, (10), 45-58.
- 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>
- Meijer, W., Bosch, M., & Nieuwenhuis, R. (2020). The effect of strengths-based performance appraisal on perceived supervisor support and the motivation to improve performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 1883. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01883>
- Mishra, P. K. (2024). The future of performance management: Shifting from annual reviews to continuous feedback. *Journal of Management and Human Resource Studies*, 18(3), 89-104.
- Murphy, K. R. & DeNisi, A. S. (2023). Performance appraisal: Evaluation and development. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(4), 512–528.
- Njoku, C. C., & Josiah, R. (2022). Organizational performance appraisal process and employees promotion in Nigerian organizations. *BW Academic Journal*, (7), 78-92.
- Nwokeocha, I. M. (2024). Performance appraisal techniques and their effects on organizational growth. *International Journal of Technology and Education Research*, 2(01), 18-31.
- Oniyide, A. A., & Agboola, M. G. (2024). Performance appraisal as a correlate of employees' productivity in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 12(4), 312-326.
- The effect of organizational innovation climate on employee innovative behavior: The role of psychological ownership and task interdependence. (2022). PMC. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9253878/>
- The future of performance management: Shifting from annual reviews to continuous feedback. (2024). ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383846204>
- Employee sustainable performance (E-SuPer): Theoretical conceptualization, scale development, and psychometric properties. (2021). PMC. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8508231/>
- Umbrex. (2026). Psychological safety framework (Edmondson). <https://umbrex.com/resources/frameworks/organization-frameworks/psychological-safety-framework-edmondson/>