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**ABSTRACT**

**Purpose:** The reactions of ratee to appraisal practices and their perceptions of appraisal system fairness may be a good indicator of appraisal system success. This research investigates employees' perception of performance appraisal (PA) aspects connected with organizational justice on Performance Appraisal effectiveness and employee satisfaction with the evaluation process in higher education.

**Design/Methodology/Approach:** The partial least square structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was employed to check the hypothesized results. Overall, 497 respondents filled the questionnaire with their views on appraisal fairness, effectiveness, and satisfaction with appraisal practices.

**Findings:** The findings show a positive relationship between organizational justice dimensions (socially determined justice and structurally determined justice) with effectiveness and satisfaction with the appraisal system. However, satisfaction with performance appraisal effectiveness and socially determined justice do not have a statistically significant relationship. Furthermore, there is a significant mediation relationship between the appraisal system's effectiveness, employee satisfaction with performance appraisal, socially determined justice, and structurally determining justice.

**Implications/Originality/Value:** The study presents some useful suggestions to managers working as appraisers on methods of increasing the performance appraisal system effectiveness and making it acceptable for the employees with their satisfaction.
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**Introduction**

Performance Appraisal is a fundamental component of performance management (Brudan, 2010), which serves multi-purposes ranging from administrative decisions (reward, promotion, demotion)
to developmental (employee training, personal and professional) aspects (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2007; Hamna et al., 2022). Therefore, in today's fluctuating situation of an organization's success and failure the performance appraisal system dominates other strategies to turn an organization towards a competitively advantaged environment (Youngcourt et al., 2007). While examining employee performance, academicians, researchers, and practitioners take Performance appraisal as an integral human resource instrument.

Organizations are encouraged to upgrade their execution levels and manage their staff and stakeholders more effectively (Abdurezak Mohammed & Tigist, 2021). Firstly, the expectation is that public and private sector performances can be enhanced; secondly, this is a desirable and necessary adjustment; and thirdly, a comparative evaluation can stimulate improvement. Thus, stakeholders' perceptions of performance justice are important factors to consider (Rowland & Hall, 2012). Mokwadi (2019) points out that employees' dissatisfaction with appraisal fairness and their perception of inequity in performance evaluation may destine the failure of the appraisal system. One of the main challenges human resource professionals face when improving performance is establishing an effective performance appraisal system (Harrington & Lee, 2015).

An organization's appraisal system effectiveness could best be analyzed through employees' perceptions of the system (Zohaib et al., 2021). Consequently, they see the decision-making process fairness to ensure that organizations' procedures have consistency, unbiasedness, accuracy, and worker concerns and opinions representativeness. They also view the fairness of interpersonal treatment they receive from their supervisors. In today's world, performance appraisal system's focus is shifted from a measurement approach to a context-based approach where employee motivation, interaction with supervisors, and organization are given more attention (Cappelli & Conyon, 2018; Meneghel et al., 2016). Employees' behavior modified through justice perception could justify the employees' reactions to the appraisal methods (Tuytens & Devos, 2012). The employees' dissatisfaction with the system may give rise to conflict and unhappiness, affecting system effectiveness and organization success (Ikramullah et al., 2011).

In Pakistan, the performance appraisal mainly focuses on comparing appraisal practices and the consequences they have at the workplace without considering how effective the system is (Ikramullah et al., 2016). Several dimensions of organizational justice have been the subject of current research. It is still unclear how the effectiveness of performance appraisals impacts employee satisfaction with appraisal systems. Organizational justice in this context plays an important role in understanding the employees' perceptions (Palaiologos et al., 2011), and employees' perception of performance appraisal system fairness is one of the most problematic issues. Hence, this study intends to identify the employees' fairness perceptions about their university appraisal practices and determine the effectiveness of the appraisal system concerning system fairness and their satisfaction with the performance evaluation practices.

**Literature Review**

**Organizational Justice**

Byrne and Cropanzano (2001) acknowledge that fairness at work, also referred to as organizational justice, is the prime concern increasingly seen among employees in performance appraisal. Employees see the outputs related to their contribution and perceive unfairness in the system. The presence of justice in an organization ensures the work performance credibility, and in the absence of justice, workers use unjust means to take their rights (Chegini, 2009). Utilizing justice and fairness throughout the organization, employees' attitudes and behaviors will be drastically affected (Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003; Greenberg & Baron, 2003).

Employees compare their benefits to benefits others receive; they may sense their non-participation in the system practices (e.g., setting targets or priorities) or feel a lack of transparency in the system.
(Heffernan & Dundon, 2016). Procedural justice is related to fairness in the decision-making process (Newman et al., 2020), which refers to the fairness of procedures applied to make decisions by top management. Fairness of procedures uses to make the employees satisfied and committed to their work and raise their level of trust and ultimate cooperation of the employees with their managers (Kim & Beehr, 2020). The worker's concern about the interpersonal treatment they receive from their superiors while endorsing organizational procedures (Jawahar, 2002). Decision makers' fairness in interpersonal treatment with their subordinates assures the interactional justice element of the organization (Ambrose et al., 2021).

**Performance Appraisal**

The appraisal of employees working for the organization should incorporate all formal procedures and methods for assessing employees' dispositions, abilities, contributions, and potentials (Soltani & Wilkinson, 2020; Thompson et al., 2001). Sensing the spirit of performance appraisal Wilson (2005) considers it neither a technique nor a solitary step to proceed; rather, it could be seen as a chronic process including staff motivation, awareness of what their manager expects from them, and assessment of their performance. In contrast, performance appraisal can be described as evaluating how well an employee performs on the job (Bourne et al., 2000). In the organizational setting, performance appraisal is defined as a structured formal interview between a subordinate and supervisor to evaluate worker performance and supply feedback (Dessler et al., 2015).

**Performance Appraisal Effectiveness**

Noe et al. (2014) suggest that an employee must determine the fairness of the organization's systems by analyzing employees' perceptions, outcomes, and managers' treatment of employees and procedures, outcomes, and management methods. Performance appraisals significantly influence individual careers and work lives more than other management processes. Supervisors must make subjective evaluations of the performance of employees, contrary to objective evaluations based on quantitative aspects of job performance (Ahmad Bilal et al., 2022; Brown et al., 2010). Reactions to appraisals and appraisal processes determine the effectiveness and viability of appraisal systems, with unfavorable reactions adversely affecting the most carefully crafted appraisal systems (Jawahar, 2007). There have been minimal improvements in how performance is assessed, from performance appraisals to numerous rating scales, identifying specific types of rating errors, to rater training to support the development of feedback systems to gather feedback from employees, peers, other managers, and customers (Rowland & Hall, 2012).

**Performance Appraisal Satisfaction**

An organization's survival must have an effective performance appraisal system, as an ineffective system leads to organizational destruction, employee dissatisfaction, and confusion. As a result, employees are more likely to be satisfied with the appraisal process (Umair et al., 2016). Employees perceive that dissatisfaction and increased turnover rates result from their managers manipulating their performance ratings, mainly because of their supervisors' hidden agendas (Murphy, 2015).

**Organization Justice and Appraisal System Satisfaction & Effectiveness**

According to Farndale et al. (2011), employees' perceptions of justice affect their thinking, feelings, and behavior. Perceptions of effectiveness and usefulness are important for users' perceptions of performance management practices, and they may predict their reactions to performance appraisal within an organization. Accordingly, aligning performance appraisal systems with the employee's perception of fair appraisals can increase appraisal acceptance and effectiveness (Chen & Eldridge, 2010). Moreover, it can also negate performance enhancement initiatives, performance system to be effective, managers must be aware of the systems and understand how they can be implemented.

Performance management effectiveness perceptions may affect organizations and employees (Ikramullah et al., 2011). When ineffective performance-management practices are implemented,
they can contribute to several negative outcomes, such as decreased employee involvement, commitment, and motivation (Baird et al., 2012). Employees can choose to change unfair ratings, request clarification regarding feedback, and express their satisfaction with performance goals and feedback (Ikramullah et al., 2016). Jawahar (2007) examined selected appraisal reactions and types of justice perceptions that furthered the appraisal reactions to understand the influence of fairness perceptions on satisfaction with appraisal components. Palaiologos et al. (2011) examined how employee satisfaction and fairness affect performance appraisals. It was found that the administrative purposes of performance appraisals were linked to distributive justice and procedural justice, while the developmental purposes were linked to interactional justice. The employees were satisfied with the performance appraisal process when the evaluation criteria were clear to them and understood by all employees.

Mokwadi (2019) Pakistani public sector organizations were investigated to determine how fair the performance appraisal system is perceived. In addition, all distributive justice and interpersonal justice items were viewed as fair by the employees. As a result, fairness in information and distribution plays a direct role in the appraisal rating and system satisfaction. However, distributive, informational, and interpersonal fairness have a strong positive relationship with employees' overall satisfaction and their satisfaction with the management (Arene Ursolo et al., 2016). Many researchers have highlighted satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the appraisal system (Chaitra, 2016; Sudin, 2011). Employee satisfaction with performance appraisals is related to the overall perception of their satisfaction with the system (Mullins & McLean, 2019). Generally, employee satisfaction occurs only when the employee accepts the performance appraisal system and is satisfied with the accuracy and fairness of the procedures. Additionally, mutual trust between supervisors and subordinates and frequent feedback to the employee leads to employee satisfaction with the appraisal system (Cappelli & Conyon, 2018).

**H1:** There is a positive relationship between socially determined justice and performance appraisal effectiveness.

**H2:** There is a positive relationship between socially determined justice and performance appraisal Satisfaction.

**H3:** There is a positive relationship between structurally determined justice and performance appraisal effectiveness.

**H4:** There is a positive relationship between structurally determined justice and performance appraisal Satisfaction.

**H5:** There is a mediation effect of performance appraisal effectiveness between socially determined justice and performance appraisal Satisfaction.

**H6:** There is a mediation effect of performance appraisal effectiveness between structurally determined justice and performance appraisal Satisfaction.

**Research Methodology**

The study measures employee perceptions about performance appraisal fairness using Greenberg’s organizational justice model (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 1993). This study is conducted in all the public and private sector universities and higher education institutions of Balochistan comprises department deans, chairpersons and faculty members, offering undergraduate and graduate programs using stratified sampling (Ahmad Bilal et al., 2022; Saunders et al., 2009).

**Measures**

We collected data from university employees, then measured demographic information and study variables at the start of the study. In Phase II, we examined whether organizational justice and its components have any relation to satisfaction with the appraisal system and its effectiveness. A total of 47-items adapted questionnaire was used from an existing organizational justice scale (Thurston Jr, 2001; Thurston & McNall, 2010; Walsh, 2003) to measure structurally determined justice
(procedural justice, distributive justice), socially determined justice (interpersonal justice and informational justice), along with two items for satisfaction with the appraisal system and appraisal system effectiveness and items were tested for factor structure and composition (Ramayah et al., 2018). Using a Likert scale, this study asked questions ranging from 1 (Very Untrue) to 5 (Very True).

**Procedure**
The data analysis is conducted through the use of SPSS version (SPSS-26), which enables handling of the data and analysis of preliminary issues in the data, such as descriptive analysis, mean, standard deviation, frequency analysis, and common method bias. In addition, partial least square structural equations (PLS-SEM) were used to determine the validity and reliability of the measurement model (outer model) and an assessment of the structure model (inner model) for the hypothesized relationships (Hair et al., 2020; Noureen et al., 2021; Sarstedt et al., 2017).

**Preliminary Data Analysis**
Skewness and kurtosis were common methods to excess the deviation from normality (Pallant, 2001). The threshold value for skewness was determined to be ±1, and for kurtosis, it is ±3. The skewness value ranges from 0.321 to .489, and kurtosis values range from 0.213 to 1.197, below the unidimensional normality criterion's threshold values. The Cronbach alpha ranges from 0.762 for structurally determined justice to 0.874 for socially determined justice. Finally, the common method bias (CMB) was performed to validate the sample data (Fuller et al., 2016). According to Podsakoff and Organ (1986), the overall variance should be less than 50%, and the present study results show that Harman's single factor contributes less than 50% of the variance, 35.47%.

**Results**
**Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)**
Partial least squares path modeling (PLS-PM) has become popular and also assess each construct's uni-dimensionality, reliability, and validity (Hair et al., 2020). The researcher can specify, estimate, assess, and present the model in a causal path diagram to show hypothesized relationships among variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Constructs</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structurally Determined Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socially Determined Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AVE= Average Variance extracted, CR= Composite Reliability, and TBR= treatment by rater. (Authors' compilation).

**Internal Item Reliability**
The reliability of individual items can be evaluated by the factor loadings of items (Sarstedt et al., 2014). Table 1 shows that the latent construct structurally determined justice loadings were 0.942 for distributive justice and 0.946 for procedural justice. The outer loadings for the socially determined justice were 0.931 for informational justice and 0.910 for interpersonal justice. The factor loadings for the construct met the criteria.
Composite Reliability
The composite reliability (CR) of each variable reaches the threshold value of 0.7, and a measurement model is said to have satisfactory internal consistency reliability. Table 1 demonstrates the coefficients of the composite reliability for latent variables. The latent constructs have a composite reliability coefficient of 0.917 for socially determined justice and 0.943 for structurally determined justice. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha also shows an adequate level of internal consistency and ranges from 0.821 to 0.878. These findings suggest that the items used to describe the constructs have a high level of internal consistency.

Convergent Validity
In order to assess the measurement model's convergent validity, its average variance extracted value (AVE) is examined. According to Chin (2010), convergent validity is adequate when constructs have an average variance extracted (AVE) value of 0.5 or higher. Table 1 shows that the AVEs for all constructs range from 0.847 to 0.892, implying that the measurement model has convergent validity.

Discriminant Validity
Finally, the measurement model's discriminant validity is evaluated using two criteria (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) and (Henseler et al., 2015) Hetero trait-Mono trait ratio (HTMT). The square root of the average variance extracted AVE is compared to the correlation of latent constructs (Hair et al., 2019). All off-diagonal elements are lower than the square roots of AVE, as shown in Table 2a, indicating the discriminant criterion is met. According to Voorhees et al. (2016), the hetero-trait–Mono-trait ratio (HTMT ratio) should be less than or equal to 0.85, which is the stricter threshold of 0.90. In this study, all the constructs with an HTMT ratio of less than 0.85, indicating no issue with discriminant validity (see Table 2b HTMT ratio).

Structural Model Assessment
The measures used to determine the validity of the structural model for this study are discussed as analyses of multicollinearity, path coefficients, coefficient of determination R-square, effect size, and predictive relevance. For assessing the structural model of analysis, variance inflation factor (VIF) was used to assess the multicollinearity, 5,000-sample re-sample bootstrapping procedure was testified as recommended to test path coefficients (J. F. Hair et al., 2020).

Table 2 Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fornell &amp; Larcker 2a</th>
<th>Socially Determined Justice</th>
<th>Structurally Determined Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socially Determined Justice</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structurally Determined Justice</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HTMT-Ratio 2b</th>
<th>Socially Determined Justice</th>
<th>Structurally Determined Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socially Determined Justice</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structurally Determined Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (Authors’ compilation).

Table 3 presents an insignificant positive relationship between socially determined justice and satisfaction with appraisal system (β = 0.026, t = 0.418, p = 0.338). The results have shown a positive association between socially determined justice and appraisal system effectiveness by (β = 0.191, t =3.054, p=0.001) proposed in H2. As for H3 of the study, there is a positive relationship between structurally determined justice and satisfaction with the appraisal system.

The results show a significant relationship with (β =0.293, t =4.044, p=0.000); thus, H3 is also supported, and the positive increase in structurally determined justice increases satisfaction with
the appraisal system. H₄ of the study is also supported, which states that structurally determined justice has a positive relationship with appraisal system effectiveness (β = 0.414, t =6.447, p=0.000); H₅ is supported. As for H₆, the study proposed the mediation effect of appraisal system effectiveness. It is also supported with (β = 0.088, t =3.068, p=0.001). Finally, H₆ of the study is also supported with (β = 0.191, t =4.805, p=0.000), which has the mediating relationship between structurally determined justice and satisfaction with the appraisal system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.DEV</th>
<th>T-values</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASE → SWAS</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>9.298</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDJ → SWAS</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDJ → ASE</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDJ → SWAS</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>4.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDJ → ASE</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>6.447</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDJ → ASE → SWAS</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>3.068</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDJ → ASE → SWAS</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>4.805</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The path coefficients are estimated at 5,000 bootstrapping and one tail distribution due to the directional hypothesis. β = path coefficients, S.DEV = standard deviation of a sample, T-values= T statistics to test the significance of path coefficients as per students' T distribution. SDJ= socially determined justice, STDJ= structurally determined justice, SWAS= satisfaction with appraisal system, ASE= appraisal system effectiveness. (Authors’ compilation).

Collinearity Diagnostics
For the assessment of multicollinearity, the variance inflation factor (VIF) is used. According to Hair Jr et al. (2020), the value of the Variance inflation factor (VIF) should be less than three (3). therefore, it can be inferred that there is no problem with multicollinearity for the analysis as all the values are less than 3 (see Table 4).

Coefficient of Determination (R²)
The amount of variance in a dependent variable explained by the independent variables is expressed as the coefficient of determination R² value. The structural model's findings in Table 4 indicate that satisfaction with the appraisal system explains 41.2 percent variation. The criterion for R² is met, and the structural model can make accurate predictions.

Predictive relevance of the model
Following Chin (2010), a cross-validated redundancy test considers the nature of the outcome variable through Q² to assess the model's predictive validity. Table 4 shows the Q² value of 0.468 for satisfaction with the appraisal system, which is greater than zero, indicating that the model has deemed predictive relevance.

Strength of the effect size
Comparing the coefficient of determination R² value of the primary model with the R² values of
the complete model integrating both exogenous and mediating variables, the intensity of mediating effects could be calculated.

**Figure 1 Structural Model**

![Figure 1](image-url)

The effect sizes of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 are considered weak, moderate, and strong, respectively (Sawilowsky, 2009). As shown in Table 4, the $f^2$ value for all the variables is adequate for the endogenous construct satisfaction with the appraisal system; on the other hand, structurally determined justice has 0.091, and socially determined justice has a low value of 0.019, contributing to a small effect size. A small effect size does not always imply that the underlying effect is negligible (Chin et al., 2003).

**Discussion**

This study explores the relationship between perceived fairness in performance appraisals and their effectiveness, as appraisal success is directly related to ratees' fairness perception of the appraisal system and how they view the appraisal process (Jawahar, 2002). The study results indicate that structurally determined justice is positively related to the effectiveness of performance appraisals and satisfaction with the system (Newman et al., 2020). It exhibits that if employees find the outcomes inequity with their efforts, they find the system highly effective, increasing their satisfaction with the system. Additionally, the results indicate no significant association between socially determined justice and satisfaction with appraisal systems. Thus, the positive increase in social determined justice did not significantly affect satisfaction with the appraisal system. This is consistent with (Cokins, 2004) statement that appraisal dissatisfaction among employees arises when an ineffective process and procedures are followed while planning, designing, and implementing the system. At the same time, results supported that socially determined justice has a positive relationship with the affective appraisal system. This finding shows that ratees are keen on the system procedural fairness only
when they find ratings inconsistencies or results are found distributive unfair. Otherwise, if procedural justice is found present in the system, that surely increases employees' satisfaction with the appraisal system (Alharbi, 2013).

However, a mediating relationship between structurally determined justice and satisfaction with the appraisal system supports the findings (Colquitt & Greenberg, 2003). Performance appraisal system may have certain unexpected effects on academic employees. However, if this system is created and executed so that employees view it fair, it will potentially help prevent burnout and stimulate employee positive work behavior (Aguinis et al., 2012). Finally, the significant mediating relationship of performance appraisal effectiveness between socially determined justice and satisfaction with the appraisal system. The performance appraisal effectiveness to employees plays a positive factor in the satisfaction of the appraisal system (Meneghel et al., 2016). In conclusion, results indicated that among all the explanatory variables of the study, appraisal system effectiveness is influenced by the sub-dimensions of organizational justice, which affects employees' satisfaction with the appraisal system (Gelens et al., 2013; Kurian, 2018).

Conclusion
The study aims to find a relationship between organizational justice dimensions with appraisal effectiveness and employee satisfaction with the performance appraisal system in higher education institutes of Pakistan. In addition to this, employee satisfaction with appraisal is highly correlated with the informational fairness in the appraisal system. It means that university employees perceive their appraisal system to be effective in terms of outcomes, the information they get about the system, and the treatment they get from their bosses but find it ineffective in its policies and procedures followed. Furthermore, academicians' satisfaction with performance appraisal is highly related to procedures, the outcome received, and the way they are informed of the system procedures. Employees' acceptance of the appraisal system in terms of fairness is the main source of employee satisfaction. Moreover, employee satisfaction carries the organization to another level of success using an effective and efficient performance appraisal system.

Implications
Study findings have practical implications for the key stakeholders connected with the performance appraisal system in higher education. Fewer studies have addressed the effectiveness of appraisal practices concerning organizational justice in higher education institutions in Pakistan. This study will provide a new direction to the managers, administrators, and policymakers to sense the needs of system and system users while setting any performance standards and criteria. It will draw administrators' and top management's attention to consider the importance of adding fairness to the appraisal system beforehand at the planning stage. The appraisal system design and its implementation align with the stakeholders' expectations and needs to mitigate the chances of unexpected and negative effects on raters and ratees work behaviors, which may cause ineffectiveness of the system and failure in organizational goal achievement.

Recommendations & Limitations
Study findings evidenced the importance of a fair performance appraisal system in higher education institutions. The responsibility of performance appraisal system implementation in higher education institutions is the Department heads, chairs, and deans should think of achieving fair results, treating academic personnel equitably, and providing them sufficient information regarding the system and practices. Studies should be conducted with a large sample of universities checking employees' fairness perception of the performance appraisal system using a more holistic approach. One key limitation of the study is the selection of universities from only one province (Quaisar Ijaz et al., 2021). Data were gathered from public and private universities in Balochistan, limiting the external validity of the study findings. Researchers are invited to further investigate performance appraisal fairness in universities with different territorial and policy backgrounds.
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