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The main purpose of this research was to analyze the relationship of organizational justice performance appraisal with affective commitment and work performance. Employees of microfinance banks in the Sukkur, Sindh region were recruited for this study because they were thought to have highly developed and transparent appraisal systems and to give a recent setting in which to evaluate the influence of organizational justice conflict. A structured questionnaire was used to investigate the relationship between these variables using correlation analysis. The response of 245 employees was taken with the help of a convenience sampling technique. SPSS-22 was used for analysis. There is a strong positive association between organizational justice and performance appraisal. Moreover, the current study examines that performance appraisal has a weak positive relationship with work performance is low. Similarly, results also confirm that performance appraisal has a positive relationship with affective commitment. The sample size of this study was insufficient to draw firm conclusions. To acquire a more accurate knowledge of the relationship between organizational justice and the performance appraisal system in an organization, future research should be undertaken with a bigger sample size, across other industries and sectors.
Introduction

Human resources are vital asset of any organization in the today’s competitive environment. It is very important factor in organizational effectiveness and success. Human resource management is a critical process for managing and motivating employees in an organization, from the acquisition of an employee to turnover intentions or leaving the organization. This process may affect workers' perceptions of their relationships with other employers (Deressa et al., 2022; Huemann, Keegan, & Turner 2007; Saeed et al., 2014; Nadeem et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2021). The problems which related to human factor in the organization resolved by the Human resource management. Human resource which influences organizational success based on the employee work performance. Mondy et al. (1999) stated that the employee performance is a method which directly impacts on organizational success with subordinate and manager roles to do work together and set probabilities, review outputs and rewards for performance. Employees might be perceived their perception regarding their work performance in the organization on the basis of performance appraisal system which used by the organizations to measure the performance of an employee (Ghoto et al., 2021; Jufrizen & Kandhita, 2021; Ahmad et al., 2021; Alvi et al., 2014; Khan, et al., 2019). Employee work performance might be based on attitudes and justice of organization with their employees which creates perception among the employees regarding performance appraisal system within the organization.

However, organizational justice can be described as output of the employee’s perception regarding performance appraisal system and other aspects of organization for the honesty and fairness while measuring the performance of the employees within the organization. Thus, there is also a degree of justice in duties, responsibilities and tasks which are given to employees based on job description which create strong or weak relationship between employees and organization which also based on justice. So, that when the employees feels that they are not treated fairly and honestly by the organization, it would be difficult for the employees to satisfy themselves regarding their job and remain committed with the organization (Oubrich et al., 2021; Jamil et al., 2014; Ullah et al., 2021; Alvi et al., 2014; Attaoa, 2003). However, according to justice theory, employees repeatedly notice and judge the apparent fairness from the available resources and outcomes of the workers (distributive justice), procedures of decision making (Procedural Justice) and interpersonal treatment (interactional justice) (Bauer & Erdogan, 2010; Alvi, et al., 2017).

Floger and Cropanzano (1998) stated that the organizational justice indicating the workers perception of honesty and justice of the outcomes which they receive from the organization for their performance and work, relating to the apparently fairness and justice of outcomes i.e., pay and promotions, recognition, performance appraisal, rewards, and benefits. If these results are to be considered as unfairly and injustice, then employees who they are working for the organization
would cognitively distort their efforts and outcomes and this injustice will increase deviant behavior due unfair treat (Zhou et al., 2022; Malik et al., 2015; Shah et al., 2020; Jamil et al., 2014; Colquitt et al., 2001). Leventhal (1976) stated that the results which can be distributed are based on needs, equality, or contribution of each employee. Thus, individual employee who make his/her point of view regarding fairness and justice through distribution and comparison with rest of the employees (Campbell & Finch, 2004). However, organizational justice is to be considered as most important because unfair in distribution of outcomes among the employees would lead to disagreements, disbelief and many other serious consequences which reduce the performance of employees and commitment and creates social issues with the managers (Ye et al., 2022; Jia et al., 2022; Suliman, 2007).

Perception regarding organizational justice and honesty might be linked with employee work performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Enjoyment in Job, positive emotions while performing job would be measured of one’s for satisfaction level regarding job. Thus, perception regarding justice and honesty of organization and employee satisfaction are important factors that leads to commitment of the employee (Locke, 1976; Rodrigo et al., 2022). When employees feel and observe high level of honesty and fairness in performance appraisal and other outcomes they will stay more in the organization and remain committed with the organization and improve their performance (Cowherd et al., 1992; Robert et al., 2020). Thus, workers with high level of organizational commitment will have more and productive contributions for the organization. Participate in organizational citizenship behavior; perform better and less likely to engage in unproductive and negative behavior (Meyer et al. 2002). Moreover, on the other hand when the employees judge and observe injustice, dishonesty and unfairness in the performance appraisal and other outcomes, they may lose their interest to the organization, and they will not perform well to achieve organizational goals and targets.

Luthans (2006) stated that the attitude of employees which includes a high level of desire to be the part of organization, a great wish to work in the best attention of organization and accepting organizations values, norms and objective with strong belief and confidence. Commitment means to give best efforts for the organizational goals, be loyal and sincere and stay in the organization for a longer period. According to Mowday (1998), the workers who have high level of organizational commitment and willing to build strong relations between customers, rest of employees and with managers, be more productive, adoptable for any change, and work efficiently and effectively for the organization. they will give more and better performance, very low in turnover intentions and show punctuality in attendance. Whereas, in service sector organizations i.e., insurance companies, perception and satisfaction regarding quality of service is directly related with behaviors and attitudes of employees who they are working in the organization (Schneider & Bowen 1993; Gruman & Budworth, 2022). However, the insurance company in Indonesia, called BPJS, takes serious actions to improve perception as it has direct impact on performance of employees and commitment with organization. By understanding the
behaviors and attitudes of employees with reference to strategies, goals and values of the organization which leads to increase productivity of the employees. The study evaluates the fairness in organizational justice in performance appraisal system and its impact on other variables i.e., organizational commitment and employee work performance.

The aim of current study is to find the relationship of organizational justice, performance appraisal, work performance and effective commitment. This research suggesting the framework for the relationship of organizational justice, performance appraisal, work performance and effective commitment for the employees of Microfinancing Banks of Sukkur Region. In this regard current study proposes three hypotheses.

**Literature Review and development of Hypotheses**

**Performance Appraisal**

It is the reality that organizations depend on performance management to evaluate the performance of the employees that how they are working for the organization. Most of the human resource managers believe on in winning the heart of talented and skilled human resource by paying and retaining to perform for the organization and preserving them to work efficiently and effectively. The process of appraisal system can be helpful for employers and employee to get information, and it affect the performance of employees positively or negatively. As for as, it based on the fairness and honesty of organization while evaluating the performance of employees. The appraisal system should contain all the relevant standards for measuring performance and should exclude the unrelated measures which are not related with job performance of employees. Archer North (1998) suggested that reasonable and translucent system of performance appraisal leads to higher satisfaction which increase organizational commitment, employee work performance and lower turnover intentions. Furthermore, Mohrmanet al. (1989) argued some major benefits of fair performance appraisal system, i.e., it increases employee motivation to perform well, supervisors and staff get new insights which helps organization to compensate and distribute rewards on reasonable and credible basis, and it increase self-understanding between workers and helps to develop positive activities which are valued to organization. Another, study of Richards (2010) found that the need and direction of trainings, improvement in performance, guideline and development in leadership and succession of planning might be provided by performance appraisal system. Meanwhile, if the employees perceive and observe injustice, unfair in appraisal system, it reduces employee productivity (Jufrizen & Kandhita, 2021; Swarts et al., 2019; Wang, et al., 2022; Asif & Rehman, 2021; Thomas et al., 1994).

**Organizational Justice**

The concern in employees regarding fairness at workplace is increasing day by day, which is also known as organizational justice (Deressa et al., 2022; Oubrich et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022). This problem, especially related fairness and honesty in performance appraisal system and other
different score points of performance which each employee receive in the organization. In the labor management, the fairness and honesty in performance appraisal system is a critical problem. When the employees feel injustice in PA, they may act to reestablish equity and understand an inequality. Thus, while measuring fair-mindedness of the employee’s performance, they may balance their inputs i.e., work, efforts, and skills against the outcome i.e., compensations and privileges.

**Organizational Justice and performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal is the sole means to evaluate employee performance in performance management. Many researchers have failed to comprehend what this implies (PA), even though it is the most important topic in the research chosen by the majority of psychologists (Flechter, 2002; Scholtes, 1993). According to Ghoto et al., (2021), performance appraisal is the managed evolution of an employee's performance and development strategy. It investigated that what employees received rating or other outcomes or how it can be decided that makes evaluation process to be seem fair (Zhou et al., 2022; Asif and Rehman, 2021). However, the work of Greenberg (1986) was also supported by Landy et al., (1978) that employees believes that their evaluation of performance was treated fairly and honestly under some certain conditions Landy et al. (1980) claim in their study that a transparent and fair appraisal procedure has clear practical aspects regardless of the findings of the evaluations themselves. The findings of Folgers et al. (1992) also supported this study since they documented the major three components (sufficient notice, equitable hearing, and judgement) that were based on evidence that were used to extend the method of justice in measuring the performance of workers.

Past research has also demonstrated that employees' perceptions of the appraisal process influence employee productivity and organizational commitment, especially when the company begins the evaluation process. For instance, Fernandes et al., (2006) argued that the employees show their concerns and perception on distributive justice for the distribution of resources and outcomes, and it also impact on satisfaction of employees with their work outcomes. The practices of unfair, injustice in performance appraisal system would lead to employees many social issues and problems i.e., disputes, mistrust, and disrespect (Suliman, 2007; Nadeem et al., 2021). Organizational justice has positive relationship with performance appraisal (Palaiologos et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2014). Thus, study proposed hypothesis.

**H1: Organizational justice has positive relationship with performance appraisal**

Performance appraisal and work performance

Chang (2008) stated that the organizational justice is the best predictor of employee work performance, most of recent findings pointed this problem that organizational justice has significant impact employee work performance and it is still important issue, even organizational management increase compensation or pay for performance. The justice and fairness in appraisal process leads to employee confidence in management of organization, give assurance to access to their rights which improve the productivity and work performance. The workers determine the
degree for fairness and honesty of dissemination of outcomes through comparison with other employees (Adams, 1965; Cropanzano & Greeberg, 1997; Campbell & Finch, 2004). Colquitt et al. (2001) documented that the justice in company is the main source of motivation and happiness, and employees will perform well and harder when they feel they are fair and honestly treated for their work and performance. The study of Nacsurdin et al. (2011) examined the Malaysian workers relation between perception regarding organizational justice and work performance and the finding of this research guided that performance appraisal has positive relation with performance of organizational workers. Performance appraisal is positively related with employee work performance (Kuvaas, 2007; Kuvaas, 2006; Krishnan et al., 2018). Current study proposes the following hypothesis.

**H2. Performance appraisal has positive relation with employee work performance.**

**PA and AFC**

Commitment can be seen in many levels of company, by employees who perform work or involved in the work and willing to improve the performance (Worley. 2005). The study of Forehead (1991) defines that the commitment has direct relation with performance, with the concept that the workers who they are satisfied regarding fairness of PA process, are more committed and perform well to achieve organizational goals and targets rather than less committed employees.

Myer and Allen (1990), on the other hand, identified three components of organizational commitment. The first type of commitment, affective commitment, refers to employees' emotional tie to the firm or their favorable response to assigned tasks. The second is continuous commitment, which refers to employees' views towards other employees who are receiving or being offered higher perks by another firm in terms of cost. While the latter is normative commitment, employees in this situation demonstrate loyalty to the firm and a sense of gratitude for the opportunity to work and remain in the organization. Furthermore, it is critical to understand employee perceptions of appraisal fairness and its impact on organizational commitment. Meanwhile, this study will look at affective commitment. Fairness and justice have a considerable association with organizational commitment (Ghoto et al., 2021; Danish, et al., 2019).

The evaluation system should be founded on organizational fairness to ensure employee engagement and performance. As a result, Biswakarma (2017) conducted yet another study in Nepal on the fairness and PA, as well as employee employment outcomes. The study looked at how organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions were affected by appraisal perception. Rana and Singh (2021) examine that performance appraisal has positive relation with affective commitment. So current study proposes following hypothesis.

**H3: Performance appraisal has positive relation with affective commitment.**

**Conceptual Framework**
The research has proposed the conceptual framework based on given literature.

Figure 01: Conceptual framework

Research Methodology

Research Approach and Type

The nature of this research is quantitative. The research which based on the philosophy of positivism is used to be positivist method, the research material is in the form of numeric and uses statistics for analysis purpose and this process or method called to be quantitative method (Sugiyono., 2017). The study used quantitative data by collecting primary data from the respondents. The employees of Microfinancing Banks of Sukkur region, Pakistan were the sample of the study using non-probability sampling technique.

Population and Sample

The Salkind (2003) stated that population means the study in which number of expected participants to whom research want to generalize the study results. Thus, the entire group of people, things or events of concentration which study willing to examine or investigate (Sekaran et al., 2009). But for this study, the population was Microfinancing Banks of Sukkur Region. The sampling method of this research is same like the technique of previous researches (For e.g., Ahmad et al., 2021; Saeed et al., 2014; Nadeem et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2021; Alvi et al., 2014; Khan, et al., 2019).

Data Collection

To collect the 300 questionnaires were distributed among the private bank employees in Sindh, Pakistan. The researcher received only 270 questionnaires back and found 245 filled and correct. Initially, questionnaires were coded and entered SPSS for further process. The SPSS-22 was used to measure the relationship of among variables.

Measure

Organizational Justice
The organizational justice is the endogenous variables in this study. The questionnaire was adopted from previous study of Al-Zu’bi (2010) for this variable with its three components (distributive, procedural and interactional). Scale is consisted of 26 items.

**Performance Appraisal**

The measures of this study were adopted from prior studies of Gallato (2012) and Ghoto et al., (2021). Scale is consisted of 07 items.

**Affective Commitment**

The measure the responses of respondent on commitment, the items were adopted form and Ghoto et al., (2021) and Allen and Meyer (1990) studies. Scale is consisted of 08 items.

**Work performance**

The items of questionnaire of this variable were adopted from previous studies of Fernandes and Awamleh (2006) and Becker (1992). Scale is consisted of 05 items. All the variables used a five-point Likert type scale, where participants could rate their level for each statement ranging from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree.

**Results & Discussion**

**Cronbach Alpha of the variable**

The study calculated inter-item consistency using Cronbach's coefficient alpha to assess the reliability of several metrics. Reliability value organizational justice is 0.90. The study also assessed work performance and performance appraisal, with reliability values of 0.81 and 0.92 respectively. Finally, Affective commitment, which resulted in a reliability coefficient of 0.79, which is considered acceptable because it is greater than the 0.7 criterion.

**Factor Analysis**

A statistical technique used to find underlying patterns or structures within a set of variables is factor analysis. It is frequently used in psychology and social sciences to uncover common elements within a set of measures or to reduce a big number of variables into a smaller number of interpretable variables. It can also be used to determine a dataset's underlying structure, such as discovering patterns of covariation among items or identifying subgroups of items that measure the same construct. Charles Spearman (1904) proposed factor analysis, which was further developed by other academics such as Guilford (1936) and Cattell (1966). Organizational justice variables were examined using statistical methods such as factor rotation to find significant dimensions of justice inside an organization. The results demonstrated a high level of sample adequacy, as indicated by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value.
### Table No 1: Organizational Justice Factor Analysis-Rotated Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>OJ</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OJ1</td>
<td>.868  .172  .208 .271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OJ2</td>
<td>.732  .213  .236 .311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OJ3</td>
<td>.826  .202  .183 .384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OJ4</td>
<td>.778  .216  .128 .310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OJ5</td>
<td>.739  .334  .182 .224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OJ6</td>
<td>.719  .262  .334 .271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OJ7</td>
<td>.317  .784  .334 .317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OJ8</td>
<td>.261  .799  .285 .261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OJ9</td>
<td>.176  .723  .425 .176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OJ10</td>
<td>.184  .737  .449 .184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OJ11</td>
<td>.364  .714  .243 .364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OJ12</td>
<td>.428  .683  .283 .428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OJ13</td>
<td>.434  .663  .251 .434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>OJ14</td>
<td>.188  .271  .823 .334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>OJ15</td>
<td>.267  .311  .776 .265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>OJ16</td>
<td>.260  .384  .769 .425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OJ17</td>
<td>.168  .310  .644 .439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>OJ18</td>
<td>.213  .224  .683 .243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>OJ19</td>
<td>.327  .172  .334 .762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>OJ20</td>
<td>.271  .213  .285 .775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OJ21</td>
<td>.167  .212  .425 .765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>OJ22</td>
<td>.174  .217  .449 .719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OJ23</td>
<td>.355  .333  .243 .723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>OJ24</td>
<td>.438  .272  .283 .723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>OJ25</td>
<td>.434  .162  .251 .663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>OJ26</td>
<td>.327  .212  .334 .673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor loading of OJ elements is shown in the above table. All the items have factor loading value greater than 0.60 and values are split in three columns which confirms the three factors of OJ.

**Factor Loading of PA, WP & AFC**

The results of a factor analysis between performance appraisal satisfaction and work performance are shown in Table 2. Varimax with Kaiser Meyer-Olkin was used to perform a principal component analysis (KMO).
Table No 2: Factor Analysis-Rotated Component of PA, WP & AFC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PA1</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PA2</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PA3</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PA4</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PA5</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PA6</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PA7</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>AFC1</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AFC2</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>AFC3</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AFC4</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AFC5</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AFC6</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AFC7</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFC8</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no 2 describe the factor loading values of PA, WP and AFC. The results demonstrated a high level of sample adequacy, as indicated by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value. Factor loading of all elements is shown in the above table. All the items have factor loading value greater than 0.60 and values. Moreover, all values are split in three columns which confirms the three different scales of PA, WP and AFC.

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OJ</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shows that the average values for OJ is larger than 3.00, and the standard deviation is less than one. The average for OJ is 3.57 with a standard deviation of 0.75. The average and standard deviation for satisfaction with performance appraisals were 2.49 and 0.76, respectively. Among all factors, work performance had the highest average of 3.10 and the lowest standard deviation of 0.46. The average for Affective Commitment was 3.12, with a standard deviation of 0.41. However, as for as concerned the mean of OJ is 3.57 which mean most of the employees are agree with the statements or we can consider a strongly agree. Thus, regarding PA
practices are not much better as its mean is only 2.29 which is very less as compared to other constructs. It means PA practices should be revised or improved as respondents are not much satisfied with regard. The mean of work performance & affective commitment is 3.10 with Std. 0.46 and 3.12 with Std.041 respectively.

**Correlation of the variables**

To establish the strength of the association between different variables, the study used correlation analysis. Correlation coefficients (r) between 0.10 and 0.29 indicate a low correlation, 0.30 and 0.49 suggest a moderate correlation, and 0.50 and 1.00 show a strong correlation. The findings revealed that, with the exception of performance appraisal, it had strong association with OJ, with value of coefficient of correlation is 0.615 which is greater than 0.50 with (p less than 0.01). This result is similar with result of past researchers who examined that organizational justice has positive relationship with performance appraisal (Palaiologos et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2014). Hence hypothesis no 1 is accepted. Work performance showed the least significant link with any of the variables, with correlation coefficients for OJ of 0.23 (p less than 0.05), and performance appraisal of 0.29 (p less than 0.01). This result is similar with the result of past researchers who examined that performance appraisal is positively related with employee work performance (Kuvaas, 2007; Kuvaas, 2006; Krishnan et al., 2018). This implies that work performance is low. Hence hypothesis no 2 is accepted. While as AFC has also least significant link with any of the variables, with correlation coefficients for OJ of 0.224 (p less than 0.05), performance appraisal of 0.28 (p less than 0.01) and AFC of 0.277 (p less than 0.01). This result is similar with the result of previous research which examines that performance appraisal has positive relation with affective commitment (Rana & Singh, 2021). Hence hypothesis no 3 is accepted.

**Table No 4: Correlation of the variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OJ</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>AFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Justice (OJ)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal (PA)</td>
<td>0.615**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance (WP)</td>
<td>0.225**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (AFC)</td>
<td>0.224**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.277**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

According to the findings, there is strong positive association between organizational justice and performance appraisal. This result is according to the result of previous study which also suggests this kind link between organizational justice and performance appraisal. Moreover, current study examines that performance appraisal has week positive relationship with work performance is low. Similarly, results also confirm that performance appraisal has positive relation with affective commitment. These results are consistent with the previous findings. However, the sample size of this study was insufficient to draw firm conclusions. To acquire a more accurate
knowledge of the relationship between organizational justice and the performance appraisal system in an organization, future research should be undertaken with a bigger sample size, across other industries and sectors.

**References**


