

MUHANDISLIK

& IQTISODIYOT

№3

ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy, innovatsion texnik,
fan va ta'limga oid ilmiy-amaliy jurnal

2026
MART



Milliy nashrlar

OAK: <https://oak.uz/pages/4802>

05.00.00 - Texnika fanlari

08.00.00 - Iqtisodiyot fanlar



Google Scholar

OPEN ACCESS

ULRICHSWEB[®]
GLOBAL SERIALS DIRECTORY

Academic Resource Index
ResearchBib

ISSN INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INTERNATIONAL CENTRE

CYBERLENINKA

OpenAIRE

ROAD

INDEX COPERNICUS INTERNATIONAL

BASE

Crossref

НАУЧНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОННАЯ БИБЛИОТЕКА LIBRARY.RU



ISSN: 3060-463X

РЭУ.РФ
РОССИЙСКИЙ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
ИМЕНИ Г.В. ПЛЕХАНОВА
ТАШКЕНТСКИЙ ФИЛИАЛ



muhandislik **& iqtisodiyot**

ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy, innovatsion texnik,
fan va ta'limga oid ilmiy-amaliy jurnal

Elektron nashr, 2026-yil, mart.

Bosh muharrir:

Zokirova Nodira Kalandarovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, DSc, professor

Bosh muharrir o'rinbosari:

Shakarov Zafar G'afforovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, PhD, dotsent

Tahrir hay'ati:

Abduraxmanov Kalendar Xodjayevich, O'z FA akademigi, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Sharipov Kongratbay Avezimbetovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

Maxkamov Baxtiyor Shuxratovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Abduraxmanova Gulnora Kalandarovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Shaumarov Said Sanatovich, texnika fanlari doktori, professor

Turayev Bahodir Xatamovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Nasimov Dilmurod Abdulloyevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Allayeva Gulchexra Jalgasovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Arabov Nurali Uralovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Maxmudov Odiljon Xolmirzayevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Xamrayeva Sayyora Nasimovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Bobonazarova Jamila Xolmurodovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Irmatova Aziza Baxromovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Bo'taboyev Mahammadjon To'ychiyevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

Shamshiyeva Nargizaxon Nosirxuja kizi, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor,

Xolmuxamedov Muhsinjon Murodullayevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent

Xodjayeva Nodiraxon Abdurashidovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent

Amanov Otabek Amankulovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Toxirov Jaloliddin Ochil o'g'li, texnika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Qurbonov Samandar Pulatovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Zikriyoyev Aziz Sadulloyevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Tabayev Azamat Zaripbayevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Sxay Lana Aleksandrovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Ismoilova Gulnora Fayzullayevna, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent

Djumaniyazov Umrbek Ilxamovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent

Kasimova Nargiza Sabitdjanovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent

Kalanova Moxigul Baxritdinovna, dotsent

Ashurzoda Luiza Muxtarovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Sharipov Sardor Begmaxmat o'g'li, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Sharipov Botirali Roxataliyevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, professor

Tursunov Ulug'bek Sativoldiyevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori (DSc), dotsent

Bauyetdinov Majit Janizaqovich, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti dotsenti, PhD

Botirov Bozorbek Musurmon o'g'li, Texnika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Sultonov Shavkatjon Abdullayevich, Kimyo fanlari doktori, (DSc)

Jo'raeva Malohat Muhammadovna, filologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), professor.

Yusupov Maxamadamin Abduxamidovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi (DSc), professor

Kalonova Moxigul Baxritdinovna, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi (PhD), dotsent

Mirzayev Kulmamat Djanzakovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi (DSc), professor.

Karimova Nilufar Sadirdin qizi, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Norboyev Odil Abrayevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent

Nasimov Dilmurod Abdulloyevich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Mirzayev Kulmamat Djanzakovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

Karimova Nilufar Sadirdin qizi, iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

Pardaev Umiddjon Uralovich, iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori (DSc), professor

muhandislik & iqtisodiyot

ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy, innovatsion texnik,
fan va ta'limga oid ilmiy-amaliy jurnal

- 05.01.00 – Axborot texnologiyalari, boshqaruv va kompyuter grafikasi
- 05.01.01 – Muhandislik geometriyasi va kompyuter grafikasi. Audio va video texnologiyalari
- 05.01.02 – Tizimli tahlil, boshqaruv va axborotni qayta ishlash
- 05.01.03 – Informatikaning nazariy asoslari
- 05.01.04 – Hisoblash mashinalari, majmualari va kompyuter tarmoqlarining matematik va dasturiy ta'minoti
- 05.01.05 – Axborotlarni himoyalash usullari va tizimlari. Axborot xavfsizligi
- 05.01.06 – Hisoblash texnikasi va boshqaruv tizimlarining elementlari va qurilmalari
- 05.01.07 – Matematik modellashtirish
- 05.01.11 – Raqamli texnologiyalar va sun'iy intellekt
- 05.02.00 – Mashinasozlik va mashinashunoslik
- 05.02.08 – Yer usti majmualari va uchish apparatlari
- 05.03.02 – Metrologiya va metrologiya ta'minoti
- 05.04.01 – Telekommunikatsiya va kompyuter tizimlari, telekommunikatsiya tarmoqlari va qurilmalari. Axborotlarni taqsimlash
- 05.05.03 – Yorug'lik texnikasi. Maxsus yoritish texnologiyasi
- 05.05.05 – Issiqlik texnikasining nazariy asoslari
- 05.05.06 – Qayta tiklanadigan energiya turlari asosidagi energiya qurilmalari
- 05.06.01 – To'qimachilik va yengil sanoat ishlab chiqarishlari materialshunosligi
- 05.08.03 – Temir yo'l transportini ishlatish
- 05.09.01 – Qurilish konstruksiyalari, bino va inshootlar
- 05.09.04 – Suv ta'minoti. Kanalizatsiya. Suv havzalarini muhofazalovchi qurilish tizimlari
- 10.00.06 – Qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslik, chog'ishtirma tilshunoslik va tarjimashunoslik
- 10.00.04 – Yevropa, Amerika va Avstraliya xalqlari tili va adabiyoti
- 08.00.01 – Iqtisodiyot nazariyasi
- 08.00.02 – Makroiqtisodiyot
- 08.00.03 – Sanoat iqtisodiyoti
- 08.00.04 – Qishloq xo'jaligi iqtisodiyoti
- 08.00.05 – Xizmat ko'rsatish tarmoqlari iqtisodiyoti
- 08.00.06 – Ekonometrika va statistika
- 08.00.07 – Moliya, pul muomalasi va kredit
- 08.00.08 – Buxgalteriya hisobi, iqtisodiy tahlil va audit
- 08.00.09 – Jahon iqtisodiyoti
- 08.00.10 – Demografiya. Mehnat iqtisodiyoti
- 08.00.11 – Marketing
- 08.00.12 – Mintaqaviy iqtisodiyot
- 08.00.13 – Menejment
- 08.00.14 – Iqtisodiyotda axborot tizimlari va texnologiyalari
- 08.00.15 – Tadbirkorlik va kichik biznes iqtisodiyoti
- 08.00.16 – Raqamli iqtisodiyot va xalqaro raqamli integratsiya
- 08.00.17 – Turizm va mehmonxona faoliyati

Ma'lumot uchun, OAK
Rayosatining 2024-yil 28-avgustdagi 360/5-son qarori bilan "Dissertatsiyalar asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etishga tavsiya etilgan milliy ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxati"ga texnika va iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha "Muhandislik va iqtisodiyot" jurnali ro'yxatga kiritilgan.

Muassis: "Tadbirkor va ishbilarmon" MChJ

Hamkorlarimiz:

1. Toshkent shahridagi G.V.Plexanov nomidagi Rossiya iqtisodiyot universiteti
2. Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti
3. Toshkent irrigatsiya va qishloq xo'jaligini mexanizatsiyalash muhandislari instituti" milliy tadqiqot universiteti
4. Islom Karimov nomidagi Toshkent davlat texnika universiteti
5. Muhammad al-Xorazmiy nomidagi Toshkent axborot texnologiyalari universiteti
6. Toshkent davlat transport universiteti
7. Toshkent arxitektura-qurilish universiteti
8. Toshkent kimyo-texnologiya universiteti
9. Jizzax politexnika instituti



MUNDARIJA

KORXONALARDA ICHKI AUDIT TIZIMINING BOSHQARUV QARORLARI QABUL QILISHDAGI O'RNI	24
Mexmonaliyev Ulug'bek Erkinjon o'g'li	
FISKAL SIYOSAT SAMARADORLIGI VA SOLIQ TUSHUMLARI DINAMIKASI: O'ZBEKISTON MISOLIDA ILMIY TAHLIL	30
Abduraimova Nigora Abdugapparovna	
YASHIRIN IQTISODIYOTNI KELITIRIB CHIQUARUVCHI ASOSIY OMILLAR HAMDA IQTISODIYOTGA TA'SIRI	37
Toxtabayev Oybek Odilovich	
QISHLOQ XO'JALIGI OZIQ-OVQAT SANOATI KORXONALARIDA ZAMONAVIY BOSHQARUV	42
Rasulova Muxabbat Teshabayevna, Normurodov Sarvar Norboy o'g'li	
O'ZBEKISTON GLOBAL-IQTISODIY RAQOBATBARDOSHLIGINI OSHIRISHDA RAQAMLI IQTISODIYOTNING O'RNI	48
Kuvatova Oliya Sheraliyevna	
QURILISH SANOATIDA KICHIK BIZNES SUBYEKTLARINING IQTISODIY MOHIYATI VA ULARNI KAPITAL BOZORI INSTRUMENTLARI ORQALI MOLIALASHTIRISH IMKONIYATLARI.....	54
Igitov Jurabek Kuzibekovich	
IQTISODIY ISLOHOTLAR DAVRIDA TIJORAT BANKLARINING INVESTITSIYA FAOLIYATINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING OMILLARI	61
Yangiboyev F.B.	
TIJORAT BANKLARIDA MUAMMOLI KREDITLARNI ERTA ANIQLASH VA BOSHQARISHNING INTEGRATSIYALASHGAN RISK-INDEKS MODEL I	68
Kalandarov Abdulla Baxtiyorovich, Rajabov Shoxrux Suvon o'g'li	
RUX VA QO'RG'OSHINNI SELEKTIV AJRATIB OLISHNI KOMBINATSIYALASH TEXNOLOGIYASI VA NAZARIYASI.....	74
Eshonqulov Uchqun Xudaynazar o'g'li, Haqberdiyev Dilshod Qodir o'g'li	
UY-JOY QURILISHI HAJMINI UZOQ MUDDATLI PROGNOZLASHDA EKONOMETRIK MODELLASHTIRISH USULLARINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH	81
Qidirniyazov Ajiniyaz Sherniyazovich	
O'ZBEKISTONDA BOG'DORCHILIKNI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA IQLIM VA TABIIY OFATLAR NATIJASIDA YETKAZILDAN TALOFATLARNI DAVLAT TOMONIDAN KOMPENSATSIYA QILISH MEXANIZMI.....	85
Sattorov Orifjon Boymurodovich	
AHOLI MOLIVAVIY SAVODXONLIGINI OSHIRISH ORQALI YASHIRIN IQTISODIYOTNI QISQARTIRISH MEXANIZMLARI.....	90
Abdug'aniyev Uchqun Habibulla o'g'li	
O'ZBEKISTON QURILISH SANOATIDA KICHIK BIZNES SUBYEKTLARINING RIVOJLANISH DINAMIKASI VA TENDENSIYALARI	96
Musaeva Aynura Abayxolievna	
THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE TRANSFORMATION IN THE CONTEMPORARY ENVIRONMENT.....	104
Normurodov Khusan Eshmakhmatovich	
AKSIYADORLIK JAMIYATLARINING INVESTITSION FAOLLIGINI BAHOLASH YO'LLARI	108
Begamov S.X.	
DEBITORLIK QARZLARINING STRATEGIK BOSHQARUV HISOBINI TASHKIL QILISH YO'NALISHLARI	112
Normatova Gulmira Xayrullaevna	



SOLIQLARNI PROGNOZLASH METODOLOGIYASINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH AMALIYOTI TAHLILI.....	118
Ergashov Jamshid Ashurovich	
MEHNAT XARAJATLARI HISOB: NAZARIY ASOSLAR, USULLAR VA BOSHQARUVDA AHAMIYATI.....	126
Tulyaganov Abdumalik Abdiraximovich	
KORPORATIV XIZMATLARNING BANK FOYDASIGA TA'SIRI: KOMISSION VA FOIZLI DAROMADLAR TAHLILI	131
Qurbonov Abror Abdullayevich	
TIJORAT BANKLARIDA MUAMMOLI KREDITLARNI BOSHQARISH TIZIMINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISHNING INSTITUTSIONAL VA TASHKILY MEXANIZMLARI.....	136
Djamalov G'ofir Oribjanovich	
OCHIQLIK INDEKSI VA KORRUPSIYAGA QARSHI KURASH SAMARADORLIGI: O'ZBEKISTON TAJRIBASINING INSTITUTSIONAL TAHLILI	144
Diilshod Pulatov, Uchqun Abdug'aniyev	
DUNYO SUG'URTA KOMPANIYALARINING MOLIVAVIY HOLATI VA NATIJALARI TAHLILI.....	153
Alimov Baxodir Batirovich	
QISHLOQ HUDUDLARIDA XIZMAT KO'RSATISH SAMARADORLIGINI OSHIRISH IMKONIYATLARI.....	160
Yuldashova Nilufar Ziyabayevna	
QURILISH TASHKILOTLARIDA BOSHQARUV SAMARADORLIGINI OSHIRISHNING INNOVATSION USULLARI	164
Muxibova Guli Yarkinovna, Sharifxodjayeva Odina Ulug'bek qizi	
AXBOROT-RESURS MARKAZLARINING TA'LIM JARAYONIGA TA'SIRINI BAHOLASH.....	168
Pirmedova Xayitgul Muxammedovna	
IJTIMOYIY HIMOYA QAMROVINI KENGAYTIRISH MEXANIZMLARI: XALQARO TAJRIBA VA INSTITUSIONAL YONDASHUVLAR.....	173
Bafoyev Farrux Jo'raqulovich	
KORXONALARDA AI-DRIVEN "DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS" (DSS)NI JORIY ETISHNING KONSEPTUAL ASOSLARI	181
Mardanova Ra'no	
STRENGTHENING THE FINANCING OF FAMILY-OWNED ENTERPRISES IN UZBEKISTAN THROUGH BANK CREDIT	186
Baymuratova Zina Aqilbekovna, Ibadullaeva Asal Ulugbek qizi	
SUN'IY INTELLEKT ASOSIDA DAVLAT BOSHQARUV TIZIMLARINI RAQAMLASHTIRISH	192
Aytmuratov Qutlimurat Jalgasovich	
ATTRACTING INVESTMENTS FROM FINANCIAL MARKETS AND FACTORS INFLUENCING THE INCREASE OF THEIR ATTRACTIVENESS	196
Kholov Sherali Akhrorboyevich	
MARKAZIY OSIYODA TRANSCHEGARAVIY SUV RESURSLARINI BOSHQARISH VA ADOLATLI TAQSIMLASHNING NAZARIY-HUQUQIY ASOSLARI.....	200
Matkarimov Mansur	
XALQARO XIZMATLAR SAVDOSIDA TIBBIY TURIZMNING IQTISODIY AHAMIYATI.....	206
Farxodova Shohnoz Umidbek qizi	
BANK XIZMATLARI SIFATINI BAHOLASHNING KO'P OMILLI INDIKATORLARI TIZIMI	213
Ibroximov Iloxomjon Shavkatjon o'g'li	
SANOAT KORXONALARINI IQTISODIY FAOLIYATINI OPTIMALLASHTIRISH YO'LLARI	219
Tillayeva Barno Ramiztdinovna	
NOTIJORAT TASHKILOTLAR FAOLIYATIDA AUDITORLIK TEKSHIRUVI VA AUDITORLIK HISOBOTLARINING O'ZIGA XOSLIGI.....	224
Xolmirzayev Ulug'bek Abdulazizovich, Ubaydullayev Toxirjon Abdullajanovich	



ЦИФРОВЫЕ ИНСТРУМЕНТЫ РЕИНТЕГРАЦИИ ВОЗВРАЩАЮЩИХСЯ ТРУДОВЫХ МИГРАНТОВ: МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ ПРАКТИКА И ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ДЛЯ КЫРГЫЗСТАНА.....	230
<i>Амантурова Дилбара Кыдыкбековна</i>	
РОЛЬ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНО-ОРИЕНТИРОВАННОЙ ЛЕКСИКИ В ЯЗЫКОВОЙ ПОДГОТОВКЕ ИНОСТРАННЫХ СТУДЕНТОВ ТЕХНИЧЕСКОГО ПРОФИЛЯ.....	237
<i>Асрарова М.У.</i>	
О СКОРИНГОВЫХ МЕТОДАХ ЭКСПРЕСС-АНАЛИЗА ДОХОДНОСТИ АКЦИЙ УЗБЕКСКИХ ЭМИТЕНТОВ.....	242
<i>Ирмухамедова Муслима Дилшодовна</i>	
UY-JOY QURILISHIDA ESKROU MEKANIZMLARINI JORIY ETISH ORQALI INVESTITSION XAVFSIZLIK VA MOLIVAVIY SHAFFOFLIKNI TA'MINLASH	247
<i>Karimov Inomjon Ortikbaevich</i>	
YASHIL IQTISODIYOT SHAROITIDA KICHIK BIZNESNING RAQOBATBARDOSHLIGINI OSHIRISH MASALALARI	254
<i>Kamoliddinov Ilhomjon Muxammadjonovich, Kobilov Murod Vakkosovich</i>	
TIJORAT BANKLARI RAQOBATBARDOSHLIGINING MOLIVAVIY BARQARORLIK KO'RSATKICHLARIGA TA'SIRINI BAHOLASH.....	259
<i>Axmedov Toxirjon Xasanjon o'g'li</i>	
SANOAT KORXONALARI IQTISODIY XAVFSIZLIGINI TA'MINLASHDA ENERGETIKA VA ISHLAB CHIQRISH SALOHİYATINING ROLI	264
<i>Tursunxo'jayev Sardor Jamoliddin o'g'li</i>	
TIJORAT BANKLARIDA KOMPLAENS-NAZORAT TIZIMI ORQALI RISKLARNI SAMARALI BOSHQARISH	270
<i>Fayziyev Sherzod Djunaydilloyevich</i>	
СОВЕРШЕНСТВОВАНИЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ БАНКОВСКИМИ РИСКАМИ И СТРАХОВАНИЯ ФИНАНСОВЫХ ОПЕРАЦИЙ В УСЛОВИЯХ РАЗВИТИЯ ДИСТАНЦИОННОГО БАНКИНГА В ХОРЕЗМСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ.....	275
<i>Бахтиёров Худайберган Хамдам угли</i>	
DOIMIY BO'LMAGAN KUCH TA'SIRIDA DEFORMATSIYALANUVCHAN STANDART CHIZIQLI QATTIQ MODEL ISHLAB CHIQRISH VA SONLI TAHLIL QILISH.....	282
<i>Ahmadov Ilhom Aktam o'g'li, Isomova Sabohat Islom qizi</i>	
YOUTH ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS A FACTOR OF STRUCTURAL ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION IN UZBEKISTAN.....	290
<i>Isakjanova Saboxat Muhamedovna</i>	
МОДЕЛИРОВАНИЕ САМОВОЗБУЖДЕНИЕ НЕЯВНОПОЛЮСНОГО СИНХРОННОГО ГЕНЕРАТОРА ПРОДОЛЬНО-ПОПЕРЕЧНОГО ВОЗБУЖДЕНИЯ	298
<i>Пирматов Нурали Бердиёрович, Бекишев Аллаберген Ергашевич, Бердиёров Улугбек Нурали угли, Бердиёров Улмасбек Нурали угли</i>	
YURTIMIZDAGI EKOLOGIK SOF YOG'OCH MATERIALLARIDAN TAYYORLANGAN ORAYOPMA KONSTRUKSIYALARINING CHO'ZILISHGA QARSHILIGI	305
<i>Yunusaliyev Elmurod Muhammadyaqubovich, Toshpulatov Ilhomjon Baxtiyorovich</i>	
AYDAR-ARNASOY KO'LLAR TIZIMINING SHAKLLANISH BOSQICHLARI VA ZAMONAVIY EKOLOGIK MUAMMOLARI	311
<i>Aminov Hamza Husanovich, Madrimov Rajabboy Masharipovich, Xamdullayeva Aziza Baxtiyor qizi</i>	
EXPLAINABLE AI YORDAMIDA SOC UCHUN TUSHUNTIRILADIGAN KIBERXAVF ANIQLASH TIZIMINI ISHLAB CHIQRISH	318
<i>N.N. Jo'rayev, A.Sh. Juraboyev</i>	
QUYOSH FOTOELEKTRIK MODULLARINI SUV YORDAMIDA TOZALASH VA SOVITISH USULLARI TAHLILI	324
<i>Ibragimov Umidjon Hikmatullayevich, Qodirov Jobir Ro'zimatovich, Izomov Shahzod Niyoz o'g'li, To'yurodov Quvonchbek Sherzod o'g'li</i>	



RAQAMLI TEXNOLOGIYALARNING QURILISH SOHASIGA INTEGRATSIYASI: ILG'OR XALQARO TAJRIBA	332
<i>Fayziyeva Gulnoza Abdurahmonovna</i>	
ФАКТОРЫ НАЛОГОВОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ И ИХ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА СОБИРАЕМОСТЬ НАЛОГОВ: СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ И ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ	339
<i>Хакимова Ситора Ильёсжон кизи, Муталова Дилором Махамаджановна</i>	
ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ МЕТОДЫ ЭКСПЕРТНОГО ПРОГНОЗИРОВАНИЯ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЙ В ЦИФРОВОЙ ЭКОНОМИКЕ	345
<i>Л.А. Кадырова, Б. Н. Эгамов</i>	
ЎЗБЕКИСТОН RESPUBLIKASIDA SUG'URTA BOZORINING TUZILISHI TAHLILI	350
<i>G'oziyeva Aziza Abdusalomovna</i>	
MINTAQALARDA INNOVATSION FAOLIYATNI MOLIYALASHTIRISH MANBALARINI DIVERSIFIKATSIYA QILISH MASALALARI	358
<i>Xamrayev Quvvat Iskandarovich</i>	
KONTEYNERLI TASHUVLARNING JORIY HOLATI, MAVJUD MUAMMOLAR VA RIVOJLANTIRISH ISTIQBOLLARI	366
<i>Samatov G'affor Alloqulovich, Xolmatov Bekzod Nurmatovich, Toxirov Maxmudjon Murodjon o'g'li, Absattarov Isomiddin Xotam o'g'li</i>	
KICHIK BIZNES KORXONALARIDA ISHLAB CHIQRISH OMILLARI BO'YICHA NOMUVOFIQLIKNI ANIQLASH VA BARTARAF ETISH MEXANIZMI	381
<i>Kaypnazarova Gulshad Xojamuratovna</i>	
TASHQI SAVDO BALANSINI MUVOZANATLASHTIRISH: NAZARIY VA AMALIY JIHATLAR	386
<i>Rahimov Eshmurod Normurodovich, Misliiddinov Ikromjon Kamoliddin o'g'li</i>	
SIFATLI TIBBIY XIZMAT KO'RSATISH VA AHOLIGA QAMROVNI TA'MINLASHDA BOSHQARUV QARORLARINING AHAMIYATI	391
<i>Satvoldiyev Ulugbek Kamilovich</i>	
SUN'IY INTELLEKT TIZIMLARIDA GIPERPARAMETRLARNI MATEMATIK OPTIMALLASHTIRISH USULLARI	396
<i>Husan Arziqulov Normurod o'g'li</i>	
ENHANCING THE SERVICE SECTOR AS A MEANS OF CREATING EMPLOYMENT IN TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE	401
<i>Zarikeev Rasul Polatovich</i>	
EXPANDING BANK CREDIT OPPORTUNITIES FOR FAMILY-OWNED ENTERPRISES IN UZBEKISTAN	406
<i>Isakov Janabay Yakipbaevich</i>	
BANKS' BROKERAGE AND ADVISORY SERVICES IN FACILITATING SECURITIES TRANSACTIONS AND IMPROVING MARKET LIQUIDITY	412
<i>Isakov Isobek Janabay uli</i>	
АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ РАЗВИТИЯ МЕХАНИЗМОВ ФИНАНСИРОВАНИЯ ВНЕШНЕЙ ТОРГОВЛИ	416
<i>Ибрагимов Мансур Ахметович</i>	
ОПТИМИЗАЦИЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ЛОГИСТИЧЕСКИХ ПРОВАЙДЕРОВ В УСЛОВИЯХ ПОСТРОЕНИЯ НОВЫХ ЦЕПЕЙ ПОСТАВОК	421
<i>Маннапова Феруза Фахриддин кызы</i>	
ЎЗБЕКИСТОН RESPUBLIKASIDA ISLOM MOLIYASINI HUQUQIY TARTIBGA SOLISH VA INSTITUSIONAL ASOSLARINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH MASALALARI	428
<i>Isroilov Obid Olimjonovich</i>	
OZIQ-OVQAT BOZORI KON'YUNKTURASINI BAHOLASHDA KO'P OMILLI REGRESSIYA MODELINING SAMARADORLIGI	433
<i>Abduraxmonov Adxamjon Sultonboyevich</i>	



AHOLI TURMUSH TARZINI YAXSHILASHNING ISTIQBOLLARI.....	438
Djuraeva Didora Sobirjonovna	
ZAMONAVIY MOLIYAVIY INFRATUZILMANING INSTITUSIONAL ASOSLARI: TO'LOV TIZIMLARI NAZARIYASI VA O'ZBEKISTON AMALIYOTI	441
Toshniyozov Sherali Kamoliddinovich	
XIZMAT KO'RSATISH KORXONALARIDA RAQAMLI MENEJMENT VA SUN'IY INTELLEKT ASOSIDA STRATEGIK BOSHQARUVNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH	449
Zayavitdinova Nafisa Muxammadovna	
CORPORATE GOVERNANCE, FDI, AND URBANIZATION IN THE GREEN ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION OF UZBEKISTAN	454
Ablaeva Valentina	
FEMALE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND MICRO-ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	460
Dilafroz Kuchkorova	
LEGIRLANGAN PO'LATLARDAN TAYYORLANGAN PROKATLASH JO'VALARINI CHIDAMLILIGINI OSHIRISH UCHUN TERMIK PUXTALASH TEXNOLOGIYALARINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH.....	466
Saydumarov Botir Muradovich, Berdiyev Darob Murotovich, Tashmatov Ravshan Qobilovich	
SHAMOL TURBINASINING IKKI TOMONLAMA TA'MINLANADIGAN ASINXRON GENERATORI O'TKINCHI JARAYONLARINING TAHLILI	471
Bekishev Allabergen Yergashevich, Kurbonov Najmiddin Abduxamidovich, Yunusov Obidxon Abdivait o'g'li, Jo'rayev Doston Majid o'g'li	
TIJORAT BANKLAR FAOLIYATI SAMARADORLIGINI OSHIRISHGA TA'SIR QILUVCHI OMILLAR TAHLILI.....	479
Babaxanova Dildora Rustamovna	
RAQOBAT USTUNLIGIGA ERISHISHDA ZAMONAVIY MARKETING TEXNOLOGIYALARINI QO'LLASH	485
Meliqulov Abduhalil Norinovich	
JAMOAT AHAMIYATIGA EGA TASHKILOTLAR TOIFASIGA KIRITISH MEZONLARI, ULARNING MOLIYAVIY HISOBOTLARI VA AUDITIGA QO'YILADIGAN TALABLAR.....	490
Shodiyev Murodjon Bakirovich	
EFFICIENCY OF IMPROVING THE IT SERVICES EXPORT	494
Uzakov Ortik Shaymardanovich	
CHORVACHILIKDA ILK VETERINARIYA XIZMATI TARIXI: QADIMGI O'ZBEKISTON MISOLIDA.....	499
Sayfudinova Djamila Badridinovna	
AHOLINI IJTIMOYIY HIMOYALASH TIZIMINI BOSHQARISHGA BAG'ISHLANGAN DASTLABKI ILMIY QARASHLARNING SHAKLLANISHI VA ULARNING TAHLILI	503
Xamroyev Anvar Ashurovich	
AHOLINING MOLIYAVIY SAVODXONLIGINI RIVOJLANTIRISH OMILLARI HAMDA MOLIYAVIY TEXNOLOGIYALARDAN FOYDALANISHNING IQTISODIY AFZALLIKLARI.....	508
A.A.Abdvoxidov	
NODAVLAT OLIY TA'LIM MUASSASALARINING MOLIYAVIY HOLATINI KOMPLEKS BAHOLASH VA IQTISODIY SAMARADORLIGINI TAHLIL QILISH	518
Turmanqulov Norpo'lat Sa'dullayevich	
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FAIRNESS AND EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES IN UZBEKISTAN'S EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: A QUANTITATIVE INVESTIGATION	525
Farida Nishanova	



PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FAIRNESS AND EMPLOYEE OUTCOMES IN UZBEKISTAN'S EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: A QUANTITATIVE INVESTIGATION

Farida Nishanova

Senior Employer Branding and Communications Officer
Westminster International University in Tashkent (WIUT)
Email: faridamavlonova1996@gmail.com

Abstract. Since 2017, Uzbekistan's education sector has expanded rapidly, yet little empirical research has examined how the fairness of performance appraisal (PA) systems affects employee outcomes in educational institutions. Drawing on Organisational Justice Theory and Social Exchange Theory, this study examines the relationship between four dimensions of PA fairness—distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice—and three employee outcomes: job motivation, organisational commitment, and intention to remain. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted among 150 academic and administrative employees from three Tashkent-based institutions: Oxbridge International School, British Council Uzbekistan, and Westminster International University in Tashkent. Data were analysed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM). Results show that procedural justice is the strongest predictor of organisational commitment and intention to remain, while distributive justice most strongly predicts job motivation. Informational justice also significantly influences all three outcomes. The findings contribute to HR management research in Uzbekistan and offer practical recommendations for improving performance appraisal systems in educational institutions.

Keywords: performance appraisal, organisational justice, job motivation, organisational commitment, intention to remain, educational institutions, Uzbekistan, PLS-SEM, HR management, Central Asia.

Annotatsiya. 2017-yildan buyon O'zbekiston ta'lim sektori jadal rivojlanib bormoqda, biroq ta'lim muassasalarida faoliyatni baholash tizimlarining adolatligi xodimlar natijalariga qanday ta'sir ko'rsatishini o'rganuvchi empirik tadqiqotlar yetarli emas. Ushbu tadqiqot tashkiliy adolat nazariyasi va ijtimoiy almashinuv nazariyasiga asoslanib, faoliyatni baholash adolatligining to'rtta o'lchovi — taqsimot adolati, protsessual adolat, shaxslararo adolat va axborot adolati — hamda uchta xodim natijasi: ish motivatsiyasi, tashkiliy sodiqlik va tashkilotda qolish niyati o'rtasidagi bog'liqlikni tahlil qiladi. Miqdoriy kesimiy so'rovnomada Toshkentdagi uchta ta'lim muassasasida — Oxbridge International School, British Council Uzbekistan va Westminster International University in Tashkent — ishlovchi 150 nafar akademik va ma'muriy xodimlar o'rtasida o'tkazildi. Ma'lumotlar PLS-SEM usuli yordamida tahlil qilindi. Natijalar protsessual adolat tashkiliy sodiqlik va tashkilotda qolish niyatining eng kuchli bashoratchisi ekanligini, taqsimot adolati esa ish motivatsiyasining eng muhim omili ekanligini ko'rsatdi. Axborot adolati ham uchala natijaga sezilarli ta'sir ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot O'zbekistonda HR boshqaruvi bo'yicha ilmiy tadqiqotlarga hissa qo'shadi va ta'lim muassasalarida faoliyatni baholash tizimlarini takomillashtirish bo'yicha amaliy tavsiyalar beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: faoliyatni baholash, tashkiliy adolat, ish motivatsiyasi, tashkiliy sodiqlik, tashkilotda qolish niyati, ta'lim muassasalari, O'zbekiston, PLS-SEM, HR boshqaruvi, Markaziy Osiyo.

Аннотация. С 2017 года образовательный сектор Узбекистана демонстрирует стремительный рост, однако эмпирические исследования влияния справедливости систем оценки эффективности работы на результаты сотрудников остаются ограниченными. Опираясь на теорию организационной справедливости и теорию социального обмена, данное исследование анализирует взаимосвязь между четырьмя измерениями справедливости оценки эффективности — распределительной, процедурной, межличностной и информационной — и тремя результатами сотрудников: трудовой мотивацией, организационной приверженностью и намерением продолжать работу в организации. Количественное перекрёстное исследование было проведено среди 150



академических и административных сотрудников трёх образовательных учреждений Ташкента: Oxbridge International School, British Council Uzbekistan и Westminster International University in Tashkent. Для анализа данных применялось моделирование структурными уравнениями методом частичных наименьших квадратов (PLS-SEM). Результаты показывают, что процедурная справедливость является наиболее сильным предиктором организационной приверженности и намерения остаться, тогда как распределительная справедливость сильнее всего влияет на трудовую мотивацию. Информационная справедливость также оказывает значимое влияние на все три показателя. Исследование вносит вклад в развитие исследований HR-менеджмента в Узбекистане и предлагает практические рекомендации по совершенствованию систем оценки эффективности в образовательных учреждениях.

Ключевые слова: оценка эффективности работы, организационная справедливость, трудовая мотивация, организационная приверженность, намерение остаться, образовательные учреждения, Узбекистан, PLS-SEM, HR-менеджмент, Центральная Азия.

INTRODUCTION

The management of employee performance is one of the most consequential — and contested — functions within human resource management (HRM). Performance appraisal (PA), defined as the systematic evaluation of an individual's work behaviours and outcomes relative to established standards and organisational expectations (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017), serves multiple organisational functions simultaneously: it informs compensation decisions, identifies development needs, documents accountability, and — critically — communicates to employees how much the organisation values their contribution. When employees perceive these evaluations as fair, credible, and development-oriented, PA systems can powerfully reinforce motivation, deepen organisational commitment, and encourage talented staff to remain. When PA is perceived as arbitrary, politically influenced, or disconnected from actual performance, the consequences are equally powerful in the opposite direction.

The importance of getting PA right is especially acute for educational institutions, where the quality of faculty and staff is inseparably linked to institutional performance, student outcomes, and organisational reputation. Teachers, academic managers, and administrative professionals who feel their contributions are evaluated fairly and meaningfully are more likely to invest discretionary effort, embrace professional development, and serve as ambassadors for the institution. Conversely, unfair appraisal not only reduces motivation but actively damages trust in leadership — a particularly corrosive outcome in educational environments that depend on collegial collaboration and shared values.

Uzbekistan presents a uniquely compelling and underexplored context for this inquiry. Between 2017 and 2025, the country's educational sector underwent a transformation without modern precedent: higher education enrolment surged from 9% to approximately 42%, 106 new private and transnational universities were established, and over 313 normative legal acts were adopted to govern the sector (Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of Uzbekistan, 2024). International branch campuses, competency-based curricula, and Key Performance Indicator (KPI)-driven staff evaluation systems have been introduced across institutions that, until recently, operated largely on Soviet-era administrative traditions — including the attestatsiya system of periodic collective review and the *otdel kadrov* model of HR as a control function rather than a strategic partner (Ruziev & Burkhanov, 2018).

These overlapping reform agendas have created institutional conditions in which formal performance management systems are being introduced rapidly but often without adequate adaptation to Uzbekistan's cultural context — characterised by high power distance, collectivism, and relational hierarchy (Hofstede, 2001) — or to the specific developmental needs and professional expectations of educational employees. Yet despite the scale of this transformation and its obvious relevance to HR scholarship, no published empirical study has systematically examined how PA fairness perceptions shape employee motivation, commitment, or retention within Uzbekistan's educational institutions.

This study addresses that gap directly. Grounded in Organisational Justice Theory (Colquitt, 2001) and Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), it investigates whether and how four distinct dimensions of PA fairness — distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice — predict job motivation, organisational commitment, and intention to remain among academic and administrative staff at three Tashkent-based educational institutions. The findings contribute the first quantitative evidence base for PA-related HR decisions in Uzbekistan's educational sector, while also testing the cross-cultural transferability of established justice theory in a Central Asian post-Soviet context (Table 1).



Table 1. Research Questions and Objectives

Research Questions	Research Objectives
RQ1: Which dimension(s) of PA fairness are the strongest predictors of employee job motivation in Uzbekistan's educational institutions?	1. Assess employee perceptions of PA fairness across four organisational justice dimensions at OIS, British Council Uzbekistan, and WIUT.
RQ2: How do PA fairness perceptions influence organisational commitment and intention to remain among educational staff?	2. Test the directional relationships between PA fairness dimensions and job motivation, organisational commitment, and intention to remain using PLS-SEM.
RQ3: Does the relationship between PA fairness and employee outcomes differ by employee type (academic vs. administrative)?	3. Examine whether employee type moderates the PA fairness–outcome relationship. Provide evidence-based recommendations for PA system design in Uzbekistan's educational context.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON THE SUBJECT

Performance appraisal is defined by DeNisi and Murphy (2017) as a formal, systematic process through which an organisation evaluates employee job-related behaviours and outcomes against explicit standards, with the dual purpose of administrative decision-making (compensation, promotion, dismissal) and employee development (feedback, coaching, training). Murphy and Cleveland (1995) distinguished between the psychometric quality of PA instruments and the contextual factors — political dynamics, rater motivation, and cultural norms — that determine whether technically sound systems produce fair and useful evaluations in practice. This distinction is critical: a well-designed PA system can function poorly in organisational cultures where supervisors pursue impression management rather than accurate assessment goals.

Bernardin and Beatty (1984) identified rating biases — including halo effect, leniency, central tendency, and recency bias — as persistent threats to PA validity. Thorndike (1920) first identified the halo effect, where a supervisor's global impression of an employee contaminates ratings across specific performance dimensions. Leniency bias — the systematic elevation of ratings to avoid interpersonal conflict — is particularly acute in collectivist, high power-distance cultures (Ng et al., 2011). The cultural profile of Uzbekistan, with its emphasis on group harmony, hierarchical deference, and relational sensitivity, creates structural conditions highly conducive to these biases, making it essential to assess how employees experience the fairness of outcomes rather than simply the technical design of appraisal instruments.

In educational contexts specifically, PA presents distinct methodological challenges. Teaching effectiveness is multidimensional and difficult to quantify, creating risk of excessive reliance on easily measurable proxies such as student satisfaction scores (Popham, 2013). Rasheed, Sarwar, and Aslam (2011) critically assessed PA systems in Pakistani universities and found that outdated Annual Confidential Report formats, untrained raters, and near-total absence of developmental feedback had left appraisal as a bureaucratic formality rather than a meaningful management tool. Halid, Haron, and Ab Malik (2024) confirmed that PA practices in Malaysian higher education institutions significantly predicted employee engagement, reinforcing the practical stakes of PA system quality.

Organisational justice theory, introduced by Greenberg (1987) in the *Academy of Management Review*, provides the foundational theoretical lens for this study. Greenberg defined organisational justice as employees' perceptions of fairness in workplace decisions and procedures. Colquitt (2001), in a landmark validation study in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, operationalised justice across four dimensions: distributive justice (perceived fairness of outcomes — is my appraisal rating proportional to my effort and contribution?); procedural justice (perceived fairness of the processes used to determine outcomes — was the evaluation conducted consistently and without bias?); interpersonal justice (perceived respect and dignity in the treatment received from the appraiser); and informational justice (perceived adequacy of explanations provided for decisions — were the reasons for my appraisal communicated transparently?).

Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng's (2001) meta-analysis across 183 studies established that procedural justice is the strongest predictor of organisational commitment and trust in supervision, while distributive justice most strongly predicts personal outcome satisfaction. Folger and Konovsky (1989) reached similar conclusions in their study of 217 manufacturing employees, showing that procedural justice better predicted organisational trust and commitment while distributive justice better predicted pay satisfaction. McFarlin and Sweeney (1992) replicated these findings with 675 banking employees, establishing the pattern as robust across industries and demographic groups.

Applied specifically to PA, numerous studies have confirmed the justice–outcome chain. Lyu, Su, Qi, and Xiao (2023) used structural equation modelling with 404 Chinese employees in SAGE Open, finding that PA justice significantly predicted job performance ($\beta = 0.478, p < .001$), work engagement ($\beta = 0.512, p < .001$), and organisational identification ($\beta = 0.492, p < .001$). Warokka, Gallato, and Moorthy (2012), studying Malaysian employees, found interactional justice the strongest predictor of PA satisfaction ($\beta = 0.63, p < 0.001$) with $R^2 = 0.70$. Uraon and Kumarasamy (2024) employed PLS-SEM with 503 IT professionals in India, confirming that all four justice dimensions positively predicted job satisfaction, engagement, and intention to stay. Dal Corso, Carluccio, Colledani, Simbula, and Falco (2019) demonstrated in *Frontiers in Psychology* that PA justice fully mediated the relationship between appraisal quality and both teacher job performance and life satisfaction among Italian educators — establishing a particularly relevant educational precedent for the current study.

Blau’s (1964) Social Exchange Theory provides a complementary motivational mechanism explaining how PA fairness translates into discretionary employee behaviours. The theory posits that when organisations treat employees with fairness and respect, employees feel obligated to reciprocate through heightened effort, loyalty, and citizenship behaviour. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) reviewed social exchange theory in *Journal of Management*, arguing that the norm of reciprocity — Gouldner’s (1960) foundational concept — operates as a universal principle guiding workplace relationships. When PA is perceived as fair, employees interpret this as organisational commitment to their interests, generating reciprocal commitment and motivation.

This theoretical logic is empirically supported. Kuvaas (2006) demonstrated with 593 Norwegian bank employees in the *International Journal of Human Resource Management* that PA satisfaction directly predicted affective organisational commitment and inversely predicted turnover intention. Ahuja, Padhy, and Srivastava (2018) confirmed that PA satisfaction predicted normative commitment ($\beta = 0.338, p < 0.001$) among Indian employees. In the educational context, Hermanto and Srimulyani (2022) used structural equation modelling with 820 Indonesian teachers to demonstrate that organisational justice — particularly procedural and interactional dimensions — significantly enhanced both teacher productivity and organisational citizenship behaviour.

Research on PM in post-Soviet and transitional economy educational systems reveals both the persistence of legacy practices and the complexity of implementing Western-origin frameworks in different cultural environments. Cheung, Minbaeva, and Collings (2021), studying performance management transfer from a Finnish MNC to Russian subsidiaries in the *International Journal of Business Studies*, documented ‘institutional bricolage’ — organisations selectively combining elements from Western PM frameworks with Soviet administrative traditions. The resulting hybrid systems often lack procedural consistency and developmental orientation, reducing PA to an accountability ritual rather than a genuine performance-improvement mechanism.

For Uzbekistan specifically, Ruziev and Burkhanov (2018) documented that HEIs inherited the Soviet *otdel kadrov* model — HR as a control and record-keeping function — alongside the *attestatsiya* system of periodic collective review. Salimov (2023) analysed emerging KPI-based personnel quality management strategies in Uzbek HEIs, finding that while result-based payment systems were being introduced, the analytical capabilities and training required to implement them fairly were still underdeveloped. Arfa-Kaboodvand, Birjandi, and Siyyari (2024) developed research-based teacher-appraisal forms for an Uzbek institution, identifying significant gaps between appraisal form design and effective feedback practice.

The convergence of rapid institutional expansion, imported PA frameworks, an embedded Soviet HR heritage, and a high power-distance collectivist culture creates a distinctive context in which standard assumptions about how justice perceptions translate into employee outcomes may not hold uniformly. This study tests those assumptions empirically for the first time in Uzbekistan’s educational sector (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of Key Literature and Identified Research Gap

Author(s) / Year	Key Finding	Method	Relevance
Colquitt et al. (2001)	Procedural justice → commitment; distributive justice → outcome satisfaction (183 studies)	Meta-analysis	Core justice theory foundation
Lyu et al. (2023)	PA justice → job performance ($\beta=0.478$), engagement ($\beta=0.512$)	CB-SEM, n=404	Direct PA–outcome effect sizes
Kuvaas (2006)	PA satisfaction → organisational commitment; → ↓ turnover intention	Survey, n=593	Social exchange mechanism
Warokka et al. (2012)	Interactional justice strongest PA satisfaction predictor ($\beta=0.63, R^2=0.70$)	Regression, n=Malaysian HEI	Educational context benchmark



Author(s) / Year	Key Finding	Method	Relevance
Dal Corso et al. (2019)	PA justice fully mediates appraisal quality → teacher job satisfaction	SEM, Italian teachers	Educational PA–outcome precedent
Halid et al. (2024)	PA practices significantly predict employee engagement in Malaysian HEIs	Quantitative, HEI sample	Closest educational PA study
Rasheed et al. (2011)	Pakistani HEI appraisal: bureaucratic, no developmental feedback	Critical analysis	Educational PA challenge context
Ruziev & Burkhanov (2018)	Uzbek HEIs inherited Soviet HR model; low strategic HRM integration	Documentary analysis	Uzbekistan contextual baseline
Salimov (2023)	KPI-based systems emerging in Uzbek HEIs but implementation weak	Descriptive analysis	Uzbekistan PA practice status

The literature consistently demonstrates that PA fairness strongly predicts positive employee outcomes across diverse educational and organisational contexts. However, no published quantitative study has tested these relationships within Uzbekistan’s educational sector — a gap this study addresses.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a positivist research philosophy, founded on the assumption that social phenomena — including employee perceptions of fairness and their behavioural consequences — can be measured objectively and analysed through statistical methods (Bryman, 2016). A deductive approach is applied: established theoretical propositions from Organisational Justice Theory and Social Exchange Theory are operationalised as testable hypotheses, which are then empirically evaluated against primary survey data. The research design is cross-sectional and quantitative, enabling statistical testing of directional relationships between PA fairness dimensions and employee outcome variables across multiple organisations simultaneously.

The following hypotheses are derived directly from the reviewed literature:

- H1a–H1d: Distributive (H1a), procedural (H1b), interpersonal (H1c), and informational (H1d) justice dimensions each have a statistically significant positive relationship with employee job motivation.
- H2a–H2d: Distributive (H2a), procedural (H2b), interpersonal (H2c), and informational (H2d) justice dimensions each have a statistically significant positive relationship with organisational commitment.
- H3a–H3d: Distributive (H3a), procedural (H3b), interpersonal (H3c), and informational (H3d) justice dimensions each have a statistically significant positive relationship with intention to remain.
- H4: Employee type (academic vs. administrative) moderates the relationship between PA fairness and outcome variables.

The study population comprised academic staff (lecturers, instructors, and researchers) and administrative employees at three Tashkent-based educational institutions: Oxbridge International School (OIS) — a 210-staff private international school operating the International Baccalaureate curriculum; British Council Uzbekistan — delivering language education and professional development programmes; and Westminster International University in Tashkent (WIUT) — an internationally accredited university with programmes validated by the University of Westminster, UK. These institutions were purposively selected to represent varying organisational scales, international affiliations, and levels of formal HR system development within Uzbekistan’s private educational sector.

A stratified random sampling approach was applied, with strata defined by organisation and employee type (academic / administrative). Target quotas of 50 respondents per institution were set. Self-administered structured questionnaires were distributed both in printed form (OIS and British Council Uzbekistan) and digitally via Google Forms (WIUT). After exclusion of incomplete responses, 150 valid questionnaires were retained for analysis (OIS: n=49; British Council: n=51; WIUT: n=50). This exceeds the minimum PLS-SEM sample size requirement of $10 \times$ the maximum number of arrows pointing at any construct (maximum = 4, requiring $n \geq 40$) and satisfies Hair et al.’s (2022) recommendation of $n \geq 100$ for models of this complexity.

The questionnaire comprised four sections. Section 1 collected demographic information (gender, age, employee type, years of service, and organisation). Section 2 measured the four PA fairness dimensions using the validated 20-item scale developed by Colquitt (2001) — 4 items per dimension, rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Section 3 measured job motivation using the 6-item Work Motivation Scale adapted from Kuvaas (2006). Section 4 measured organisational commitment using the 6-item Affective Commitment Scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and intention to remain using the 3-item Retention Intention Scale from Crossley, Bennett, Jex, and Burnfield (2007). All scales were translated into Uzbek and Russian by

bilingual academics and back-translated to English to verify equivalence. A pilot test with 15 employees (5 per institution, not included in final sample) confirmed clarity of item wording.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach’s Alpha (threshold: $\alpha \geq 0.70$; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and Composite Reliability (threshold: $CR \geq 0.70$; Hair et al., 2022). Convergent validity was assessed via Average Variance Extracted ($AVE \geq 0.50$; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Discriminant validity was assessed using the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio (threshold: $HTMT < 0.85$; Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2015).

Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 4.0 (Ringle, Wende, & Becker, 2022) was selected as the primary analytical method, following Hair et al.’s (2022) guidelines. PLS-SEM is appropriate for this study given its exploratory objectives in an understudied context, the moderate sample size, the formative conceptualisation of PA fairness as a higher-order construct, and the established precedent for its use in comparable educational PA studies (Halid et al., 2024; Uzochukwu et al., 2025). Bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples was applied to test the significance of path coefficients (Hayes, 2018). Moderation analysis (H4) was tested using the PLS-SEM interaction term approach (Table 3).

Table 3. Research Hypotheses and Statistical Methods

Hypothesis	Construct Relationship	Analytical Method
H1a–H1d	PA Justice Dimensions → Job Motivation	PLS-SEM path coefficients + bootstrapping
H2a–H2d	PA Justice Dimensions → Organisational Commitment	PLS-SEM path coefficients + bootstrapping
H3a–H3d	PA Justice Dimensions → Intention to Remain	PLS-SEM path coefficients + bootstrapping
H4	Employee Type × PA Justice → Outcomes (moderation)	PLS-SEM interaction term

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Of the 150 respondents, 56.7% were female and 43.3% were male, reflecting the gender composition of the educational sector in Uzbekistan. The dominant age cohort was 26–34 years (50.7%), consistent with the young professional workforce characteristic of Tashkent’s international educational institutions. Academic staff constituted 58.7% of the sample and administrative staff 41.3%. The majority (68.0%) held a Master’s degree or above, and 72.7% were employed on a full-time basis. Tenure distribution showed 36.7% with 1–3 years of service and 26.0% with 3–5 years — suggesting a relatively recent workforce, consistent with the institutions’ expansion trajectories (Table 4).

Table 4. Demographic Profile of Respondents (n = 150)

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	85	56.7%
	Male	65	43.3%
Age	21–25 years	18	12.0%
	26–34 years	76	50.7%
	35–44 years	38	25.3%
	45+ years	18	12.0%
Employee Type	Academic staff	88	58.7%
	Administrative staff	62	41.3%
Education	Bachelor’s degree	42	28.0%
	Master’s degree	82	54.7%
	PhD / Doctoral	26	17.3%
Years of Service	Less than 1 year	16	10.7%
	1–3 years	55	36.7%
	3–5 years	39	26.0%
	More than 5 years	40	26.6%



All constructs demonstrated acceptable internal consistency: Cronbach's Alpha ranged from 0.763 to 0.841, and Composite Reliability from 0.811 to 0.879 — all exceeding the 0.70 threshold (Hair et al., 2022). Average Variance Extracted (AVE) ranged from 0.512 to 0.591, satisfying the Fornell-Larcker (1981) criterion of $AVE > 0.50$ for convergent validity. HTMT ratios for all construct pairs fell below 0.85, confirming discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2015). The measurement model therefore demonstrates adequate reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, warranting structural model evaluation (Table 5).

Table 5. Measurement Model Assessment Results

Construct	Cronbach's α	Composite Reliability	AVE	Validity
Distributive Justice	0.801	0.848	0.531	Acceptable
Procedural Justice	0.818	0.864	0.562	Acceptable
Interpersonal Justice	0.763	0.811	0.512	Acceptable
Informational Justice	0.829	0.871	0.578	Acceptable
Job Motivation	0.841	0.879	0.591	Acceptable
Organisational Commitment	0.814	0.858	0.549	Acceptable
Intention to Remain	0.797	0.842	0.537	Acceptable

Descriptive analysis revealed moderately favourable PA fairness perceptions overall, with mean scores ranging from 3.14 to 3.71 on the 5-point scale. Interpersonal justice received the highest mean rating ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.74$), indicating that employees generally feel treated with respect by their appraisers. Informational justice received the lowest mean ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 0.91$), reflecting significant dissatisfaction with the quality and adequacy of explanations provided for appraisal decisions. Procedural justice ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.83$) and distributive justice ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.87$) received intermediate ratings. This pattern suggests that Uzbek educational institutions maintain acceptable interpersonal conduct during appraisals but fail to adequately explain the criteria, reasoning, and rationale behind evaluation outcomes — a finding with important implications for PA system redesign.

Among the outcome variables, job motivation ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 0.79$) was rated most favourably, followed by intention to remain ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.88$) and organisational commitment ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.82$). Academic staff reported higher mean scores than administrative staff on all three outcome dimensions, with the largest gap in organisational commitment (Academic $M = 3.61$ vs. Administrative $M = 3.17$), suggesting that administrative employees may be a priority group for PA system improvement efforts.

The PLS-SEM structural model for job motivation was statistically significant and explained 41.3% of variance ($R^2 = 0.413$). Distributive justice was the strongest predictor of job motivation ($\beta = 0.374$, $t = 5.21$, $p < 0.001$), followed by informational justice ($\beta = 0.298$, $t = 4.07$, $p < 0.001$), procedural justice ($\beta = 0.241$, $t = 3.18$, $p = 0.002$), and interpersonal justice ($\beta = 0.187$, $t = 2.54$, $p = 0.011$). All four H1 hypotheses are accepted. The dominance of distributive justice — the perceived fairness of appraisal outcomes relative to effort and performance — over procedural considerations in predicting motivation suggests that employees in this context are strongly outcome-oriented in their assessment of appraisal fairness.

The model explained 44.8% of variance in organisational commitment ($R^2 = 0.448$). Procedural justice emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.421$, $t = 6.14$, $p < 0.001$), followed by informational justice ($\beta = 0.312$, $t = 4.38$, $p < 0.001$), interpersonal justice ($\beta = 0.254$, $t = 3.47$, $p = 0.001$), and distributive justice ($\beta = 0.198$, $t = 2.71$, $p = 0.007$). All four H2 hypotheses are accepted. This pattern — with procedural justice as the dominant predictor of commitment — aligns closely with Colquitt et al.'s (2001) meta-analytic findings and replicates the pattern documented by Folger and Konovsky (1989) in an educational employer context for the first time in Uzbekistan.

The structural model explained 38.7% of variance in intention to remain ($R^2 = 0.387$). Procedural justice was again the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.389$, $t = 5.62$, $p < 0.001$), followed by distributive justice ($\beta = 0.287$, $t = 3.94$, $p < 0.001$), informational justice ($\beta = 0.241$, $t = 3.29$, $p = 0.001$), and interpersonal justice ($\beta = 0.163$, $t = 2.19$, $p = 0.029$). All four H3 hypotheses are accepted. The relatively stronger role of distributive justice in predicting retention (compared to commitment) may reflect the practical consideration that employees are more likely to remain when they believe pay, recognition, and rating outcomes are commensurate with their contributions — a dimension of fairness with direct material consequences (Table 6).

Table 6. PLS-SEM Structural Model Results — Path Coefficients (n = 150)

Hypothesis	Justice Dimension → Outcome	β	t-value	p-value	Decision
H1a	Distributive → Job Motivation	0.374	5.21	< 0.001	Accepted
H1b	Procedural → Job Motivation	0.241	3.18	0.002	Accepted
H1c	Interpersonal → Job Motivation	0.187	2.54	0.011	Accepted
H1d	Informational → Job Motivation	0.298	4.07	< 0.001	Accepted
H2a	Distributive → Org. Commitment	0.198	2.71	0.007	Accepted
H2b	Procedural → Org. Commitment	0.421	6.14	< 0.001	Accepted
H2c	Interpersonal → Org. Commitment	0.254	3.47	0.001	Accepted
H2d	Informational → Org. Commitment	0.312	4.38	< 0.001	Accepted
H3a	Distributive → Intention to Remain	0.287	3.94	< 0.001	Accepted
H3b	Procedural → Intention to Remain	0.389	5.62	< 0.001	Accepted
H3c	Interpersonal → Intention to Remain	0.163	2.19	0.029	Accepted
H3d	Informational → Intention to Remain	0.241	3.29	0.001	Accepted

The moderation analysis tested whether employee type (academic vs. administrative) significantly moderated the relationships between PA justice dimensions and outcome variables. Results revealed a significant moderation effect for the procedural justice → organisational commitment path (β interaction = -0.189 , $t = 2.74$, $p = 0.006$), indicating that academic staff show a stronger positive commitment response to procedural fairness than administrative staff. No significant moderation was found for other justice–outcome paths (all $p > 0.05$). H4 is therefore partially supported: employee type moderates the procedural justice–commitment relationship specifically. This finding underscores the importance of differentiated PA approaches for academic and administrative employee groups — a practical implication discussed in the recommendations section.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This study provides the first quantitative empirical investigation of the relationships between performance appraisal fairness and employee outcomes in Uzbekistan’s educational sector. Drawing on Organisational Justice Theory and Social Exchange Theory, and applying PLS-SEM analysis with 150 respondents across three Tashkent-based educational institutions, the study produces five substantive conclusions:

- All four dimensions of PA fairness — distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice — are statistically significant positive predictors of job motivation, organisational commitment, and intention to remain in the Uzbek educational context. All twelve directional hypotheses (H1a–H3d) are accepted, confirming the cross-cultural validity of Organisational Justice Theory in this Central Asian post-Soviet setting.
- Procedural justice is the dominant driver of organisational commitment ($\beta = 0.421$) and intention to remain ($\beta = 0.389$), replicating Colquitt et al.’s (2001) meta-analytic pattern and extending it to Uzbekistan’s educational institutions for the first time. Employees who perceive that appraisal processes are conducted consistently, without bias, and with opportunity for voice commit more strongly to their organisations and are more likely to remain.
- Distributive justice is the strongest predictor of job motivation ($\beta = 0.374$), reflecting the centrality of outcome equity — perceived fairness of ratings, recognition, and rewards relative to contribution — in driving discretionary work effort among educational staff in Uzbekistan’s rapidly evolving, KPI-oriented institutional environment.
- Informational justice — the perceived quality and adequacy of explanations for appraisal decisions — is significantly and substantially underperforming relative to interpersonal justice ($M = 3.14$ vs. $M = 3.71$). Yet its path coefficients for commitment ($\beta = 0.312$) and motivation ($\beta = 0.298$) are among the strongest in the model, making it both the largest satisfaction gap and the highest-leverage improvement opportunity for HR practitioners.
- Academic staff show a significantly stronger commitment response to procedural justice than administrative staff, suggesting that PA system design should be differentiated by employee type, with academic staff PA processes placing particular emphasis on consistency, transparency, and opportunity for input.



Based on the empirical findings, the following evidence-based recommendations are offered to HR managers, academic leaders, and institutional governance bodies of educational organisations in Uzbekistan:

- Redesign PA processes around procedural fairness standards. Given the primacy of procedural justice in predicting commitment and retention, institutions should establish formal appraisal protocols that guarantee: consistent application of criteria across all employees; opportunity for employees to present evidence of their performance before ratings are finalised; a formal appeal or clarification mechanism; and documented appraisal timelines known to all staff in advance.

- Prioritise informational justice through structured feedback conversations. The informational justice gap ($M = 3.14$) is the single largest actionable finding of this study. Institutions should mandate structured post-appraisal feedback conversations in which managers provide written and verbal explanations for all rating decisions, referencing specific performance evidence. Supervisor training in evidence-based feedback delivery — using frameworks such as the Situation-Behaviour-Impact (SBI) model — should be incorporated into annual professional development programmes.

- Align distributive justice with transparent, merit-based reward mechanisms. To maximise motivational impact, appraisal outcomes — particularly ratings linked to salary increments, bonuses, or promotion — should be visibly anchored to objective performance criteria communicated in advance. Institutions should publish salary band progressions, performance-rating thresholds, and the criteria linking appraisal scores to material rewards, reducing the perceived arbitrariness that currently dampens motivation.

- Develop differentiated PA frameworks for academic and administrative staff. The significant moderation effect of employee type on the procedural justice–commitment relationship indicates that a single PA system applied uniformly to both groups is suboptimal. Academic PA should emphasise research output, teaching quality, and scholarship contribution within a collegially developed framework. Administrative PA should emphasise service quality, process improvement, and stakeholder satisfaction, with appropriate Key Performance Indicators co-developed with staff.

- Invest in appraiser training to mitigate cultural bias risks. Given Uzbekistan's high power-distance, collectivist cultural profile — which predisposes appraisers to leniency bias and outcome inflation to avoid interpersonal conflict — institutions should implement Frame of Reference (FOR) training for all appraisers, calibration sessions to align rating standards, and 360-degree feedback elements to provide multiple evaluative perspectives and reduce single-source bias.

Several limitations of this study warrant acknowledgement. The convenience-stratified sample drawn from three Tashkent-based institutions limits generalisability to the broader Uzbek educational sector and to public institutions, which operate under distinctly different governance and HR frameworks. The cross-sectional design prevents causal inference about how changes in PA fairness practices produce changes in employee outcomes over time. Common method variance, inherent in self-reported survey data, may inflate observed relationships between perceptions and self-reported behavioural intentions.

Future research should employ probability sampling across a wider range of public and private educational institutions, incorporate multiple data sources (e.g., HR analytics, supervisor ratings, organisational performance metrics), and utilise longitudinal or experimental designs to establish causal directionality. Comparative studies between Uzbekistan and other Central Asian economies — Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan — would enrich the regional evidence base and identify whether the observed justice–outcome patterns are specific to Uzbekistan's institutional context or characteristic of the broader post-Soviet educational region.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Ahuja, A., Padhy, P. L., & Srivastava, S. (2018). Effect of performance appraisal satisfaction on employee commitment. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 53(4), 618–631.
2. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18.
3. Arfa-Kaboodvand, N., Birjandi, P., & Siyyari, M. (2024). Designing research-based teacher-appraisal forms: A case of effective EAP lecturers in Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Language Education*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v8i2.23467>
4. Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). *Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work*. Kent Publishing.
5. Bernardin, H. J., & Pence, E. C. (1980). Effects of rater training: Creating new response sets and decreasing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(1), 60–66.
6. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.
7. Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
8. Cheung, F., Minbaeva, D., & Collings, D. (2021). 'We have performance appraisal every day and every hour': Transferring performance management to Russia. *International Business Studies*. ScienceDirect.
9. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
10. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.

11. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445.
12. Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900.
13. Crossley, C. D., Bennett, R. J., Jex, S. M., & Burnfield, J. L. (2007). Development of a global measure of job embeddedness and integration into a traditional model of voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1031–1042.
14. Dal Corso, L., Carluccio, F., Colledani, D., Simbula, S., & Falco, A. (2019). An opportunity to grow or a label? Performance appraisal justice and performance appraisal satisfaction to increase teachers' well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 2361.
15. DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421–433.
16. DeNisi, A. S., & Pritchard, R. D. (2006). Performance appraisal, performance management and improving individual performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 2(2), 253–277.
17. Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115–130.
18. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
19. Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22.
20. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
21. Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.
22. Halid, H., Haron, H., & Ab Malik, R. (2024). The influence of performance appraisal practices on employee engagement at higher education institutions of Malaysia. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2442093>
23. Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
24. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135.
25. Hermanto, Y. B., & Srimulyani, V. A. (2022). The effects of organizational justice on employee performance through organizational commitment mediation and organizational citizenship behavior. *Sustainability*, 14(13), Article 8179.
26. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
27. Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: Mediating and moderating roles of work motivation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 504–522.
28. Lyu, B., Su, W., Qi, Q., & Xiao, F. (2023). The influence of performance appraisal justice on employee job performance: A dual path model. *SAGE Open*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231194513>
29. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626–637.
30. Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of Uzbekistan. (2024). *Annual report on higher education sector development*. Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation.
31. Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. SAGE Publications.
32. Ng, K. Y., Koh, C., Ang, S., Kennedy, J. C., & Chan, K. Y. (2011). Rating leniency and halo in multisource feedback ratings: Testing cultural assumptions of power distance and individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(5), 1033–1044.
33. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
34. Popham, W. J. (2013). *Evaluating America's teachers: Mission possible?* Corwin Press.
35. Rasheed, M. I., Sarwar, S., & Aslam, H. D. (2011). A critical analysis of performance appraisal system for teachers in public sector universities of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(23), 9897–9904.
36. Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J. M. (2022). *SmartPLS 4*. SmartPLS GmbH. <http://www.smartpls.com>
37. Ruziev, K., & Burkhanov, U. (2018). Uzbekistan: Higher education reforms and the changing landscape since independence. In H. de Wit et al. (Eds.), *25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries*. Palgrave Macmillan.
38. Salimov, F. (2023). Modern strategies of ensuring and management of personnel quality level in higher education institutions in Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Pedagogics*, 3(9), 26–36.
39. Thorndike, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 25–29.
40. Uraon, R. S., & Kumarasamy, M. (2024). The impact of justice perceptions of performance appraisal practices on job satisfaction and intention to stay: The mediating role of job engagement. *Employee Relations*, 46(2). <https://doi.org/10.1108/er-07-2022-0328>
41. Uzochukwu, C. E., Mohammed, I., & Asare, S. S. (2025). Mediating effect of appraisal fairness between the relationship of appraisal satisfaction and employee performance. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2450297>
42. Warokka, A., Gallato, C. G., & Moorthy, T. (2012). Organizational justice in performance appraisal system and work performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2012.159467>

muhandislik **& iqtisodiyot**

ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy, innovatsion texnik,
fan va ta'limga oid ilmiy-amaliy jurnal

Ingliz tili muharriri: Feruz Hakimov

Musahhih: Zokir Alibekov

Sahifalovchi va dizayner: Abdurahmon Qurbonov

2026. № 3

© Materiallar ko'chirib bosilganda "Muhandislik va iqtisodiyot" jurnali manba sifatida ko'rsatilishi shart. Jurnalda bosilgan material va reklamalardagi dalillarning aniqligiga mualliflar ma'sul. Tahririyat fikri har vaqt ham mualliflar fikriga mos kelmasligi mumkin. Tahririyatga yuborilgan materiallar qaytarilmaydi.

"Muhandislik va iqtisodiyot" jurnali 26.06.2023-yildan
O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Adminstratsiyasi huzuridagi
Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan
№S-5669245 reyestr raqami tartibi bo'yicha ro'yxatdan o'tkazilgan.

Litsenziya raqami: №095310.

**Manzilimiz: Toshkent shahri Yunusobod
tumani 15-mavze 19-uy**





+998 93 718 40 07



<https://muhandislik-iqtisodiyot.uz/index.php/journal>



t.me/yait_2100