

# Effect of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance in Public Health Facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya.

Dome Rogers<sup>1</sup>

Christopher Kuloba

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding Author

P O Box 10066, postal code 30100, Eldoret, Kenya

---

## Abstract

Employees' dissatisfaction with their organizational justice engenders organizational toxicity and poor performance. Issues of fairness at work should be key to all employers. In this regard this study was designed to assess the effect of procedural, distributive and interactional justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya. In a bid to effectively achieve these objectives, the study adopted a descriptive survey design based on samples drawn from 10 public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County. The target population was 332. A two-stage sampling technique was adopted where cluster random sampling was used to select the public health facilities after which simple random sampling was used to select respondents within the facilities. The study used Krejcie & Morgan table, (1970) to determine a sample of 181 respondents. Data was analyzed by use of inferential statistics. To check on validity a pilot was done on 3 health facilities prior to the actual study. Cronbach's alpha values were used to check on reliability of instruments; values > 0.7 was accepted. Results from multiple regressions revealed that organizational justice dimensions jointly and independently influenced employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya. Jointly the three constructs of organizational justice explained 68.5 % ( $R^2 = 0.685$ ) variation in employee performance. The regression coefficients indicated procedural justice ( $\beta = .592, t = 6.943, P < 0.05$ ), interactional Justice ( $\beta = .074, t = 1.122, P < 0.05$ ) and distributive justice ( $\beta = .244, t = 3.313, P < 0.05$ ) which were statistically significant. Management of public health facilities need therefore to be strategic in formulating and implementing policies geared towards enhancing organizational justice so as to galvanize employee motivation and performance. The human resource practices adopted should be bundled through mutually consistent policies to enhance synergy in achieving organizational justice and high employee performance.

**Key Words:** Employee Performance, Procedural, Distributive and Interactional justice

---

Date of Submission: 20-12-2021

Date of Acceptance: 04-01-2022

---

## I. Introduction

Organizational justice (OJ) deals with how employees perceive the extent of fairness or unfairness at their work places (Greenberg, (1990); Colquitt & Greenberg, (2003); Colquitt, Greenberg & Zapata-Phelan, (2005); Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland (2007)). Organizational justice is seen as how organizations behaves towards its workers as they work in and out it (Rahman, Haque, Elahi & Miah, 2015). When employees perceive organizational actions and practices as fair and honest, they will show more extra-role behavior, which is beneficial to the development of organizations (Demirkiran, Taskaya and Dinc, 2016). Rather than respond to perception of unfair treatment with a range of negative behavioral responses (e.g., theft, withdrawal, resistance, vandalism, sabotage, and reduction of positive behavior (Lilly, 2017). OJ has been notably conceptualized as made up of 3 aspects namely; procedural justice, interactional justice and lastly distributive justice. Procedural justice highlights a fairness and opens in the decision making procedures in the organization, distributive justice signifies organizational impartiality in offers to employees (in such areas as pay, promotion, performance evaluations, job tenure e.t.c ) (Moorman, 1991). Lastly interactional justice which highlights a fairness in inter personal treatment during organizational decisions and procedures.

Employee performance on the other hand highlights the extent to which an individual completes the duties that are required for a given position, which they assume within an organization. It describes an aptitude and avidity to carry out tasks. 'Aptitude' alludes to the attributes or abilities that an employee must possess to be able to do a certain job including knowledge and skill. 'Avidity' hints at the motivation an employee needs in performing his/her job. (Dome, Kemboi & Kapkia, 2017). Over time employee perception of justice has

determined the nature and quality of relationship with the organization (Swalhi et al., 2017). When employees perceive fair treatment from the organization and its authorities, they may feel a sense of obligation to create a good act in return (Ghosh, Sekiguchi, & Gurunathan, 2017). Evidence on the profound contribution of OJ on employee behaviour and attitude can never be emphasized enough; studies have linked OJ to employee commitment (Karanja 2016; Gichira, Were & Orwa 2016) while others have sought out its effects on turnover intentions (Chelangat, Were & Odhiambo, 2018) and others have linked it to employee engagement (Mutero 2017). Better still others have incorporated it (OJ) to enrich effect-cause relationships (Kimwolo & Kimosop, 2017). Notwithstanding discourse on OJ is still limited specifically for the Kenyan cases; Muchemi (2019) in a study evaluates the effects of OJ on perceived organizational performance but for high end restaurant employees. It is therefore evident that empirical research on the effects of OJ on employee performance is still limited more so for public healthcare workers in Kenya

### **Statement of the Problem**

How organizations treat employees is of crucial importance. Uasin Gishu County like any other employer is on the forefront of taking good care of its employees. Through the Human Resource for Health Strategic Plan, the county has been striving to address health workers' issues of reward, motivation, capacity building, appraisal, and welfare amongst others (Uasin Gishu County Health Strategic Plan 2013-2018). However such efforts need to be fair and open for those it means to benefit. If not affected employees end up demoralized, feel discriminated against; eventually affecting their performance which in turn makes patients lose trust in government facilities. These altogether invoked the need for scientific knowledge to ascertain if perhaps there is a significant effect of organizational justice on employee performance in the public health facilities in Kenya an attempt to fill existing gaps in literature

#### **1.1. Research Objectives**

- i. To examine the effect of procedural justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya.
- ii. To analyze the effect of distributive justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya.
- iii. To investigate the effect of interactional justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub- County, Kenya.

#### **1.2. Research Hypothesis**

**H<sub>01</sub>** Procedural justice has no significant effect on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya

**H<sub>02</sub>** Distributive justice has no significant effect on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya

**H<sub>03</sub>** Interactional justice has no significant effect on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya

## **II. Materials And Methods**

### **2.1. Design**

The study adopted descriptive survey research targeting 10 public health facilities with 181 respondents. Data for this study was collected from clinical and non-clinical staff. Clinical staff were those concerned directly with medical treatment or patient care, while non-clinical were those not directly involved with such responsibility. Data was collected through surveys that were administered to respondents. From a sample of 181, 127 questionnaires were returned which translated to about 70% response rate.

### **2.2. Sampling Technique and Sample Size**

A two stage sampling technique was used first to cluster the 10 public health facilities thereafter random samples within these groups were selected. The size of each group was determined through proportional allocation. A sample of 181 respondents was then determined using the Krejcie & Morgan table (1970). The sample proportions from each public health facility were determined using the formula below (Table 3.1)

$$n_i = (N_i \times n)/N$$



Besides R squared we also used ANOVA to check how well the regression model fits the data. Looking at the regression row, the significant value is less than the confidence levels for prediction hence the model statistically and significantly predicts employee performance. Results Table 3.2 indicated by the model shows model is a good fit of the data. Hence, procedural justice was significant in predicting employee performance

**Table 3.2 ANOVA results for the relationship between procedural justice and employee performance**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	21.362	1	21.362	217.393	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	11.399	116	.098		
	Total	32.761	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance  
 b. Predictors: (Constant) procedural justice.

**3. 1.1.1 Regression Coefficients for the effect of procedural justice on employee performance**

After checking the model fit, the study sought to determine the importance of the independent variable in predicting the dependent variable thus the coefficients were employed. The regression coefficient (Table 3.3) of the effect of PJ on employee performance reveal ( $\beta = .808$ ,  $t = 14.744$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). The t statistics and a corresponding p value were used to help determine the relative importance of procedural justice in the model. As a guide regarding useful predictors, the researcher looked for t values well below -2 or above +2. Hence these results led to the rejection of the hypothesis H0:1 and therefore conclude that procedural justice had a significant effect on employee performance for healthcare workers.  $\beta = 0.808$  implying that an increase of 1 standard deviation in procedural justice is likely to result in a 0.808 standard deviations increase in employee performance.

**Table 3.3: Regression Coefficients for the relationship between procedural justice and employee performance**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	1.294	.209		6.203	.000		
Procedural Justice	.728	.049	.808	14.744	.000	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: employee performance

**3.1.2. Effects of interactional justice on employee performance**

Results for the effect of interactional justice in predicting employee performance as presented in Table 3.4 reveals that interactional justice (IJ) explained 27.2 % ( $R^2 = .272$ ) of the variance in employee performance. Although the values of R squared range from 0 to 1. Small values indicate that the model does not fit the data well. While R-square tends to overestimate the variance hence the adjusted R-square adjusts for a bias in R-square. This adjusted value for R-square will be equal or smaller than the regular R-square.

**Table 3.4: Goodness of Fit Model Summary for the relationship between interactional justice and employee performance**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change in R Square	Durbin-Watson
1	.522 <sup>a</sup>	.272	.266	.453	.272	1.335

a. Predictors: (Constant), Interactional justice  
 b. Dependent Variable: employee performance

Looking at the regression row (table 3.5), the significant value is less than the confidence levels for prediction hence the model statistically and significantly predicts e

**Table 3.5 ANOVA results for the relationship between interactional justice and employee performance**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.912	1	8.912	43.348	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	23.849	116	.206		
	Total	32.761	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

b. Predictors: (Constant) interactional justice.

**3.1.2.1. Regression Coefficients for the effect of interactional justice on employee performance**

Results reveal standardized regression coefficient for interactional justice as  $\beta=0.522$ , implying that an increase of 1 standard deviation in interactional justice is likely to result in a 0.522 standard deviations increase in employee performance. ( $\beta = .522$ ,  $t = 6.584$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) also meant that interactional justice was also an important predictor of employee performance for healthcare workers in turbo sub-county health facilities

**Table 3.6: Regression Coefficients for the effect of interactional justice on employee performance**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2.415	.295		8.181	.000		
Interactional justice	.479	.073	.522	6.584	.000	1.000	1.000

b. Dependent Variable: employee performance

**3.1.3 Effects of Distributive justice on Employee Performance**

The regression model summary results between distributive justice and employee performance indicate that distributive justice (DJ) accounts for 47.1 % ( $R^2 = .471$ ) table 3.7 with the remainder 52.9 % explained by other factors other than distributive justice. Adjustment of the R square did not change the results substantially, having reduced the explanatory behavior of the predictor to 46.6%.

**Table 3.7: Model Summary effect of distributive justice on employee performance**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.686 <sup>a</sup>	.471	.466	.387	1.595

a. Predictors: (Constant), distributive justice

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Looking at the regression row (table 3.8), the significant value is less than the confidence levels for prediction hence the model statistically and significantly predicts employee performance. This shows that the model was valid.

**Table 3.8 ANOVA results for the effect of distributive justice on employee performance**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15.424	1	15.424	103.198	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	17.523	116	.149		
	Total	44.412	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), distributive justice

**3.1.3.1 Regression Coefficients for the effect of distributive justice on employee performance**

Results of the regression coefficients presented in Table 3.9 give the  $\beta$  value which tells us about the relationship between employee performances and distributive justice. The positive  $\beta$  value (.686) indicates a positive relationship between the two constructs. From the results we conclude that an increase of 1 standard deviation in distributive justice is likely to result in a 0. 0.686 standard deviations increase in employee performance.

**Table 3.9: Regression Coefficients for the effect of distributive justice on employee performance**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	2.408	.193		12.452	.000		
Distributive justice	.494	.049	.686	10.159	.000	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

**3.1.4 Effects of organizational justice on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya.**

Results presented in Table 3.10 reveal that the three constructs (distributive justice, interactional justice and procedural justice explained 68.5 % ( $R^2 = 0.685$ ) of the variation in employee performance. The remaining 31.5% variation in performance is therefore explained by other factors not considered in the study. R indicating a strong relationship between organizational justice (distributive, interactional and procedural justice collectively) and employee performance, the larger the value the stronger the relationship ( $R = .827$ )

**Table 3.10 Model Summary for the effect of organizational justice on the effect of employee performance**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	RStd. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Durbin Watson
1	.827 <sup>a</sup>	.685	.676	.301	.685	1.604

Predictors: (constant), Procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice

Dependent Variable: Employee performance.

ANOVA was then checked to determine how well the regression model fits the data. Results shown in Table 3.11 reveal that the significant value is less than the confidence levels for prediction hence the model statistically and significantly predicts employee performance.

**Table 3.11: ANOVA results for the relationship between organizational justice and employee performance**

Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
22.427	3	7.476	82.475	.000 <sup>a</sup>
10.333	114	.091		
32.761	117			

a. Predictors: (Constant) Procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice

b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

**3.1.4.1 Regression Coefficients for the effect of organizational justice (procedural, interactional & distributive justice) on employee performance**

Results of the regression coefficients presented in Table 3.12 shows that the estimates of  $\beta$  values and give an individual contribution of each predictor jointly to the model. The  $\beta$  value tells us about the relationship between employee performances with each predictor. The positive  $\beta$  values indicate the positive relationship between the predictors and the outcome. The regression coefficients from the results are given as procedural justice ( $\beta = .592, t = 6.943, P < 0.05$ ), interactional Justice ( $\beta = .074, t = 1.122, P < 0.05$ ) and distributive justice ( $\beta = .244, t = 3.313, P < 0.05$ ) which were statistically significant, the t statistics and a corresponding p value were used to help determine the relative importance of each variable in the model. As a guide regarding useful predictors, the researcher looked for t values well below -2 or above +2.

The results above contradicts those posted by Baba & Ghazali (2017) that procedural and distributive justice were positively related to employee motivation while interactional justice has no relation to employee motivation.. From the table 3.12, results indicates the amount of change one would expect in employee performance given a one-unit change in the value of that variable, given that all the variables in the model are standardized basing on the standardized coefficients. Results reveal standardized regression coefficient for procedural justice  $\beta=.592$  implying that an increase of 1 standard deviation in procedural justice is likely to result in a 0.592 standard deviations increase in employee performance. Standardized regression coefficient for interactional justice  $\beta= .074$ , implies that an increase of 1 standard deviation in interactional justice is likely to result in a 0.074 standard deviations increase in employee performance. Standardized regression coefficient for  $\beta=.244$  implies that an increase of 1 standard deviation in distributive justice is likely to result in a 0.244 standard deviations increase in employee performance.

**Table 3.12: Coefficients of regression for the effect of organizational justice on employee performance**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	1.144	.222		5.153	.000		
Procedural Justice	.534	.077	.592	6.943	.000	.380	2.632
Interactional Justice	.068	.061	.074	1.122	.000	.637	1.571
Distributive Justice	.176	.053	.244	3.313	.000	.509	1.965

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

These findings indicate that procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice as predictors, which significantly affect employee performance in public health facilities. The results led to the rejection of the hypothesis H0:1, H0:2 & H0:3 and therefore it was safe to conclude that organizational justice affects employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, both individually and at collective level.

**Table 3.13 Summary of Results for Hypotheses Testing**

Hypothesis	Description	P	Decision
H <sub>01</sub>	Procedural justice has no significant effect on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya	.000	ACCEPT null hypothesis
H <sub>02</sub>	Distributive justice has no significant effect on employee performance in public health facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya	.000	ACCEPT null hypothesis
H <sub>03</sub>	Interactional justice has no significant effect on employee performance in public	.000	ACCEPT null hypothesis

**V. Conclusion**

From the findings this study submits the following conclusions: Organizational justice constitutes 3 concepts each of which plays a significant role in determining employee performance. That the three constructs (distributive justice, interactional justice and procedural justice) both individually and collectively affect healthcare worker performance. As such Uasin Gishu County through its health department needs to re-evaluate justice to a strategic level of priority and further facilitate a systematic adoption of fairness policy at all levels of employee engagement.

### Reference

- [1]. Chelangat, C. E., Were, S., & Odhiambo, R., (2018), Effect of Perceived Organizational Justice on Turnover Intentions in the Banking Sector in Nairobi City County in Kenya, *Journal of Public Policy & Governance* Vol 2(1) pp. 1-20
- [2]. Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. 1986. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), 43-55.
- [3]. Mohamed, A. S (2014). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Quality Performance among Healthcare Workers: A Pilot Study. *The Scientific World Journal* Hindawi Publishing Corporation <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/757425>
- [4]. Rahman M, Haque M, Elahi F, Miah W. (2015) Impact of Organizational Justice on Employee Job Satisfaction : An Empirical Investigation. *American Journal of Business Management* 4(4): 162–171. <http://doi.org/10.11634/216796061504714>
- [5]. Muchemi M (2019) Effects of Organization Justice on Perceived Organization Performance in the high-end dining industry in Kenya MBA thesis
- [6]. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48.
- [7]. Kimwolo, K. A & Kimosop, J (2017) The moderating effect of distributive perceived organizational justice on the relationship between flexibility I-deals and innovative work behavior among tied life insurance agents in Kenya *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management* Vol. V, Issue 10, ISSN 2348 0386
- [8]. P. M. Gichira, S. M. Were, and G. O. Orwa, (2016) "Relationship between Perceptions of distributive justice and employee commitment in health sector non-governmental organizations in Kenya". *European Journal of Human Resource*, vol. 1, issue 1, pp. 1-25.
- [9]. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.). *The handbook of organizational justice* (pp 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [10]. Karanja, W. G. (2016) Effect of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment in Public Secondary Schools and Commercial Banks in Kenya. PhD thesis
- [11]. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 76:845.
- [12]. Demirkiran, M., Taskaya, S., and Dinc, M. (2016). A study on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior in Hospitals. *Int. Journal of Bus. Mngt. Econ. Res.* 7, 547–554.
- [13]. Baba, A & B. Ghazali, B. S (2017) Influence of Organizational Justice on Motivation of Public Sector Employees in Nigeria: An Empirical Investigation *International Journal of Management Research & Review* Vol 7/Issue 9/Article No-5/913-925
- [14]. Dome, R., Ambrose K & Moses. K. K. (2017) Moderating Effect of Employee Training on the Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Employee Performance among Insurance Firms in Eldoret, Kenya *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* Volume 22, Issue 11, Ver. 6 PP 53-59 e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
- [15]. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.). *The handbook of organizational justice*
- [16]. Colquitt, J. A., & Greenberg, J. (2003). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. *Organizational behavior: The state of the science*, 159-200.
- [17]. Mutero, W. D (2017) the influence of organizational justice on employee engagement in energy solution providers in Kenya: a case study of premier gas company limited. Master's Thesis
- [18]. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- [19]. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.
- [20]. Cojuharenco, I., & Patient, D. (2013). Workplace fairness versus unfairness: Examining the differential salience of facets of organizational justice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 86, 371–393.
- [21]. Cooper, C. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2008). *Business research methods (10 ed.)*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- [22]. Ghosh, D., Sekiguchi, T., & Gurunathan, L. (2017). Organizational embeddedness as a mediator between justice and in-role performance. *J. Bus. Res.*, 75, 130–137.
- [23]. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–151.
- [24]. Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *Research methodology Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- [25]. Lilly, J. D. (2017). What happened to civility? Understanding rude behavior through the lens of organizational justice. *Bus. Horizons*, 60, 707–714.
- [26]. Manyisa, Z., & Elsie, J. (2017). Factors affecting working conditions in public hospitals: A literature review. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences*, 6, 28–38.
- [27]. Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 845-855.

Dome Rogers, et. al. "Effect of Organizational Justice on Employee Performance in Public Health Facilities in Turbo Sub-County, Kenya." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 24(01), 2022, pp. 04-11.