

Assessment of Organizational Justice and Employee Performance in Selected Plastic Manufacturing Firms in Delta State, Nigeria

Charles Ikechukwu Ebolum, Henry Sonna Ojukwu, Ijeamaka Charity Mgbemena, Nkechi Catherine Nwankwo, and Enemu-Uzoezie Chuka

Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Corresponding author: hs.ojukwu@unizik.edu.ng

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62154/3bw0z976>

Abstract

The seeming injustice in the focused firms regarding employee reward and interaction amongst employees propelled the researcher to conduct this study, whose broad objective was to ascertain the nature of the relationship between Organizational Justice and Employee Performance in selected plastic firms in Delta State. The study was anchored on Social Exchange Theory (SET). The study population was 243, consisting of employees of the selected firms, and Taro Yamane's formula was used to determine the sample size of 151. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Regression Analysis were employed to test the three hypotheses. The findings revealed that interactional justice had a significant positive (0.975) relationship with job satisfaction. Following this revelation, the study concluded that the performance of the employees will improve with improved fairness in the processes and procedures leading to reward. It recommended, among other things, that organisations embrace justice in all its ramifications when rewarding employees for their contributions to bring about committed employees.

Keywords: Employee Performance, Interactional Justice, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Justice.

Introduction

Every organisation has a purpose for being established; it could be to produce goods or services, provide security to protect lives and properties or provide welfare services to the people. It could also be for the protection of the rights of the poor and vulnerable in society. Whatever the purpose, the organisation's employees are central to achieving objectives (Anjum & Parvez, 2013). Employees are recruited to help organisations achieve their goals, objectives, mission, and vision, and the organisation requires them to do their best. All employees have motivating and de-motivating factors that affect organisational performance overall. Fairness, however, is sacrosanct in whatever motivates or de-motivates workers in an organisation. The way employees view the fairness in the reward they receive, the processes leading to giving such reward, and the relationship between the employees and employers play a vital role in determining employees' disposition toward the organisation, and these all boil down to Organizational Justice (OJ). Colquitt, Greenberg, and Zapata-Phelan (2005) posit that OJ is a crucial factor associated with the

success of every organisation. When employees feel treated fairly by the organisation in every aspect, they are inclined to show positive attitudes and behaviours like job satisfaction. Issues like allocating monetary resources, hiring employees in organisations, policy-making, and policy implications that affect decision-makers and those affected by such decisions require special attention regarding justice (Colquitt et al., 2005). Fairness perceptions are essential in the decisions and processes regarding human resource aspects such as pay, benefits, and other compensation facets (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Fairness in compensation received, decisions regarding the compensation-related process and how this information is communicated to all the employees play an integral role in formulating the responses about the compensatory system (Nelson, 2008; Milkovich & Newman, 2008).

The plastic manufacturing sector in Delta State is not very vibrant, as very few of them exist. However, the few existing ones try to out-muscle others from the industry through various production techniques, the introduction of unconventional means of production, and their skills in customer relationships. As stated above, the effectiveness and efficiency of these firms directly or indirectly depend on the level of employee commitment and contribution towards the achievement of the goals and objectives of the organisation. Many things could go a long way in determining the level of commitment of the employees, and one such factor is the perception of employees regarding reward packages, the processes and procedures of selection of employees for unique treatments and relationships with their immediate supervisors and management. These, if not treated cautiously, could impact negatively on the commitment level of the employees and likely increase turnover intentions among employees.

Objective of the Study

The study aims to explore the relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction.

Research Question

What type of relationship exists between interactional justice and job satisfaction?

Literature Review

This section focused on reviewing concepts and concluded with the development of a testable hypothesis to properly align with the study intention.

Organisational Justice

The term Organizational Justice (OJ) was first coined by Greenberg in 1977, and it represents an individual's perceptions and reactions to fairness in the organisation. The conceptualisation of the justice construct has evolved over four decades of study. Organisational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness in the workplace, which significantly influences an individual's motivation and performance at work (Cropanzano &

Greenberg, 1997). Justice refers to an action or decision that is morally and ethically right (Tabibnia et al., 2008). They opined that justice can be linked to religion, ethics, equity, and law. Justice or fairness in organisations may include issues associated with perceptions of fairness in pay, equal opportunities for promotion and employee selection processes (Tabibnia et al., 2008). OJ is concerned with the fair treatment of employees (Randeree, 2008). It is a personal evaluation of the ethical and moral standing of managerial conduct or employees' perceptions of fairness in the workplace (Bauer et al., 2001). OJ is seen as a perception that employees make in their minds regarding fair treatment (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010).

Therefore, organisational justice provides a mechanism that ensures fair treatment for organisational members at various levels and positions. Greenberg (1990) reveals that organisational justice refers to people's perceptions of the fairness of treatment received from organisations and is vital as an essential requirement for the effective functioning of organisations. It involves the encouragement of fair and ethical applications and operations within the organisation. In other words, in a fair organisation, the employees evaluate the administrators' behaviours as fair, ethical and rational (İscan, 2004). Organisational justice refers to the overall fairness of the organisation's reward system and the perceived fairness of the actions of individuals responsible for implementing the rewards allocation system (Amna & Muhamma, 2014). OJ can also be seen as a collective research field where the organisational behaviour field must be approached from essential and different points of view. It describes how fair and just the management of an organisation is (Colquitt, 2001). In other words, organisational justice means that the employees find the processes and procedures prudent, their leaders are fair and sincere, and their leaders' work is logical (Dessler, 2008). Greenberg and Barling (1999) describe organisational justice as a concept that describes employees' perception of how they are treated and how this perception affects the results, such as commitment and work satisfaction.

Interactional Justice

Interactional justice (IJ) entails structural and social sides. IJ represents the social side, specifically, the social sensitivity (e.g., politeness, dignity, and respect) rendered by authorities. IJ represents the structural side and reflects the extent to which decision-makers explain and provide adequate justification for their decisions (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010). IJ focuses on the quality of the interpersonal treatment people receive during the implementation of procedures. That is, how one person treats another will manifest in the type of satisfaction one obtains from his job (Umphress et al., 2003). A person is interactionally just if he or she appropriately shares information and avoids rude or cruel remarks. Interactional justice was initially suggested to be an essential predictor of responses to judgments about the supervisor and co-workers. However, investigations show that, beyond the person-focused outcomes such as conflict, low performance, and poor attitudes, it has a notable ability to predict behavioural outcomes, including organisational citizenship behaviours (OCBOs), withdrawal, adverse reactions, and job

satisfaction (Colquitt et al., 2001). As an intermediate step between the enactment of organisational procedure and the decision, interpersonal concerns may be more salient to individuals when they form judgments of fairness than either the outcome or the structural characteristics of the procedure. Although supervisors are often considered to be the source of interactional injustice, as they can determine the quality of interpersonal treatment (Cropanzano et al., 2002), employees who feel unfairly treated by their supervisors do not always take hostile actions against them due to potential sanction (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Interactional justice pertains to issues such as respect, dignity, and explanation. Unlike formal rules by an organisation's top managers, information about interpersonal treatment comes directly through interactions with organisational agents (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010). In organisations, employees have ample opportunity to interact with others and thus should find it relatively easy to interpret terms of dignity and respect. Further, interactional injustice is more likely to provoke the most intensive emotional and behavioural response to all types of injustice (Devonish & Greenidge, 2010). Not only do victims of interactional injustice engage in behaviours that help make even the score with the offender, but their goal is to express anger, outrage, or frustration, regardless of the instrumental value or the target of such actions (Van den Boss, 2001).

Employee Performance

Performance describes how an employee carries out the tasks that make up the job. Good performance results from effort, ability, and direction (Fagbamiye, 2000).

Job performance refers to formal job duties assigned by organisational authorities and evaluated during performance appraisal. Aguinis (2007) opines that performance is about behaviour or what employees do and not about what employees produce or the outcomes of their work. A combination of declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and motivation determines performance. There are two crucial facets of performance: task and contextual. Task or work performance refers to the specific activities required by one's job. Meanwhile, contextual performance refers to the activities required to be a good organisation member or citizen. Both task and contextual performance are needed for organisational success, and both should be included in a performance management system (Aguinis, 2007). The effectiveness and efficiency with which employees carry out these activities depend on many factors, including organisational justice (Aguinis, 2007). A manufacturing firm's efficiency depends mainly on how human resources are motivated, utilised, and provided with an adequate and conducive environment to perform their duties. Employees play a significant role in any organisational process (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). Ajala (2000) asserted that how a person perceives his surroundings influences how such a person behaves in that environment. In brief, a sense of organisational justice in the manufacturing firm depends upon administrative behaviour that is equitable, sensitive, respectful, just, honest and ethical (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). Employees want to give their best and make their contribution felt by the organisation and derive satisfaction within themselves. They also want to make their opinions heard in decisions, processes and policies that affect them, but

they must be willing to do equity (justice) by putting the firm's interest ahead of their own (Fox, 2008).

Job Satisfaction

Over the last four decades of organisational research, job satisfaction has been widely studied. Job satisfaction has been defined and measured as a global construct and a concept with multiple dimensions or facets (Lund, 2003). Overall, *job satisfaction* has been defined as a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering (Locke, 1969). Job satisfaction is critical to retaining and attracting well-qualified personnel. Job satisfaction is people's attitude about their jobs and the organisations in which they perform these jobs. Methodologically, *job satisfaction* can be defined as an employee's effective reaction to a job based on comparing actual and desired outcomes (Mosadeghrad, 2003). Job satisfaction is generally recognised as a multifaceted construct that includes employee feelings about various intrinsic and extrinsic job elements. It encompasses specific satisfaction aspects related to pay, benefits, promotion, work conditions, supervision, organisational practices, and co-worker relationships (Misener et al., 1996). Aryee, Budhwar and Chen (2002) conceptualised job satisfaction as a multi-dimensional construct composed of five factors: "the job on its own, interactions with co-workers, supervisor quality, promotion prospects, and pay", which they say have their function as regards employee emotion and predicts job satisfaction. Furthermore, more satisfied employees engage in innovative activities in continuous quality improvement and participate more in organisational decision-making (Kivimaki & Kalimo, 1994). Job satisfaction is closely linked to that individual's behaviour in the workplace. It is the collection of employees' feelings and beliefs about their current job. The degree of job satisfaction ranges from extreme satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction (Aziri, 2011). Employees have attitudes about various aspects of their jobs, e.g., their work, colleagues, supervisors or subordinates, and pay. The importance of job satisfaction especially emerges when many negative consequences of job dissatisfaction come to mind, such as disloyalty, increased absenteeism, low productivity, turnover and increased number of accidents. (Aziri, 2011). Therefore, to be competitive in this global business environment, companies must identify factors that affect their employees' job satisfaction and morale (Al-Zu'bi, 2010). Job satisfaction is influenced by factors such as the nature of work, salary, growth opportunities, relationship with management and supervisors, work groups and working conditions. (Aziri, 2011).

Methodology

A Correlation Research Design was adopted for the study because the study seeks to determine the type of relationship between the dependent and the independent variables and the most appropriate research design for this type of study is a correlation research design.

Study Population and Sample Size Determination

The firms of study have a combined population of 243, and are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: Population Table

S/n	Organization	Population
1	Celest Plastic Industry	41
2	Eghaghan Plastic Enterprises	32
3	Mogbonju Nigeria Limited	37
4	Plasticman Enterprises	45
5	Sapele Integrated Industries Limited	32
6	Unity Plastic Industry Nigeria Limited	56
	Total	243

Source: Field Survey, 2023

The study used Taro Yamane's Statistical formula to determine the sample size. The formula is given below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + (Ne)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{243}{1 + 243(0.05)^2}$$

$$= \frac{243}{1.6075} = 151$$

To allocate the questionnaire, the study used Bowley's formula. The formula is given below:

$$nh = \frac{nNh}{N}$$

Table 2: Bowley's Proportional Allocation

Firms	Calculation	Outcome
Celest Plastic Industry	$41 \times 151/243$	25
Eghaghan Plastic Enterprises	$32 \times 151/243$	20
Mogbonju Nigeria Limited	$37 \times 151/243$	23
Plasticman Enterprises	$45 \times 151/243$	28
Sapele Integrated Industries Limited	$32 \times 151/243$	20
Unity Plastic Industry Nigeria Limited	$56 \times 151/243$	35

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Tools for Data Collection

Data were collected from the employees of the six selected plastic manufacturing companies using a well-structured questionnaire instrument.

Table 3: Instrument Distribution and Collection

S/N	Organization	Distributed	Collected	Analyzed
1	Celest Plastic Industry	25	23	23
2	Eghaghan Plastic Enterprises	20	20	20
3	Mogbonju Nigeria Limited	23	19	19
4	Plasticman Enterprises	28	25	24
5	Sapele Integrated Industries Limited	20	19	18
6	Unity Plastic Industry Nigeria Limited	35	32	32
	Total	151	138	136

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Table 3 underscores the importance of the sample size in our research. One hundred fifty-one questionnaires were distributed to the organizations under study, representing 100 per cent of the population size. One hundred thirty-eight questionnaires were retrieved, accounting for 91% of the total distributed. Of these, 136 were deemed usable, with only two voided due to dual ticking by the respondents.

Validity and Reliability of Research Instrument

The research instrument underwent a rigorous validation process to ensure the accuracy of the data collected. It was subjected to content and face validity by research experts in management sciences, who meticulously aligned the questionnaire items with the study's variables. They also made necessary corrections to ensure relevance and clarity. To further test the instrument's consistency, copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the employees of Joel Industries. The internal consistency was then evaluated using Cronbach Alpha in SPSS version 20, yielding a high-reliability coefficient of .967, affirming the instrument's reliability.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using inferential statistics, specifically Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. This statistical tool was chosen for its ability to measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables. The decision rule was straightforward: A positive coefficient indicated a positive relationship between the variables, while a negative coefficient indicated an inverse relationship. A relationship

was deemed to exist when the P-value was less than 0.01, leading to the acceptance of the alternate hypothesis. Otherwise, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Result and Discussion

Research Question: What type of relationship exists between Interactional Justice and Job Satisfaction?

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Research Question

Descriptive Statistics						
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
QUES1	136	2	5	522	3.84	.945
QUES2	136	2	5	439	3.23	1.186
QUES3	136	1	5	396	2.91	1.105
QUES4	136	2	5	508	3.74	1.027
QUES5	136	2	5	481	3.54	1.122
QUES6	136	1	5	387	2.85	1.039
QUES7	136	1	5	582	4.28	.908
QUES8	136	1	5	426	3.13	1.198
QUES9	136	1	5	420	3.09	1.092
QUES10	136	1	5	420	3.09	1.092
Valid N (listwise)	136					

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Computation: SPSS Ver. 20

Table 4 makes clear the descriptive values of the questionnaire items 1-10 which were geared towards answering the research question. The decision rule is to accept any mean value greater than or equal to 3.00 or otherwise reject it. Looking at the obtained figures, all questionnaire items are accepted except questionnaire item 3 and 6 which since values are less than 3.00 and are thus rejected.

Hypothesis Testing

H_A: There is a significant positive relationship existing between Interactional Justice and Job Satisfaction

Table 5: Table for Hypothesis Testing

Correlations			
		INTJST	JBSAT
INTJST	Pearson Correlation	1	.975**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	136	136
JBSAT	Pearson Correlation	.975**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	136	136
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Computation: SPSS Ver. 20

Table 5 gives the details of the correlation result of the study hypothesis which state that there is a significant positive relationship existing between Interactional Justice and Job Satisfaction. The correlation coefficient (r) is .975 with a p -value of 0.000 which is less than 0.01 at 2-tailed implies a significant positive relationship exists between the variables; thus, the research hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The objective was to explore the type of relationship that exists between Interactional Justice and Job Satisfaction. The test of hypothesis carried out using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation shows a significant positive relationship between interactional justice and job satisfaction. Thus, the hypothesis was accepted. The implication of the findings is that as employees view their relationship and interaction with supervisor being mutually beneficial, they will derive satisfaction from their job. Agreeing with this result is Amna and Muhamma (2014) who examined the relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment and the mediating effect of job satisfaction on organizational behaviour and found a meaningful and affirmative relationship among OJ, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Also, Princy and Nagalingappa (2000) who explored the consequences of perceived organizational justice found out that that interactional justice is a stronger predictor of turnover intention as well as job satisfaction than procedural and distributive justice. Similarly, Segun and Adeyemi (2014) found a significant Positive Relationship between Organizational justices with job satisfaction of employees and their results also suggested that Organizational Justice has significant impact on Job Satisfaction of the employees in when they investigated the relationship between perceived organizational justice and the employee's job satisfaction in selected manufacturing firms in Lagos metropolis.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The study centered on employee perception of organisational justice towards overall performance and good working climate. Interactional justice was matched against job satisfaction among employees in the selected plastic manufacturing firms in Nigeria. After due survey and onward analyses, the result revealed that a positive relationship exists between the identified variables. Furthermore, it is vital to present these valid findings to the top management of the studied plastic manufacturing firms for a thoughtful implementation approach. From the findings result, the following recommendations were made;

- Adopting a performance based reward system should be encouraged throughout organisational levels.
- To ensure increased job satisfaction, organisations should embrace a justice system that is devoid of partiality and unrevealing.

References

- Anjum, T.T., & Parvez, C.I. (2013). "Contemporary justice research: a new look at familiar questions", *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 89 (1), 803-12.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., Zapata-phelan, B. R., (2005). Organizational justice: A fair assessment of the state of the literature. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational behavior: The state of the science* (2nd ed.): 165-210. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 86: 278-321.
- Nelson, B. and Peter, E. (2005), *Management Bible*, Sweden: John Wiley and Sons Incorporate
- Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, J. M. (2005). *Compensation* (8th Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103
- Cropanzano, R. & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in Organizational Justice. Tunneling Through the Maze. In I.T. Robertson and C. L. Cooper (Eds.) *International Review Of Industrial And Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372, NY: Wiley.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, V. (2005). Three roads to organizational justice. In G. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*: 1- 113. Oxford, England: Elsevier Science
- Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., Sanchez, R. J., Craig, J., & Campion, M. A. (2001). Applicant reactions to selection: Development of the selection procedural justice scale (SPJS). *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 387- 419.
- Devonish & Greenidge (2010). The Effect of Organizational Justice On Contextual Performance, Counterproductive Work Behaviors, And Task Performance: Investigating The Moderating Role of Ability Based Emotional Intelligence, *International Journal Of Selection And Assessment*. Vol 10.
- Amna, Z., & Muhamma, A. (2014). The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Commitment and the Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Behavior. *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research*, 2014 ISSN (2226-8235) Vol-3,
- Colquitt, J. A., (2001). Explaining Injustice: The Interactive Effect of Explanation and Outcome on Fairness Perceptions and Task Motivation. *Journal of Management*, 28(5), 591-610.
- Dessler, G. (2008). *Human resource management* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Prentice Hall.

- Umphress, E. E., Labianca, G. J. & Scholten, L. (2003). The role of instrumental and expressive social ties in employees' perceptions of organizational justice. *Organization Science*, 14: 738-753.
- Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 434-443.
- Van den Boss, K. (2001). Fairness heuristic theory: Assessing the information to which people are reacting has a pivotal role in understanding organizational justice. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in Social Issues in Management*, 1: 6384. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Aguinis, H. J. (2007). *Performance Management*, Upper Saddle River NJ.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2005). *Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice*. New York, McGraw-Hill Co. Ltd.
- Lund, J. (2003). The impact of organizational justice on employees' job satisfaction: The Malaysian companies' perspectives. *Am. J. Economics and Business Administration*. 2.(1): 56-63.
- Locke, E.A. (1969) The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. In: Dunnette, M.P., Ed., *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1297-1350
- Mosadeghrad, A.M. (2003). The role of participative management (suggestion system) in hospital effectiveness and efficiency. *Research in Medical Sciences*. 8(3): 85-9.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S. and Chen Z. X., (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285.
- Kivimaki, M. & Kalimo, N.A. (1994). Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (12), 103
- Aziri, L. A. (2011). Relational demography in supervisor subordinate dyads: Impact on subordinate job satisfaction, burnout, and perceived procedural justice. *J. Organizational Behavior*. 18: 351-362
- Al-Zu'bi, Hasan A. (2010). A Study of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business & Management*, Vol. 5, pp.102-109.