



DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION IN RIVERS STATE

Sunny Azubuike Emmanuel

Department of Sociology, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This study examined the relationship between distributive justice and employee satisfaction in Rivers state. Data for the study were obtained using the questionnaires method. The theoretical framework anchored on equity theory. Data analysis was carried out using chi-square (χ^2). The findings of the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between distributive justice and employee satisfaction. The sample of the study consisted of 180 respondents. The study concluded that when fairness is positively perceived in an organization, the psychological and social well-being of employees would be greatly enhanced. It is imperative therefore that distributive justice should be vehemently pursued in the workplace in order to guarantee the sustenance of organization and employees.*

KEYWORDS: Distributive, Justice, Employee, Satisfaction, Ministry, Rivers State, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

The success and survival of any organization are determined by the method the employees are treated and rewarded. Distributive justice is an imperative factor connected with the success of every organization. With a specific end goal to keep workers fulfilled, dedicated, and faithful to the organization, the organization should be fair in its framework in regards to distributive justice, when employees sense that they are treated fairly by the organization in every aspect, they are inclined to indicate more inspirational mentality and conduct like job satisfaction (Greenberg and Zapata-Phelan, 2005).

As the organizations turn out to be progressively better, distance between administrative and employees is pushed to its limit (Aburrowa, 2013) and this circumstance is a formula to bring forth question among employees.

In the same vein, the determination of concentrating on organizational justice is to unveil the elements that cause the workers to think whether they are genuinely treated by the organization or the other means. This helps them to grasp what produces the sentiments of just or unjust treatments in the minds of workers. In various examinations it has been established that impression of workers as to organizational justice has effective impact in deciding job satisfaction, workers turnover and commitment towards the organization (Colquitt, 2001). Earley & Lind (1987), confirm that there exists a strong connection between observation about fair treatment and performance in the place of work. Bakhshi and Kumar (2009) perceived organizational justice as a precondition to guarantee citizenship conduct by workers. Understanding the distinctive measurements of workers performance helps owners of organization to act in a way that would make their businesses more profitable (Ngodo, 2008).



In existing literature, organizational justice characterized into three general classifications to be precise "distributive", "interactional" and "procedural" justice (Martinez-Tur, 2006).

Distributive justices have been defined as fairness in allocating result among employees based on value, equality and need (Cropanzano, 2007). Distributive justice assumes a powerful part between work outcomes and employee satisfaction which thusly prompt organizational viability (Suliman, 2007). Observations about distributive justice are essentially formed by comparison (Greenberg, 1987). In actuality workers assess their reward and position by making a comparison with the people staying in a similar stratum (Tremblay & Roussel, 2001) within the organization or with people having the comparable position outside the organization.

In Nigeria, the problem of imbalanced treatment of Human Resources in organization on the bases of sex, relationship, ethnicity, particular treatment has received the attention of researchers in this epoch. Organizational justice alludes to the ways and method by which laborers are treated at work environment with or without any prejudice and preference. Researchers have confirmed that among organizational behaviorists, the organizational justice has extensive enhancements on citizenship conduct at work environment (Chad, 2007 and Clement, 2008). Chad (2007) and Clement (2008) attested that organizational justice with particular accentuation on the role of fairness in the work environment has matching impact on work turnover and truancy. The issues of equity are key concerns to workers within an organization. Workers regularly decide if their commitments to the organization match the rewards they get. They likewise judge the rationality of the fundamental leadership process, check whether the methods are just and fair (Cohen, 1991).

In a specific situation, distributive justice has been viewed as the prime factors influencing employee's satisfaction. For the past decades, Human Resource administrators and researchers have known the noteworthy connection between distributive justice and employee satisfaction at work.

The inquiry is whether concerns about fairness at work are general in nature, the sociological view is that standardizing control of conduct exists in all cultures as a utilitarian perquisite for social interaction (Beugre, 2005 and Greenberg, 2004). Be that as it may, when individuals have disguised distinctive standards and qualities, they might have diverse view of fairness. Individuals disguise these standards and qualities mostly because they originate from various societies (Greenberg, 2004). In general, individuals concur that justice is vital however they frequently characterize it distinctively in practice. In this way, understanding individuals' view of fairness likewise requires considering the standards that win in their particular culture (Greenberg, 2004).

In spite of the reality that a lot of research has tended to the matter of organizational justice, minimal experimental study has been carried out to look at the link among distributive justice and employee satisfaction in government ministries in Rivers State. The argument above is confirmation of the manner that there have been a few investigations on the concept of distributive justice and employee satisfaction particularly in Rivers State. Therefore, the aim of this study is to examine the relationship between distributive justice and employee satisfaction in Rivers State Ministries of Education and Works.



METHODS

This study utilizes cross-sectional design and the primary source using questionnaire.

The target population for this study consists of all categories of respondents' male and female, employees in ministries Education and Works in Rivers State. The staff population based on 2018 from nominal roll is 290 for Ministry of Education and 310 for Ministry of Works. From the above ministries the total number of 600 respondents were obtained for the study. The two ministries were selected through stratified sampling technique. Out of the 240 respondent's, 120 questionnaires were administered to each of the two ministries.

The population size of 600 employees, a sample of 240 respondents were randomly selected out of the 600 using the scientific Yaro Yemen's Rule instrument.

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

Where n = Sample size sought

N = Population

e = Level of significance (0.05)

1 = Constant

$$\frac{600}{1 + 600(0.05)^2} = 240$$

Percentage distribution and chi-square test were used for the analysis. Whereas percentage is used to show the distribution respondents, according selected variables, chi-square was used to test the relationship between variables.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Equity theory is associated with Adams (1965). This work is anchored on the equity theory. To explain why injustice, occur in an organization. The idea of distributive justice streams from "equity theory" which posits that judgments of equity and inequity are derived from comparisons between one's self and others based on input and outputs. Input refers to what a person perceives to contribute "knowledge and effort" while outcomes are what an individual perceives to get out of an exchange relationship "pay and recognition". Comparison points against which these input and outcomes are judged may be internal "one's self at an earlier time" or external "other individual".

Wat and Weller (2005), the word equity connotes feelings of good, just, right and fair and they are deeply embedded in our common heritage. If people see a discrepancy between the rewards they are receiving for their efforts when compared to those of others (the rewards-to-work ratio), they would be motivated to do more or less work. It also refers to the perceived fairness of the amounts of compensation employee receive (Greenberg and Baron 2003).



Equity theory has focused on reaction to pay inequities; Leventhal studied the condition under which people proactively employed various justice norms. The major structural components of equity theory are input and outcomes. Input are described as what a person perceives as his/her contribution to the exchange for which he or she expect a just return. Outcomes are described as the rewards in individual receive from the exchange and can include such as pay, and intrinsic satisfaction (Chen and Greenberg, 2000).

Adams (1965), argued that social behavior is affected by beliefs that the allocation of rewards within a group should be equitable, that is, outcomes should be proportional to the contributions of group members. In other words, equity theory argues that people are satisfied when the ratio of their own inputs to outcomes (reward) equals the ratios of inputs to outcomes in comparison to others. Perceived inequity through this comparison feels unpleasant, and motivates people to reduce those unpleasant feelings (Folger and Cropanzano, 2003).

Adams (1965), suggested that when allocation outcomes do not meet this criterion, people would perceive inequity distress and attempt to behaviorally or cognitively restore equity. Equity theory focuses on two sides: the input and the outcome. An employee compares his or her job's inputs with an outcome's ratio. If the employee perceives inequality, he or she will act to correct the inequity. The employee may lower productivity or reduce the quality of their job. When people felt injustice will lead to dissatisfaction, anger, and guilt. People will feel angry and dissatisfied when they are getting less of what they expect in comparison to what they input, and people also will feel guilty if they receive more than their worth. Adams calls this "guilt" when over-rewarded advantageous inequity whereas, calls "anger" reaction when under-rewarded (disadvantageous inequity) Adams (1965).

Equity theory deals with human motives and it should have wide applications in understanding organizational behavior. Equity theory has a one major proposition which is the comparison of one's inputs and outcomes to others inputs and outcomes and as a result of this comparison one might experience equity or inequity. This proposition is very clear and parsimonious unlike many theories in the social science. Everyone can understand this theory since it has to deal with our feelings toward equity and justice. These are very important issues to humans and that is why people will be inclined to understand this theory more clearly (Rice, 1993). Equity theory is considered to be one of the most valid frameworks to understand human attitudes and motivation (Miner, 1984). One of the reasons why justice in the workplace is so important is that employees need to feel that they have some control over their future with their employer. An unfair system is one in which has a lack of predictability, so that arbitrary decisions are made and employees fear victimization. Unfair systems undermine the employees believe that efforts will result in valid outcomes.

Equity theory has been widely applied to organizational settings by industrial psychologists to describe the relationship between an employee's motivation and his or her perception of equitable or inequitable treatment. In a organizational setting, the relevant (dyadic relationship is that between employee and employer. As in other contractual dyadic relationships, equity theory assumes that employees seek to maintain an equitable ratio between the inputs they bring to the relationship and the outcomes they receive from it (Adams, 1965). Equity theory in business, however, introduces the concept of social comparison, whereby employees evaluate their own input/output ratios based on their comparison with the input/outcome ratios of other employees Carrell and Dittrich, (1978).



Inputs in this context include the employee's time, expertise, qualifications, experience, intangible personal qualities such as drive and ambition, and interpersonal skills. Outcomes include monetary compensation, perquisites ("perks"), benefits, and flexible work arrangements. Employees who perceive injustice will seek to reduce it, either by distorting inputs and/or outcomes in their own minds ("cognitive distortion"), directly altering inputs and/or outcomes, or leaving the organization Carrell and Dittrich, (1978). These perceptions of injustice are perceptions of distributive justice, or more specifically, injustice. Subsequently, the theory has wide-reaching implications for employee morale, efficiency, productivity, and turnover.

Human Resource Development needs to take equity theory under serious consideration when dealing with people whether in cases of administering simple tasks like pay, promotions, and recognition or in cases of training, improvements, and development. Equity theory would help Human Resource Development (HRD) explain employee's behavior and provide them with the possible factors that might decrease efficiency and performance. The fairness of exchange between employees and employer is not usually perceived by the employees as simply as an economic matter, an element of relative justice is involved. Equity theory could be applied to any social situation in which an exchange takes place (e.g., between a man and his wife, between football team mates, and between employee and his employer). When two people exchange something, there is a possibility that one or both will feel that the exchange was inequitable. This is the case frequently when an individual exchange his services for pay (Adams, 1963).

Adams proposed this theory in particular on how employees would behave in response to situations when they are treated less or more justly in comparison to others. The theory suggests that inequitable comparison would result in a state of tension, which would encourage employees to restore equity (e.g., increase or decrease work effort, quit their job).

RESULT

Table 1: Ministry of Education and Ministry of Works Responses

| NO/S | PARTICULARS | SA | AG | SD | DG | UND | TOTAL |
|------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | Are all employees treated equally with no discrimination | 30 16.8% | 40 22.2% | 60 33.3% | 40 22.2% | 10 5.5% | 180 100% |
| 2 | To what extent do your organization rewards employee according to their contribution? | 50 27.8% | 55 30.6% | 15 8.3% | 35 19.4% | 25 13.9% | 180 100% |
| 3 | Are you satisfied with your job and like to stay | 70 38.8% | 45 25% | 30 16.8% | 10 5.5% | 25 13.9% | 180 100% |
| 4 | Are you satisfied with the techniques of appraisal used by your organization | 45 25% | 60 33.3% | 15 8.3% | 35 19.4% | 25 13.9% | 180 100% |



| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| 5 | Providing and sharing accurate decision and correlation measure influence satisfaction for the organization | 80 44.4% | 55 30.7% | 10 5.5% | 15 8.3% | 20 11.1% | 180 100% |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|

Table 1 above shows the summary of results to the statement that all employees treated equally with no discrimination". It indicated that 30 respondents representing 16.8% "Strongly agreed", while 40(22.2%) "Agreed", 60(33.3%) respondents "Strongly disagreed", 40(22.2%) "Disagreed" 10(5.5%) "Undecided" respectively that all employees treated equally with no discrimination. From the above table shows the overall responses to the statement that "organization rewards employee according to their contribution". It indicated that 50 respondents "Strongly agreed" while 55(30.6%) of them "Agreed" while 15(8.3%) of the respondents "Strongly disagreed" 35 respondents representing 19.4% "Disagreed" and 25(13.9%) "Undecided" that organization rewards employee according to their contribution. From the score, we deduced that employees are fulfilled with their occupation and like to stay. It indicated that 70 (38.8%) "Strongly agreed", 45(25%) "Agreed", 30(16.8%) "Strongly disagreed" while 10(5.5%) "Disagreed", and 25(13.9%) "Undecided" that they are satisfy with their occupation. From the table above shows that "employees are satisfied with the technique of appraisal used by their organization". It indicated that 45(25%) "Strongly agreed", 60(33.3%) "Agreed", 15(8.3%) "Strongly disagreed" while 35(19.4%) "Disagreed", and 25(13.9%) "Undecided" that they are satisfied with the technique of appraisal utilized by the organization. Table 4.2 above shows the summary of results to the statement "Providing and sharing accurate decision and correlation measure influence satisfaction for the organization", 80(44.4%) respondents "Strongly agreed", 55(30.7%) "Agreed", 10(5.5%) "Strongly disagreed" 15(8.3%) "Disagreed" and 20(11.1%) Undecided respectively that providing and sharing accurate decision and correlation measure influence satisfaction for the organization.

The idea of testing hypothesis is to ascertain the validity or otherwise of the hypothesis earlier postulated in the study. Having acquired all relevant data to the hypotheses formulated with the test of them is performed with the utilize of chi-square method. The chi-square used for testing hypothesis aids to establish the degree of relationship between dependent and independent variable in the formulated hypothesis. The formulated hypothesis for this study were tested to examine their validity.

To experiment the premise formulated from the objective, the researcher used Chi-Square method.

Thus,

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

where: χ^2 = Value of Chi-Square

f_o = Observed Frequency

f_e = Expected Frequency



Operated Assumptions:

Levels of significance $1/s = 0.05$

Degree of freedom $d/f = (r-1)(c-1)$

Where: r = row

C = column

Note $f_e - f_o$

= $\frac{\text{Total observed frequency}}{\text{Total row}}$

There is no Significant Relationship between Distributive Justice and Employee Satisfaction.

Table 2: Observed and Expected Respondents of Appraisal

| VARIABLES | SA | AG | SD | DG | UND | TOTAL |
|--|--------|---------|----------|---------|--------|-------|
| Are you satisfied with the techniques of appraisal used by your organization | 42(34) | 10(9.9) | 20(24.5) | 8(11.8) | 5(4.7) | 85 |
| Fairness of performance appraisal plays imperative function in improving the present performance of employee and achieving organizational goals. | 15(18) | 5(5.2) | 10(13) | 13(6.2) | 2(2.5) | 45 |
| Are all employees treated equally with no discrimination | 15(28) | 6(5.8) | 22(14.4) | 4(6.9) | 3(2.7) | 50 |
| Total | 72 | 21 | 52 | 25 | 10 | 180 |

Chi-square X^2 calculated value = 28.0414 to compare calculated value with table value, degree of freedom

(DF) is ascertained thus:

$$DF = (R-1) (C-1) = (3-1) (5-1)$$

$$= 2 \times 4$$

$$= 8$$



At 8 DF, the table value of X^2 at 0.05 level of significance = 15.51 Decision Rule: the generally accepted decision rule for the submission of Chi-square (X^2) test states that we accept null hypothesis if calculated value is greater than the table value and reject hypothesis if the calculated value is lesser than table value. In this study, since calculated value for X^2 is 28.0414 and table value is 15.51, the hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and employee satisfaction is hereby accepted, meaning that the alternate hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between distributive justice and employee satisfaction is rejected.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study lay emphasized on the assumption that distribution justice activities attract employee's satisfaction such as satisfaction for the job and satisfaction for the organization.

Chi- square (x) tool was a useful to study the relationship between two variables. The results empirically substantiate that distributive justice activity influences employee satisfaction of ministry of education and ministry of works in Rivers State. In addition, there are optimistic and important relationship between the specific element of distributive justice and employee satisfaction, hypothesis raised were statistically measured and accepted. Thus, it made sense to argue that distributive justices have the potential to develop upon effective performance which in turn attracts employee satisfaction. Furthermore, that fairness encourages optimistic behavior of performance, job fulfillment, loyalty and commitment Greenberg (2007).

The investigation empirically demonstrates that distributive justice is significantly connected to employee satisfaction. The findings prove that distributive justice improves employee satisfaction. It exposes that justice stirred employee organizational behavior as acting unselfishly toward others, helping others paying attention cautiously to their needs, Wayne, (2003). The findings therefore maintain and add to facts that distributive justice attracts employee satisfaction in ministries in Rivers State.

CONCLUSION

The research seeks to make an original contribution of knowledge by investigating the relationship between distributive justice and employee satisfaction in ministries in Rivers State. For organizations to achieve desired goals there is need to keep employees satisfied, functional and committed. Hence, there is the need to be fair in the distributive justice so that employees would perceive workplace procedures, interaction and outcome to be fair in nature. The study concluded that when fairness is positively perceived in an organization, the psychological and social well- being of employees would be greatly enhance. It is imperative therefore that distributive justice should be vehemently pursued in workplace in order to guarantee the sustenance of organization and employees. Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the following recommendations were made and considered for the study. organizations should always improve and promote the ability to fairly treat employee especially in appropriateness of outcomes (equity, equality and need) as regards to their work. Organizations should always improve on effective and appropriateness in maintaining



standard and allocation process (consistency, accuracy, correction and lack of bias) during and after work.

REFERENCES

- Abrowa, A. H., Ardakanib, S. M., Haroonic, A. M. and Pourd, M. H. (2013). The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Justice Components and Their Role in Job Involvement in Education. *International Journal of Management Academy*, 1 (1): 25-41.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social*
- Adams, J. S. (1965) *Inequity in social exchange*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), advances in experimental psychology pp. 267-299. New York: Academic Press.
- Adams, J. S. (1965) *Inequity in social exchange*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). New York: Academic Press. Alabama.
- Bakhshi, A. & Kumar, K. (2009). National culture and organizational citizenship behavior: Development of a scale. In Singh, S. (Ed.), *Organisation Behaviour*. Global Publishing House: New Delhi.
- Carrell, M. R. & Ditttrich, J. E. (1978). *Equity theory: The recent literature*, methodological
- Clement, Stephen D. (2008). Organizational Studies of the U.S. Department of the Army Organizations. U.S. Department of the Army: Unpublished Reports.
- Cohen, S.G. (1991). Teams and teamwork: Future directions. Los Angeles: Center for Effective Organizations, University of Southern California.
- Colquitt J.A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. (2005). *What is organizational justice: An historical analysis*.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Cropanozano R, Goldman B, and Folger R. (2003) Deontic Justice: The role of moral principles in workplace fairness. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 24, 1019-1024.
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S.W. (2007). *The management of organizational justice*. Academy of Management Perspectives, 21(4), 34 -48.
- Earley, P. C., & Lind, E. A. (1987). Procedural justice and participation in task selection: The role of control in mediating justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52: 1148-1160.
- Greenberg (2004), Stress Fairness to Fare NoStress: Managing Workplace Stress by Promoting Organizational Justice. *Organizational Dynamics* 33 (4) 352-365
- Greenberg, J. and Baron, R.A. (2003). Behavior in Organization: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work. 8th ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Greenberg, J., & Tyler. R. T. (1987), “Why Procedural Justice in Organizations?” *Social Justice Research*, 1(2), 127-142.
- Martinez-Tur, V., Peiro, J. M., Ramos, J., & Moliner, C. (2006). Justice perceptions as predictors of customer satisfaction: The impact of distributive, procedural and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. vol.36(1)., 100-119.
- Miner, J. B. (1984). The validity and usefulness of theories in an emerging organizational
- Ngodo Oliver, E. (2008). “Procedural Justice and Trust: The Link in the Transformational Leadership – Organizational Outcomes Relationship”. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(1): 82-100.



-
- Rice, R. D. (1993). *Equity theory: The pay satisfaction Construct*. Thesis. Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Suliman, A. M. T. (2007). Links between Justice, Satisfaction, and Performance in the Workplace: A Survey in the UAE and Arabic Context. *Journal of Management Development*, 26(4), 294-311.
- Tremblay, M., & Roussel, P. (2001). Modeling the role of organizational justice: Effects on satisfaction and unionization propensity of Canadian managers. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(5): 717-737.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.