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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to assess the effects of organization justice on perceived organization performance, with specific focus on the High-End Dining Industry in Kenya. The study had three research objectives: establish the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organization performance; establish the relationship between interactional justice and perceived organization performance; and establish the relationship between distributive justice and perceived organization performance.

Restaurant businesses in Kenya have grown rapidly over the last two decades. These establishments operate in relatively competitive environments, which are more often than not price sensitive. These, and other related consumer requirements push management to exert undue pressure on employees in terms of what is expected of them. The managers may, for instance, set unrealistic targets for employees. They may also reprimand employees for ‘poor service’ on a customer’s account, without giving the involved employee an opportunity to defend themselves. Others might impose sanctions such as suspensions or salary cuts as a result of customer complaints. Therefore, the approach to decision making in high end restaurant outlets has raised questions on utilization of organizational justice principles.

The research focused on one of the leading high-end dining restaurants in Kenya. The study adopted a survey research design using quantitative approach. The sample size was 255 respondents across 14 branches. A structured questionnaire was designed to collect data. The study findings were as follows. The study concludes that the relationship between interactional justice and perceived organizational performance is statistically significant (B=0.367, p=0.003). This means that for every unit increase in the value of interactional justice, perceived organizational performance increases by 0.367. However, the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational performance is statistically
insignificant (B=0.232, p=0.063). This translates to change in perceived performance by 0.232 for every unit change in procedural justice.

Lastly, relationship between distributive justice and perceived organizational performance is statistically significant (B=0.276, p=0.037). For every unit change in distributive justice, perceived organizational performance increases by 0.276. Data reliability was established using Cronbach Alpha. Descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used to analyse the data. These included: frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviation, correlation, and multiple regression analysis. The data was presented in tables and supported by the researcher’s interpretation.

The study concludes that a positive enhancement of procedural justice in an organization would lead to a less than proportionate change in perceived organizational performance. However, procedures should be well understood across an organization, and applied consistently and with fairness. The study also concludes employees who perceive unfairness in distribution of rewards decrease their contribution towards perceived organization performance. Organizations should therefore adopt distributive justice principles that ensure equity is perceived in distribution of outcomes. These principles should be clearly communicated to all employees. Further, the study concludes that perceived organization performance is enhanced when situations are clearly, truthfully and adequately explained and employees are treated with courtesy, dignity and respect. Additionally, perceived performance is enhanced when situations are clearly, truthfully and adequately explained and employees are treated with courtesy, dignity and respect. Managers and supervisors should therefore communicate in a fair and clear manner, without any favoritism.

This study brings out interesting perspectives on perceptions of justice in the High-End Dining Industry in Kenya. Areas of further studies across various industries and cultures are discussed. This would benefit organizations, in as far as understanding nuances in application of different justice principles across cultures.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Justice is a concept that is familiar to most individuals from different cultures and backgrounds. Researchers in political, social, economic, philosophical and religious fields define justice as both a process and an outcome. From a legal perspective, justice is fairness, moral rightness or a system of law in which every person receives their due from the system, including all rights; both natural and legal (Abul-Ethem, 2015). From the early 60s and 70s, researchers explored the concept of justice at the workplace. Adams (2016) originally discussed justice in terms of equity. According to Adams, people measure justice by evaluating perceived inputs relative to the outcomes received, and the extent to which this ratio of the inputs against outputs is fair. Adam argued that inequity exists whenever an individual perceives that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of others’ outcomes to inputs as unequal.

Over the decades, the concept of organization justice has broadened to encompass much more than equity. Law and psychology researchers noted that parties in dispute resolution procedures not only reacted to the outcomes received, but also to the procedure through which they received outcomes. This led to the development procedural justice; which is defined as the fairness of the process used to arrive at decisions (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). Allen and Helms (2016) argued that employees working in an organization that effectively adopts distributive and procedural justice could react differently to procedures, depending on how their managers implemented the procedure.

This led to the concept of interactional justice, which focuses on the interactional side of organizational practices. Greenberg (2017) further distinguished interactional justice as a function of two components, interpersonal justice – the extent to which the superiors treat people with dignity and respect, and informational justice - explanations provided to
employees on usage of procedures in a certain way or allocation of outcomes in a certain manner. One of the main advantages of classifying justice in the above components is that by the three classifications (distributive, procedural and interactional), one can easily identify gaps in each of the areas, and recommend changes to procedures or the behavior of those involved in order to enhance fairness perceptions (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). Organization justice is used to determine overall fairness at the workplace (Greenberg, 2017). Specifically, organizational justice focuses on the extent to which employees perceive whether they are treated fairly in their jobs and the ways in which these perceptions influence other outcomes (Alexander & Ruderman, 2013). In an attempt to understand employee behavior, and variables that affect productivity, researchers furthered knowledge on organization justice by linking fair treatment to a number of beneficial employee attitudes and behaviors (Colquitt, Conlon, & Wesson, 2018). Researchers have explored these variables at length in different geographical contexts.

Colquitt, Conlon and Wesson (2018) sought to establish the effect of procedural, interactional, and distributive justice on organization trust. From this research, results showed that procedural, interactional and distributive justice are significantly related to organization trust. It has also been argued that organizational justice relates to considerations of perceived fairness of economic or social changes which involve individuals in their relations with their supervisors and the organization as a social system (Omari, K'Obonyo, & Kidombo, 2012). The development of organizational justice has been gradual. It has been backed by sound academic literature from influential scholars in the area.

Colquitt (2014) credits Greenberg for the growth of the concept; through his seminal works in the latter years of the twentieth century. He states that Greenberg developed the organizational justice from intellectual adolescence into its current status as a more adult literature. This maturation saw literature on organizational justice gain an ever-expanding presence in academia, scholarly book series and conference programs. He further explains that organizational justice has experienced trends of differentiation, cognition and
exogeneity (Colquitt, Lepine, Piccolo, Zapata, & Rich, 2014). The differentiation trend gave impetus to the development of three categories of organizational justice. These are: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Cohen & Diamant, 2017). The cognition trend, he argues, has created a rational, calculative theme in many of the theories that characterize organizational justice. Finally, he posits that exogeneity has facilitated organizational justice’s occupation of a position of an independent variable in most empirical studies. Emotions are seen as a key determinant of perception of justice in the organizational context; as well as how employees react towards unfair outcomes. It is therefore important for managers to clearly understand issues such as emotions of employees for them to effectively manage justice perceptions in an organizational setting (Dai & Xie, 2016).

The hospitality sub-sector is a key element of the service sector in the Kenyan economy. This paper particularly focuses on the High-End Dining industry. The Kenyan middle class’ consumption tastes are continuously evolving, based on prevalent trends in the international scene. Globally, the restaurant industry, has significantly grown over the last 50 years; mostly due to the influence of changing lifestyles (Gikonyo, Berndt, & Wadawi, 2015). Other factors that have provided impetus for the growth are increased urbanization, inter-city mobility and a lot of time spent by the working class commuting to and from work (Kiura, 2017). This has made it difficult for the middle-income demographic to prepare homemade meals consistently.

Consequently, the demand for ready-made meals to support these busier commuter lifestyles and dual-working families has risen. Entrepreneurs, both local and foreign, have sought to exploit these opportunities by setting up restaurants and fast food outlets. Most of these establishments have been set up in the country through franchising agreements. A franchise system a business model whereby a party (a franchisor) grants a right to another (a franchisee) to conduct business using the trademark of the franchisor through an agreement (Omari, K’Obonyo, & Kidombo, 2012). The franchisee is offered training prior to the
opening of the establishment for purposes of standardization of systems and quality control. This business model has thrived in the country, partly due to the availability of relatively cheap labour (Gikonyo, Berndt, & Wadawi, 2015). However, the approach to decision making in these high-end outlets has raised questions on utilization of organizational justice principles. These establishments operate in relatively competitive environments, which are more often than not price sensitive. The middle class is also keen on the nature and quality of service that accompanies meals and drinks (Kiura, 2017). These, and other related consumer requirements, may push management to exert undue pressure on employees in terms of what is expected of them.

The managers may, for instance, set unrealistic targets for employees. They may also reprimand employees for ‘poor service’ on a customer’s account, without giving the involved employee an opportunity to defend themselves. Others might impose sanctions such as suspensions or salary cuts as a result of customer complaints. These examples indicate scenarios where the principles of distributive, procedural and interactive justice are not being given regard. The employees’ perception of justice is usually affected and this may negatively affect organizational performance (Wang, Liao, & Zhan, 2011). With the above context in mind, this study seeks to assess the effects of organization justice on perceived organization performance, with specific focus on the High-End Dining Industry in Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Increased competitiveness to acquire and retain the right talent leads companies to adopt creative employee motivation strategies. Fundamental to adopting optimal motivation strategies is understanding drivers of employee attitude and behavior, and the extent to which employers can influence these drivers. Research on organizational justice shows that both procedural and distributive justice are related to a wide variety of individual and organizational outcomes such as commitment, evaluation of supervisors, pay and job satisfaction (McFarlin & Sweeney, 2016). Findings from their research submit that distributive and procedural justice are significant predictors of work outcomes.
Specifically, they argue that distributive justice is an important predictor of two personal outcomes, pay satisfaction and job satisfaction. Additionally, their findings state that procedural justice is an important predictor of one organization outcome, organizational commitment. Recent justice theories state that employees who are not treated fairly are likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors (Cohen & Diamant, 2017). It is therefore pertinent to understand the effects of organization justice in the workplace, the relevance of culture in organization justice research, and ways in which in-role behavior, team performance and organization performance are influenced by organization justice. The restaurant industry in Kenya has experienced sustained growth over the last decade. This growth has, in part, been attributed to growth of the middle class. This has enabled them to explore various experiences available in the market, particularly in food and dining. These changes have presented opportunities for entrepreneurs to capture this market niche, riding on the franchise business model.

It is seen as a low risk, low commitment approach by the franchisors (Gikonyo, Berndt, & Wadawi, 2015). This market segment has also become competitive, forcing restaurants to seek to differentiate themselves in order to gain an edge over their peers. In a competitive environment, employees may be subjected to excessive managerial pressure, so as to foster the organizational performance. Few studies have been done in respect of the use of franchises to set shop in the Kenyan market. Acholi (2016) reviewed Kentucky Fried Chicken’s entry strategy into the Kenyan market. She concluded that the franchise business model was appropriate for Kentucky Fried Chicken. Kiura (2017) observes that the international franchise market in Kenya has grown intensively, led by the fast food industry. She asserts that this has been fueled by customers’ preference for established brands.

There is however not much literature on the effect of managerial decisions on organizational justice as understood by employees, especially in relation to the food industry. A gap exists in Africa and Kenya in relation to appreciation of the extent to which organization justice affects employee behavior, and ultimately, employee and organizational performance.
This study aims to study the organization justice and employee behavior relationship, and the effect of this on organizations, with specific focus on the High-end Dining Industry in Kenya. While researchers have dedicated many years to studying these variables, examining organization justice in the Kenyan context will broaden understanding on whether the aforementioned behaviors influence performance in an organizational setting.

1.3 General Objective

To establish the effects of organization justice on perceived organization performance, with focus on the High-end Dining Industry in Kenya.

1.4 Specific Objectives

1.4.1 Establish the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organization performance.

1.4.2 Establish the relationship between distributive justice and perceived organization performance.

1.4.3 Establish the relationship between interactional justice and perceived organization performance.

1.5 Justification of the Study

1.5.1 Management and Decision Makers in High-End Dining Restaurants

With sustained economic growth in Kenya, the middle class has continued to growing the last two decades. The growth has come with changing consumer demands, which the high-end dining industry has sought to capitalize on. However, a neglected aspect of organization performance in this setting, is the place of employees in the performance equation. Little attention has been paid to employees, especially in relation to how employee perceptions of justice impact performance. This study seeks to understand how employees view organizational justice and the effect on their perceptions of organizational performance.
1.5.2 Scholars

The study demonstrates the impact of organizational justice in arriving at desired outcomes, with focus on organization performance. The study therefore underscores the importance of understanding employee perceptions on organization justice, and the importance of applying justice principals at the work place. The study will also provide a premise for further research into organizational justice, its application and usefulness in the service industry in Kenya.

1.5.3 Policy Makers

The study will be useful to policy makers in understanding fair labour principles that are directly linked to employee perceptions on justice. These principles can be in terms of promoting employee welfare and ensuring that there is due process in workplace processes and outcomes. Implementation of recommendations from the study can potentially help in lowering the high employee turnover rate in the Kenyan Hospitality Industry.

1.6 Scope of the Study

This study will be conducted in the High-end Dining Industry in Kenya, with specific focus on one of the leading restaurants. The research was limited to fourteen branches within the Nairobi region. The study was conducted for 3 months from March – May 2019. There was also an issue of providing objective information to the respondents, as most of the responses were guided by attitudes and perceptions. However, the researcher encouraged the respondents to fill objectively without any fear or prejudice as the questionnaires would bear no names of the participants.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Procedural Justice

Procedural Justice refers to employees’ perception of whether they are fairly treated by the organization or team which acts as an enacting authority (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2015).
1.7.2 Distributive Justice

Distributive Justice relates to justice in the distribution of benefits and burdens to individuals, or in the balancing of competing claims made on the benefits (Olsaretti, 2018).

1.7.3 Interactional Justice

Interactional Justice is defined as an employee’s perception of justice, and especially their perception of how the process of procedure execution would be influenced by the attitude of the executors and how the executors treat them (Dai & Xie, 2016).

1.7.4 Perceived Organization Performance

Perceived Organizational Performance is defined as employee perceptions regarding their organization’s overall performance (Allen & Helms, 2016).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter provides an introduction into the subject matter of this study. It has outlined a background to organization justice, the three categories and presents the knowledge gap that exists. The research problem is to find out the effect of organizational justice on organization performance, specifically in relation to the High-end Dining Industry in Kenya. The chapter has also outlined the reasons informing the study, together with the broad and specific objectives that the study seeks to achieve. Chapter two reviews the literature on organization justice globally, regionally, nationally. Chapter three addresses the research methodology. Chapter four provides the results and findings. Chapter five presents the summary, discussion, conclusion and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses literature by various scholars in respect of the development of the three categories of organizational justice, namely distributive, procedural and interactional justice. The chapter also gives context on the theories on organizational justice, especially on how they influence perceived organization performance. The origin and historical development of the concept of organizational justice can be attributed to a number of scholars. Adams (2016) originally discussed justice in terms of equity. According to Adams, people measure justice by evaluating perceived inputs relative to the outcomes received, and the extent to which this ratio of the inputs against outputs is fair. Adam argued that inequity exists whenever an individual perceives that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of others’ outcomes to inputs as unequal.

Greenberg (2017) analyzed organizational justice with bias on the legal profession. He observed that an adversarial legal system was seen to be more impartial. It also resulted in fairer outcomes. This led him to emphasize on the importance of procedures in the perception of fair outcomes in a setting where decisions are made or expected to be made. Nowakowski and Donald (2005) observe that by the 1990s, the study of organizational justice began shifting from legal procedures towards organizational procedures. Organizational justice concerns ways that employees feel they are being treated fairly or otherwise in an organization (Azeem, Abrar, Bashir, & Zubair, 2015). There are three main categories of organizational justice: procedural, distributive and interactional justice.

2.2. Procedural Justice and its effect on Perceived Organization Performance

Procedure can be defined as a pre-determined and accepted way of doing something. In an organizational set up, many activities are undertaken using a systematic and accepted criterion. Procedural justice seeks to understand the impact and importance of procedure in
decision making and the perception of fairness or lack of it thereof (Biswas, Varma, & Ramaswami, 2016). Blader and Tyler (2003) assert that people pay attention to procedural characteristics that touch on the fairness in decision making procedures. They further elaborate that people focus on aspects of procedures that enable them to evaluate decision making processes. They outline a two-model concept of procedural justice, which they argue is a test which is used by people to judge procedural fairness. These principles are: (a) evaluation of formal rules and policies related to how decisions are made in the group (formal decision making), (b) evaluation of formal rules and policies that influence how group members are treated (formal quality of treatment) (Blader & Tyler, 2003).

2.2.1. Formal Decision Making

Decision making in an organization can be chaotic and if not undertaken well may have disastrous effects. These effects may be both internal and external to the organization. Large organizations bank on agreed-upon procedures and systematic reporting levels and mechanisms to manage this. This style of management embraces bureaucratic principles (He, Zhu, & Zheng, 2013). It was developed by management experts in the twentieth century in a bid to eliminate overlaps and confusion in decision making. Organizational justice seeks to build on decisions (outcomes) in an organization and assist supervisors to better understand what employees think about them (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). It has been observed by commentators that organizational justice has the capacity to influence trust, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The evolution of research on procedural justice was heavily influenced by the legal profession. In the legal context, procedure is an essential part of the justice system, as it accords all parties an opportunity to be heard and to attempt to convince the judicial system to make a ruling in their favor (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2015). Baldwin (2015) defines procedural justice as the fairness of the process leading to a particular outcome (decision). She further elaborates that people are willing to accept unfavorable outcomes if they believe that the process leading up to it was conducted according to organizational justice principles.
In an organizational setting, the importance of procedure is essential and led to the development of the voice principle. This, according to Baldwin (2015) entails giving employees an opportunity to submit information they have and voice their concerns before decisions that affect them are made. Baldwin states that this can be employed in situations such as the general day-to-day work life, management practice on formal, and one-off procedures such as disciplinary procedures. According to her research, psychologists state that having a voice helps in fulfilling needs such as the chance to be heard and influence others (Baldwin, 2015). It also serves as a confirmation of one being valued as a member of a particular group. From this research, she argues that procedural justice can be fostered through activities such as: lunches with lower-level colleagues, operating on the basis of an open-door policy, undertaking ‘walk-around’, suggestion schemes, having appellate mechanisms in an organization and participative management. The author outlines a number of other determinants of procedural justice. These are: consistency, neutrality, accuracy, correctability, representatives, morality and ethicality (Baldwin, 2015).

Baldwin holds the view that in any organizational setting, there must be a strong commitment by management for maintenance of systems to ensure that procedural justice is fostered. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) define procedural justice as the fairness of the processes by which outcomes are determined. It is considered to exist when procedures in an organization are characteristic of certain types of normally accepted principles. McFarlin and Sweeney (2016) they highlight that the fairness in a firm’s procedures may have a greater impact on organizational commitment than the fairness of outcomes (distributive justice). This means that employees may continue to see an organization in good light even if confronted with an unfavorable outcome, such as low pay, as long as they perceive the organization’s procedures to be fair.

Pillai, Williams and Tan (2001) reiterate the position that procedural justice revolves around fairness in organizational procedures. Fairness in these procedures is crucial for enhancement of legitimacy of outcomes. They also state that, both distributive and
procedural justice are crucial predictors of commitment, satisfaction and trust. Lau and Lim (2002) highlight that procedural justice relates to employees’ perception of fairness in procedures used at arriving at outcomes that affect them. This includes processes utilized by their superiors to evaluate their performance, communicate feedback and determine feedback such as promotions and pay increases. In their research, Lau and Lim are cautious about drawing a direct link between procedural justice and employee performance; choosing instead to state that the relationship between the two may be more complex than a simple direct relationship. Nonetheless, they argue that if managers can apply rules fairly and consistently and base rewards on performance and merit devoid of bias, then it might lead to higher satisfaction, commitment and involvement (Lau & Lim, 2002).

Lau and Lim also point out that procedural justice may be a condition-precedent for effective public participation. Their study indicates that procedural justice is a key determinant of managerial performance. They conclude that it is a critical element in the organizational psychology of decision making. Decision making in smaller organizations is slightly different. There are less procedures to follow. Outcomes are also harder to predict. There is also a higher level of subjectivity prevalent in the decisions made by those who are in charge (McFarlin & Sweeney, 2016). This has the potential to aggravate organizational justice perceptions and concerns of employees in a given organization. Indeed, Kozlowski and Bell (2003) recommend that employees are made an active part of the decision-making process.

Managers are also encouraged to ensure fairness in outcomes and ensure that they are courteous when explaining decisions to employees. Consistency is also important because it enables employees to predict consequences and/or benefits of certain acts within an organization (Nowakowski & Conlon, 2005). It is, however, difficult to engender these principles in small organizations because managers and supervisors enjoy reduced levels of accountability. They bear the biggest share of risks, including in a day-to-day context, and therefore, from their perspective, the rewards and benefits as brought out through outcomes, should vest in them as a matter of priority (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2015).
This can however be harmful, especially where outcomes do not take adequate regard of employee inputs. It has the potential to impair positive justice perceptions by employees. This, in turn, might trigger counter productive work behaviour; which usually ends up causing harm to organizational performance (Cohen & Diamant, 2017).

### 2.2.2. Formal Quality of Treatment

The second principle is used by people to judge procedural fairness is evaluation of formal rules and policies that influence how group members are treated (formal quality of treatment). This principles are drawn from the group engagement model. A core principle of the group engagement model is that an individual’s behavioral effort on behalf of a collective to which he or she belongs is influenced by the role the group plays in how the individual thinks and feels about themselves (Biswas, Varma, & Ramaswami, 2016).

Research shows that fairness is a primary dimension that people use to evaluate the processes and treatment they encounter in their groups. This is reflected in their judgments of procedural fairness (Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 2017). According to their research, the second basis of the reactions from people to encounters with their groups is the outcomes—particularly the economic outcomes—that they attain as a result of group membership (Tyler, Degoey, & Smith, 2017). Therefore, the group engagement model integrates arguments that (a) procedural justice impacts behavior, (b) procedural justice impacts social identity, and (c) social identity impacts behavior, and reasons that social identity accounts for at least part of the reason that procedural justice impacts behaviour (Tyler & Blader, 2014).

Research on the group engagement model underscores the importance of procedures, as they shape an individual’s social identity in a group context, and social identity in turn influences attitudes, values and behaviours. Zhu and Zheng (2013) observe that the desire to empirically determine how procedural justice impacts an employee’s performance and attitude has garnered a lot of academic attention. They state that organizations are increasingly trying to find solutions on how best to motivate their employees and make them more engaged in their
work. They argue that their research work supports the notion that procedural justice positively impacts on employee engagement, and by extent this impacts on employee performance. The importance of understanding procedural justice is underscored by research findings that indicate the correlation between employee perceptions on decision-making processes, and employee behaviour (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2015). Greenberg (2017) identifies five principles of determining fair appraisal of employees. These are: soliciting and using employee input, ability to challenge evaluations, rater's familiarity with ratees' work, and two-way communication during the appraisal interview and the consistent application of evaluation standards. Greenberg further argues that sustained study of procedural justice is important in that it can help in the linkage of diverse organizational phenomena such as compensation programs and grievance-resolution procedures.

According to Cohen and Diamant (2017), in a situation where there is no defined procedure of addressing the grievance, employees engage in counterproductive behaviour. These employees may engage in acts of sabotage, and are therefore are a threat to the organization. The two scholars state that unfair treatment serves as a primary motivator for employees to seek revenge. They further argue an organization has an ethical obligation to treat its employees equally, since it is always assumed that the input of all employees to the organization is equal. Where an organization is in breach of this obligation, employee behaviour is negatively influenced. This in turn leads to a perception of unfair treatment, which can act as a trigger for counterproductive behaviour. Some of the counter-productive behaviour identified include; organizational deviance, aggression, sabotage, cheating and stealing (Cohen & Diamant, 2017). McFarlin and Sweeney (2016) defined procedural justice from the remuneration angle. They argue that it entails organizational processes which are important in fostering the fairness of compensation accorded to employees.

2.3. Distributive Justice and its effect on Perceived Organization Performance

Distributive justice relates to fairness in allocation of outputs in proportion to the inputs of an employee (Baldwin, 2015). Baldwin argues that outcomes in a work context may take the
form of wages, salaries, social approval, job security, career opportunities and promotions. She points that employees compare their contribution-outcome ratio to that of their colleagues. Cohen, Charash and Spector (2015) define distributive justice as relating to the perceived fairness of outcomes and state that it has strong implications in an organizational context. They argue that distribution of outcomes is an integral part of decision-making process in an organization, with the possibility of influencing behaviour in the cognitive and affective sense.

2.3.1. Monetary Rewards

McFarlin and Sweeney (2016) discuss distributive justice in relation to employee remuneration. They define distributive justice as perceived fairness with regard to the amount of compensation accorded to employees. They argue that distributive justice is an important predictor of personal outcomes, such as assessment of how employees are content with their pay level. Pillai, Williams and Tan (2001) indicate that lack of distributive justice can cause employees to lower their job performance, reduce cooperation with colleagues, reduced job commitment and satisfaction. Colquitt, Lepine, Piccolo, Zapata & Rich (2014) discussed the nature of the various decisions that can be made in an organizational set up. These decisions can, for instance, relate to performance evaluations, bonuses, salary increases, job assignments and informal spot rewards. They argue that failing to make an equitable decision in relation to the above, may lead to the emanation of doubts as to the competence of the management.

Colquitt, Lepine, Piccolo, Zapata & Rich (2014) discern that this behaviour can be in the form of employee attitudes and behaviour. Further, distributive justice has the capacity to have a lot of impact on employee performance. They opine that performance may be in the form of task performance, citizenship behaviour and counterproductive behaviour. It also has the potential to impact employee trust, which the authors have defined as confident, positive expectations about the words, actions and decisions made in an organizational set up. Olsaretti (2018) has extensively discussed the concept of distributive justice. She states
that justice consists of giving every individual his or her due, or treating similar circumstances alike. She describes distributive justice as the distribution of benefits and burdens to people, and entails balancing competing claims that are made in respect to benefits that are up for distribution. Olsaretti advances condition-precedents which can be used to assess distributive justice in an organizational setting. These are: the pre-conditions, the objective and the normative significance. The pre-conditions refer to settings that must be present for considerations of distributive justice to be availed to all persons. The object includes procedures that govern the allocation of distributable goods, such as income and wealth. Lastly, normative significance is the assessment of the importance of distributive justice claims. That is, considering all the reasons that form the basis of a claim before making a decision (Olsaretti, 2018).

McKee (2009) describes distributive justice as a form of virtue. He states that it is concerned with human behaviour. He further argues that there is an obligation in organizations (including public authorities) to observe the dictates of distributive justice. That distributive justice calls for equivalence between what is due to or from each and what is contributed or received. McKee also explores distributive justice in relation to the public governance. He points out that key antecedents of distributive justice in the public domain are levels of taxation and other social charges (inputs) and benefits that accrue to the public in the form of merit goods and services, and which are shareable.

This underscores the importance of ensuring that there is a fair allocation of outputs to employees in an organizational set up. One of the ways that this can be explored is assessing the outputs based on the level of employee input. The evaluation and understanding of distributive justice across cultures is underscored by an understanding of individualism vs collectivism in different cultural contexts. According to Muller, Iverson & Jo (2016), collectivist cultures emphasize on group over self, seniority rather than merit in promotions, and a strong respect for hierarchical values, influenced the relationship between met expectations about work-related issues and justice evaluations. Distributive justice also has
the potential to impact trust. Organization trust is defined as confident, positive expectations about the words, actions and decisions made in an organizational set up (Colquitt, Conlon, & Wesson, 2018).

2.3.2. Non-Monetary Rewards

Rewards in an organization context are categorized into monetary and non-monetary form. The extent to which distributive exists is dependent upon the context, goals and motives of a particular situation, with individuals evaluating the distribution of outcomes with respect to some distributive rule, namely equality, equity, or need (Hornibrook, Fearne, & Lazzarin, 2013). Adams (2016) took a broad approach to contributions and rewards, noting that contributions could include education, intelligence, experience, skill, effort and time, whereas outcome rewards were thought to include pay, recognition, prestige and acceptance. Cohen and Diamant (2017) observe that when an employee is confronted with a situation where they perceive injustice in distribution of rewards, they seek redress. Research points out that employees are more likely to assess the fairness in distributive justice claims through a comparative analysis of the benefits that have been vested in their peers or equals in the organization.

Mutero (2017) argued that the equality rule is often cited as a key reference point in determination of the fairness in decisions made and the consequent outcomes. She also pointed out the need rule, which requires that unique needs of an individual be taken into consideration where allocations are set to be done. The overall findings from Mutero’s research was that distributive justice is a key determinant of employee engagement. Some of the key considerations that the respondents pointed out as being important in assessing justice were merit, duties allocated and the unique needs of a person (Mutero, 2017). Interestingly, she observed that the respondents did not expect that all people had to be allocated equal outcomes. This in effect means that from her study, equality was not a very important consideration for distributing outcomes to employees. Biswas, Varma and Ramaswani (2013) studied the effect of distributive justice on employee engagement in
India. The scholars argued that employees’ assessment of equity or inequality in organizational outcomes is through comparative reference to an individual or group. This comparison is multifaceted in that it assesses their personal input-output ratio vis-à-vis the rewards that accrue to the referent group or individual (Biswas, Varma, & Ramaswami, 2016). They further point out that distributive justice can form a basis of prediction of workers’ satisfaction with compensation and benefits. Distributive justice also affects emotions. When decisions are seen to be unfair, an employee may experience emotions such as sadness, anger, pride or guilt (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2015).

Distributive justice can also be used as a basis for evaluating attitudes towards a job, including job satisfaction. They ultimately arrive at the conclusion that distributive justice, together with the other categories of organizational justice can help an organization determine employee engagement. It can particularly, be important in assisting managers to better understand and control factors that may lead to improved levels of employee engagement (Biswas, Varma, & Ramaswami, 2016). Yean and Yusof (2015) point out that one of the impacts of distributive justice is the potential to positively influence job performance by improving the output of employees. They define job performance as output in term of its quality or quantity, based on objectives defined by superiors. The development of distributive justice has been influenced by a number of theories.

The origin of the concept can partly be attributed to John Stacey Adams’ Equity Theory (Adams, 2016). The theory argues for the need to strike a fair balance between an employee’s input and their output. The inputs may include hard work, skill, acceptance, enthusiasm, while outputs may include salary, recognition, promotions and bonus. The Equity Theory explains how individuals perceive fairness within an organization and the consequent impact on their behaviour. It also explores organizational fairness in a comparative context and argues that employees expect to be treated fairly relative to their colleagues (Yean & Yusof, 2015). Theories have emerged in the distributive justice discipline, namely: reactive content theories, reactive process theories, proactive content theories and proactive process theories.
According to Greenberg, reactive content theories pay attention to how individuals respond to unfair distribution of outcomes. He argues that unfair acts evoke negative emotions and sometimes trigger escape as a means of redressing the inequality. Reactive process theories, on the other hand, focus on procedures. Proactive content theories target employees’ response to perceived fair and unfair outcomes. (Barling & Philips, 2010). According to Greenberg (2017), when an employee is confronted with an unfair decision, they first attempt to create fair outcomes. On the other hand, proactive process theories are concerned about allocative behaviour.

Allocation procedures is preferred (by employees) to the extent that they achieve certain value goals. These goals include the attainment of justice (Barling & Philips, 2010). Greenberg argues that attainment of justice can be assessed through six principles. For it to be argued that the principles have attained justice, they must: (a) allow opportunities to select the decision-making agent, (b) be based on accurate information, (c) follow consistent rules (d) identify the structure of decision-making power, (e) employ safeguards against bias, (f) provide opportunities for changes to be made in procedures, and (g) allow for appeals to be heard (Greenberg, 2017). Scholars have also explored the linkage between distributive justice and disruptive behaviour. This is referred to as counter-productive behaviour (Cohen & Diamant, 2017).

2.4. Interactional Justice and its effect on Perceived Organization Performance

This was the last of the three categories of organizational justice to develop. It seeks to evaluate the behaviour of superiors in an organizational set up, towards their juniors (Dai & Xie, 2016). This behaviour is mostly in relation to how management and/or supervisors communicate to employees about organizational outcomes. Many scholars in the organizational justice field argue that interactional justice is closely related to procedural justice. There are two main components of interactional justice: interpersonal and informational justice (Colquitt, Conlon, & Wesson, 2018).
2.4.1. Interpersonal Justice

Baldwin (2015) defines interpersonal justice as the quality of treatment received by those working in an organizational set up. She argues that a number of factors can enhance employees’ perception of interpersonal justice. These are: truthfulness, respect, propriety and justification. Truthfulness is explained in the sense that information being communicated must be accurate, and ought to be presented in an open and forthright manner. Respect, on the other hand, entails treating employees with courtesy and according them dignity. At no point must there be recourse to insults. Propriety relates to the fact that statements should not be laden with improper motives or prejudicial elements (Baldwin, 2015).

Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) view interpersonal justice as relating to aspects of the communication process between a source and a recipient of justice. They argue that this form of justice is characterized by cognitive, affective and behavioral reactions towards superiors. The authors point out that negative reactions resulting from poor interactive justice experiences are more likely to be directed towards the individual superiors in question, as opposed to the organization itself. They recommend that the behaviour of management should be characterized by politeness, respect and honesty. Dai and Xie (2016) argue that employees’ perception of justice is influenced by the attitude of the executors towards them.

When employees feel that they are being treated with fairness by their leaders, they become passionate and have high morale (Barling & Philips, 2010). Dai and Xie (2016) point out that the source of the information being communicated is important in determining the level and nature of interactive justice across the entire communication chain. More specifically, they argue that the personalities and behaviors of leaders determines perceptions of interactive justice among subordinates. In addition, they explain that when leaders exert their influence on outcomes, subordinates are no longer passive receivers. The nature of influence exerted plays a key role in the employees’ understanding and reaction to interpersonal justice.
Research reveals that there is a weak relationship between interpersonal justice and employee performance (Barling & Philips, 2010). The weak relationship is also present in relation to organizational commitment and withdrawal behaviour. There is however a strong relationship between interactional justice and agent evaluation of authority and job satisfaction. Interactional justice also has the potential to enhance unity amongst managers in an organization. Ismail, Mashkuri Sulaiman & Hock (2011) state that employees are often sensitive to the quality of interpersonal treatment received from their managers. They further argue that the ability of a manager to use fair treatment in, for instance, determining the amount of pay and appreciating employees’ constructive suggestions goes a long way in enhancing perceptions of positive interactional justice.

This may boost job satisfaction in organizations that observe principles of interactional justice. It also decreases employee misconceptions. Barling and Phillips (2010) make an interesting observation in respect to interactional justice. Findings from their study concluded that interactional justice did influence withdrawal behaviors, trust in management and affective commitment. Barling and Phillips (2010) advise organizations, to not only focus on outcomes and formal procedures, but to also pay attention to the perception of justice as is inherent in interpersonal interactions between employees and their supervisors or managers. According to their research, interpersonal justice refers to the respect and dignity with which one treats another.

2.4.2. Informational Justice

Informational justice refers to whether one is truthful and provides adequate justifications when things go wrong. Kim (2016) conducted study on the role of informational justice in the wake of downsizing from an organizational relationship management perspective. In investigating responses to downsizing, informational justice was chosen as an antecedent of the survivors’ intentions to leave. Organization Public Relationship (OPR) was hypothesized to function as a mediator between informational justice and turnover intentions. The results revealed significant association between informational justice and OPR, as well as
association between OPR and turnover intentions in a downsizing context. Additionally, the research findings showed that OPR mediates the relationship between informational justice perceptions during the downsizing, and turnover intentions after the downsizing (Kim, 2016). McNall and Roch (2007) conducted a study on the effects of electronic monitoring types on perceptions of interpersonal justice, and privacy in Chicago, Illinois. Electronic performance monitoring and control systems (EPMCSs) are raising fairness and privacy concerns in many organizations. Researchers treat different types of EPMCS’s as equal, yet various EPMCS types (e.g., computer monitoring, eavesdropping, and surveillance) may exert differential influences on fairness and privacy perceptions.

Results from this study indicated that different types of EPMCS significantly influenced perceptions of interpersonal justice, and privacy. Computer monitoring was perceived as the most procedurally unjust; traditional direct observation by a supervisor without electronic monitoring was perceived as the most interpersonally just, and the least invasive in terms of privacy. These findings suggest that employers should be cautious in the type of monitoring used. Bouckenooghe, De Clercq and Deprez (2014) conducted a study on the interpersonal justice. Data was collected from employees directly affected by a large-scale restructuring in a European-based organization. The research findings demonstrated that interpersonal justice positively affects commitment to change and that relationship conflict fully mediates the relationship.

Further, social interaction moderates both the interpersonal justice relational conflict and the relational conflict commitment to change relationships, such that they get invigorated at higher levels of social interaction. The findings also reveal that the indirect effect of interpersonal justice on commitment to change, through relational conflict, is more pronounced at higher levels of social interaction, in support of a moderated mediation effect. Shin, Seo, Shapiro and Taylor (2015) conducted a study on the role of leaders’ informational justice and transformational leadership on maintaining an organization’s commitment to change. The study concluded that employees’ early commitment to change is positively and significantly associated with their later commitment, if they receive appropriate support from
their leaders during change. They argue that informational justice and transformational leadership may fuel employees to support change initiatives due to the norm of reciprocity (Shin, Seo, Shapiro, & Taylor, 2015).

2.5. Perceived Organization Performance

An interesting dimension of organizational performance relates to how employees think, from their perspective, that an organization is fairing performance wise. In organizational justice studies, this is known as perceived organizational performance (Drennan, McColl, & Janet, 2010). This is an important facet of the overall organizational performance because, an employee’s mindset is crucial and it influences their attitude towards their assigned tasks.

Therefore, it is important that organizations seek to actively foster organizational justice principles so as to positively influence the perception of the employees in terms of the performance of the organization. (Bayo-Moriones, Billon, & Lera-Lopez, 2013). Naveed, Adnan, Ullah & Sohaul (2017) argue that human resource management best practices influence perceived organizational performance. They assert that human resource departments must undertake performance appraisal which is guided by merit and performance as a way of improving the perception of employees in relation to the performance of the organization.

Adnan, Ullah & Sohaul (2017) also encourage the need for continuous provision of skills, knowledge and expertise to employees and involving them in decision making. Javed and Syed (2018) reiterate the fact that human resource issues influence employees’ perception of firm performance. They also state that trust has been identified as a key determinant of employee contentment. Perceived Performance is defined as employee perceptions regarding their organization’s overall performance (Allen & Helms, 2016). In their research, San Martín, and Ramon-Jeronimo (2012) sought to establish factors that determine firms’ perceived performance of mobile commerce in Spain. The findings show that the perception of performance on firms engaging in mobile commerce depends on the extent to which firms’ activity fits mobile business, technological competence and customer value for the firm.
From their research, there is demonstrable linkage between the extent to which a firm’s operations and activities are aligned, and perceived performance. This conclusion is further underscored by Bayo-Moriones, Billon and Lera-Lopez (2013), who conducted a study on effects of perceived performance on ICT in manufacturing SMEs in Canada. Their findings showed a strong positive relationship between ICT adoption and the measures of perceived performance analysed (Bayo-Moriones, Billon, & Lera-Lopez, 2013).

However, the impact is not always immediate since the lag effects and length differ according to the type of ICT. Managers' perceptions of ICT impact are related to the adoption of new work practices. ICT impact on final performance (market share and profits and margin) takes place through the improvement of internal and external communication, as well as through operational performance (Bayo-Moriones, Billon, & Lera-Lopez, 2013). Michinov, Olivier and Rusch (2015) conducted a study on the influence of transactive memory on perceived performance, job satisfaction and identification in the medical field. According to the researchers, communication and coordination between physicians and nurses plays a crucial role in maintaining a good level of performance under time pressure, particularly for anaesthesia teams, who are confronted with uncertainty, rapid changes in the environment, and multi-tasking.

The study therefore sought to assess the relationship between a specific form of implicit coordination, the transactive memory system, and perceptions of team effectiveness and work attitudes such as job satisfaction and team identification (Michinov, Olivier-Chiron, Rusch, & Chiron B, 2015). The analyses revealed that transactive memory system predicted members’ perceptions of team effectiveness, and affective outcomes such as job satisfaction and team identification. Additionally, the results demonstrated that transactive memory processes, and especially the coordination component, were a better predictor of teamwork perceptions than socio-demographic (i.e. gender or status) or contextual variables (i.e. tenure and size of team). Drennan, McColl and Janet (2010) conducted a study on the relationship between internet use and perceived performance in retail and professional service firms. The study revealed that internet use has a positive impact on perceived performance, such that,
increased engagement in internet related activities, proactive communication to clients, customer feedback collection, using the interest to search for, market and sell company products and services, leads to an increase in perceived performance. However, there are differences in the forms of internet use between the two service groups and their relative effect on performance. For retail firms, use of transactional function, such as ordering, selling and payment, was found to be positively related to increases in perceived performance. In contrast, for professional health service firms, the ability to search for information on products and/or services was found to be positively associated with perceived performance (Drennan, McColl, & Janet, 2010).

Nzuve & Njeru (2013) conducted a study on the perceived factors affecting performance among local authorities in Kenya. The study comprised of 10,600 employees, with 7% being from senior management, 27% from middle level management and 66% from lower level management. The study found out that the perceived factors that influenced performance management were understanding of performance management, stakeholder involvement, continuous monitoring, feedback, dissemination and learning from results, organizational culture and leadership commitment. Research supports a model of organizational justice in which distributive, procedural, and interactional justice have unique (or independent) relationships with organization-directed reactions and other types of employee attitudes and behaviors (Barling & Philips, 2010).

An increasingly large body of literature supports a two-way interaction model of organizational justice in which distributive justice works in tandem with procedural justice (Alexander & Ruderman, 2013). One way of describing the modal two-way interaction between distributive justice and procedural (or interactional) justice is as follows: Employees react most strongly to distributive justice when procedural (or interactional) justice is low. In other words, procedural and interactional justice may moderate the effects of distributive justice. In an extension of the literature regarding interactions between the forms of organizational justice, Drennan, McColl, & Janet (2010) supported a three-way interaction model in which employees reacted most strongly to distributive justice when both procedural
and interactional justice were low. These findings suggest that procedural and interactional justice can serve as substitutes for one another in moderating the effects of distributive justice.

2.6. Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined scholarly literature in relation to the concept of organizational justice and historical development of subject. The chapter has also discussed the three categories of organizational justice: distributive, procedural and interactional justice. The analyzed material, to an extent, demonstrated that there is a link between organizational justice and the three independent variables, procedural, distributive and interactional justice. The Chapter also discusses other variables linked to organizational justice: employee commitment, job satisfaction, employee engagement and rewards. The next chapter outlines the research methods and techniques used to conduct the study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the procedures used in carrying out this research. It provides details on the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures and data analysis methods.

3.2. Research Design

Research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and data analysis in a manner that aims to combine the relevance with the research purpose (Dul & Hak, 2015). It is a strategic framework for action that serves as a bridge between research questions and the execution, or implementation of the research strategy (Durrheim, 2017). According to Cooper and Schindler (2015) research design is a master plan that specifies methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing the needed information. The research design adopted for this study was a survey. Survey research is defined as the collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions (Check & Schutt, 2014). This design helps the researcher to understand more about opinions, and attitudes of the respondents (Check & Schutt, 2014). According to Dul & Hak (2015), a survey attempts to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables.

3.3. Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1. Population

A research population is defined as the total number of people who are grouped into a similar set of characteristics (Hollaway & Wheeler, 2014). The research population for this study was 700 employees in a leading high-end dining industry restaurant in Kenya.
respondents, 14.9% were in supervisory roles, while 192, 77.4% were in non-supervisor roles. This population was included because it provided the necessary information to adequately answer the research questions.

**Table 3.1: Population Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Staff</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supervisory Staff</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leading High-End Dining Restaurant in Kenya (2019)

3.3.2. Sampling Design

Sampling design entails how cases are selected for observation and represent the sampling design. It maps out the process that is followed to draw a sample of a study (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The sampling design entails sampling frame, sampling technique and sample size.

3.3.2.1. Sampling Frame

A sampling frame is defined as a complete list of eligible sampling units in the pool available to be sampled (Check & Schutt, 2014). According to Cooper and Schindler (2015), a sampling frame consists of variables of the population who meet the criteria to be in a sample and have a limit to the units that are suitable for inclusion in the sample. The sampling frame was made up of 700 employees as shown in the table below.
Table 3.2: Population Distribution across Branches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch Number</th>
<th>Branches within Nairobi</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Branch A</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Branch B</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Branch C</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Branch D</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Branch E</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Branch F</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Branch G</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Branch H</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Branch I</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Branch J</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Branch K</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Branch L</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Branch M</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Branch N</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Leading High-End Dining Restaurant in Kenya (2019)*

### 3.3.2.2. Sampling Technique

Sampling technique is the process of selecting elements from the population that represents the population that will be used in the study (Check & Schutt, 2014). A sample is a portion of the target population that is carefully selected to represent that population (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). Check & Schutt (2012) define sampling as the process of selecting a part of the population which will be used as a representation of the whole population in a study. This study uses stratified random sampling. Stratified random sampling technique is a method of sampling that involves the division of a population into smaller groups known as
strata (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2014). In stratified random sampling, the strata are formed based on members' shared attributes or characteristics.

### 3.3.2.3. Sample Size

A sample size as a small representation of the entire target population (Check & Schutt, 2014). Selection of a sample size is of paramount importance in a study because the selected sample should be able to provide accurate inference to the entire population. The study adopted Yamane (2007) to determine the sample size of the study.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(\epsilon^2)}
\]

Where

- \(n\) = Sample Size
- \(N\) = Study Population
- \(\alpha\) = Margin of Error (\(\alpha = 0.05\) at 95% confidence level)

Therefore,

\[
n = \frac{700}{1 + 700(0.05^2)} = 255
\]

This gave an estimated sample size of 255 employees which was distributed proportionately to the size of the population. The sample size and technique used were also guided by time available to select sample, collect and analyze the data.
Table 3.3: Sample Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branches within Nairobi</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Branch A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Branch B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Branch C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Branch D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Branch E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Branch F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Branch G</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Branch H</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Branch I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Branch J</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Branch K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Branch L</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Branch M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Branch N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>255</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leading High-End Dining Restaurant in Kenya (2019)

3.4. Data Collection

Data collection is the process of gathering and measuring information on targeted variables in an established systematic fashion which the enables the researcher to answer relevant questions and evaluate outcomes (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2014). Data collected is classified into two main classes: qualitative and quantitative data. Quantitative data can be counted, measured, and expressed using numbers (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2014). It is descriptive and conceptual. On the other hand, qualitative data is non-statistical and is mostly unstructured or semi-structured in nature (Hollaway & Wheeler, 2014). Sources of data are distinguished into two main groups: primary and secondary data.
According to Hollaway & Wheeler, primary data is collected by the researcher or investigator from first-hand sources, using methods like surveys, interviews, or experiments. They further define secondary data as data gathered from studies, surveys, or experiments that have been run by other people or for other research. This study used primary quantitative data using a structured questionnaire. The study uses a five-point Likert Scale to collect data on the three independent variables and the dependent variable. The questionnaire is structured into five sections (Appendix 1). The first section consists of general information on the respondents. The second question presents statements on procedural justice, third section presents interactional justice statements, fourth section distributive justice statements and the final section statements on perceived organization performance.

3.5. Research Procedures

The researcher sought authorization from restaurant management through an official letter. To establish validity of the data collection instrument, the researcher adapted questionnaire items from previous studies. The reliability of the instrument was checked using Cronbach’s Alpha. Reliability is the degree to which the instrument supplies consistent results and is a necessary contributor to validity of the instrument but not a sufficient condition for validity (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). Reliability pertains to the degree to which a measurement is free of random error and has the perspectives of stability (consistent results with repeated measurements), equivalence (how much error introduced by different samples of items being studied), and internal consistency (degree to which instrument items are homogeneous and reflect the same underlying constructs) (Check & Schutt, 2014).

Cronbach’s alpha is a measure used to assess the reliability, or internal consistency, of a set of scale or test items (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). The study aimed to reach a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.7. The alpha values range is between 0 and 1.0; the higher the alpha value, the higher the reliability among the items. To increase the alpha value of the instrument, the researcher may remove the item contributing to low alpha value from the instrument. According to George and Mallery (2013), the following rules of thumb apply in Cronbach
Alpha: alpha values higher than 9 are considered Excellent, > 0.8 Good, >0.7 Acceptable, > 0.6 Questionable, > 0.5 Poor, and < 0.5 Unacceptable. Procedural justice had a coefficient of 0.905, with interactional justice having a 0.917 coefficient, distributive justice at 0.858 and perceived organization performance at 0.912.

All variables depicted that the value of Cronbach's Alpha is above value of 0.65 and below 0.95. This represented high level of reliability and on this basis, the scales used is reliable for the set of questions in this study. The questionnaire was administered to the respondents during branch meetings. The research ensured compliance to ethical requirements. No harm, risk come to the participants. The researcher obtained a letter of authority from USIU before starting data collection.

In addition, the researcher obtained research permit form NACOSTI prior to data collection. The participation was on voluntary basis and no consequences befell participants that chose not to give information. The researcher used a hard copy questionnaire to collect data. Anonymity was ensured as there was no provision for names.

3.6. Data Analysis

Data analysis method is the process by which data is reviewed, cleaned and displayed with the aim of highlighting useful information, suggesting conclusions and supporting decision making (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The collected questionnaires were reviewed for completeness and accuracy. Missing values were checked and all the responses missing more than 10% were disregarded from analysis. Since the collected data was quantitative in nature, it was analyzed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences® (SPSS) software platform. A summary of the results was obtained, and inferences drawn from the data. Descriptive Statistics was used to describe the data through summaries and trend analysis. These were the percentages, mean and standard deviation. For the inferential statistics, the study employed Pearson’s bivariate correlation and regression analyses.
To test the hypotheses, regression coefficients were used. Correlation refers to the strength of an association between two variables (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). A strong or high correlation means that two or more variables have a strong relationship with each other while a weak or low, correlation means that the variables are hardly related. On the other hand, regression analysis is a statistical tool for the investigation of the relationship between variables (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). Regression analyses requires normally distributed data, or at least the non-normality should not be severe, with no significant outlier observations. Observations should also be independent, and would involve the testing of a hypothesis between variables, with the consequent rejection of the null hypothesis if the p-score is less than α (α=0.1, 0.05, or 0.01 depending on the level of significance of the test) (Check & Schutt, 2014). Whereas correlation analysis indicates the strength and direction of relationships between two variables under test, it does not indicate whether one variable influences the outcome of the other (Babbie, 2013). In view of this shortcoming on the correlation analysis, it was decided to use regression analysis, which enables explaining and predicting the relationship between a predictor variable and the outcome variable (Cresswell, 2003). Linear regression was used to determine the effect of each of the independent variables (procedural, distributive and interactional justice) on perceived performance. The linear regression model used was expressed as:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_i X_i + \varepsilon \]

Where

- \( y \): Represents the independent variable. It is the predicated value of Y for a selected value of \( X_i \)
- \( \beta_0 \): Represents the estimated value of Y when \( X_i \) is zero. It is the Y-intercept
- \( \beta_i \): Represents the proportionate change in Y for every change in \( X_i \)
- \( X_i \): Represents any value of the independent variable selected
- \( \varepsilon \): Represents the error term
Specific to this study, the regression will be as follows:

\[ y \text{ (Perceived Performance)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Distributive Justice} + \beta_2 \text{Interactional Justice} + \beta_2 \text{Procedural Justice} \]

Finally, a summary of the results and conclusions were prepared so as to compare to the literature review for any consistencies and inconsistencies or to establish areas of agreement and disagreement. Dominant themes were identified through systematic sorting of data aligned to the following research objectives: (a) Establish the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organization performance; (b) Establish the relationship between distributive justice and perceived organization performance; and (c) Establish the relationship between interactional justice and perceived organization performance.

3.7. Chapter Summary

The chapter details the research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods used to carry out the study, research procedures and data analysis methods employed during the study. The population and sample size of the study is 700 and 255 respondents respectively. A structured questionnaire consisting of a Likert scale was designed to collect primary data. It was then analyzed using SPSS to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the results from the study on the relationships between procedural justice, interactional justice, and distributive justice on perceived organization performance. The chapter is divided into several sections: the first section gives general information about the respondents, the second gives demographic information, while the last four sections provide information on descriptive statistics, reliability statistics, correlation analysis and multiple regression respectively. A chapter summary is provided in the last section.

4.2. General Information

Response rate refers to the number of survey responses divided by number of individuals to whom the survey was administered (Check & Schutt, 2014). The sample size for the study was 255 respondents. Two hundred and sixty questionnaires were administered, out of which 248 were returned and used for analysis. The study response rate was 97% which is acceptable.
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Figure 4.1: Study Response Rate
4.3. Demographic Information

This section presents the results of the general information of the respondents which included gender, age range, years’ of service and ranking in supervisory versus non-supervisory roles.

4.3.1. Gender of Respondents

The gender distribution among the respondents was 52% female and 48% male.
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Figure 4.2: Employee Gender Breakdown

4.3.2. Number of Employees per Age range

Findings show that of a total of 248 respondents, 105(42.3%) were in the age bracket of 18 - 25 years, 104 (41.9%) between 26-35 years, 33 (13.3%) between 36 - 45 years, 4 (1.6%) in the 46 – 65 range, with only 2 (0.8%) above 66 - 75 years.
4.3.3. Education Level

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of education. The responses are as shown in Figure 4.4 below. The highest percentage of respondents had attained diploma level education, (65% representing 166 respondents), 25% (64 respondents) had degree level education, and 10% (26 respondents) secondary level education.

Figure 4.3: Number of Employees per Age Range

Figure 4.4: Respondents’ Education Level
4.3.4. Tenure of Employees

The research sought to collect data from respondents in different tenure categories. 72 (29%) of respondents had worked in the restaurant for less than 1 year, 78 (31.5%) for 1-2 years, 65 (26.2%) for 3-4 years, 27 (10.9%) for 5-6 years, 4 (1.6%) for 9-10 years. Finally, 2 (0.8%) of respondents had worked in the restaurant for more than 15 years. The findings are attributed to high turnover rates experienced in the Dining Industry in Kenya.

Figure 4.5: Employee Tenure in Years

4.3.5. Supervisory Roles

Lastly, the respondents were asked whether they had any supervisory roles in their branches. 48 respondents, 19% were in supervisory roles, while 200, 81% in non-supervisory roles. This was important to the study, as the respondents in non-supervisory roles gave feedback on their perceptions on procedures, distribution of outcomes and Interactional justice.
4.4. Descriptive Statistics

The purpose of descriptive statistics is to enable the researcher meaningfully describe a distribution of scores or measurements using indices or statistics (Check & Schutt, 2014). The type of statistics or indices used depends on the types of variables in the study and the scale of measurements. The study used mean, average and deviations to present the study findings, as presented below:

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organization Performance</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 above shows that 248 respondents completed the survey with the mean of 4.37 out of 7.00 on a seven-point Likert scale with a standard deviation of 1.455. Interactional justice shows a mean of 2.76 on a seven-point Likert scale with a standard deviation of 1.1595 for the 248 respondents. Procedural justice recorded a mean of 2.48 and standard deviation of 1.137 and number of respondents being 248. Finally, distributive justice recorded a mean of 2.71, standard deviation of 1.104, and number of respondents at 248.

4.5. Reliability Statistics

Reliability of the data collection instrument was evaluated through Cronbach Alpha. Reliability pertains to the degree to which a measurement is free of random error and has the perspectives of stability (consistent results with repeated measurements), equivalence (how much error introduced by different samples of items being studied), and internal consistency (degree to which instrument items are homogeneous and reflect the same underlying constructs) (Check & Schutt, 2014).

Table 4.2: Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organization Performance</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedural justice had a coefficient of 0.905, with interactional justice having a 0.917 coefficient, distributive justice at 0.858 and perceived organization performance at 0.912. All variables depicted that the value of Cronbach’s Alpha is above value of 0.65 and below 0.95. This represented high level of reliability and on this basis, the scales used is reliable for the set of questions in this study.
4.6. Correlation Analysis

Correlation refers to the strength of an association between two variables (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). A strong or high correlation means that two or more variables have a strong relationship with each other while a weak or low, correlation means that the variables are hardly related. Correlation coefficient can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while a value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value of 0.00 means that there is no relationship between variables being tested (Check & Schutt, 2014). The most widely used types of correlation coefficient is the Pearson Correlation. This analysis assumes that the two variables being analyzed are measured on at least interval scales.

Table 4.3: Correlations Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interactional Justice</th>
<th>Procedural Justice</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Perceived Organizational Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactional Justice</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.649**</td>
<td>.688**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural Justice</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.649**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.690**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distributive Justice</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.688**</td>
<td>.690**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Organization Performance</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.535**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation analysis results in the table above revealed that there is a strong and positive correlation between interactional justice and perceived organizational performance (r=0.564, and p<0.05).
The other two independent variables, procedural justice and distributive justice also have a positive significant correlation with perceived organizational performance, with $r=0.521$, $p<0.05$, and $r=0.535$ and $p<0.05$ respectively.

4.7. Multiple Regression

Regression analysis is a statistical tool for the investigation of the relationship between variables (Cooper & Schindler, 2015). Regression analysis allows a researcher to model, examine and explore spatial relationship, and can help explain the factors behind observed patterns. Regression analysis is also used for prediction. The model summary provides the coefficient of determination ($R^2$), which shows proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the independent variable, and correlation coefficient ($R$) shows the degree of association between the dependent and independent variables. In this study, regression analysis was used to explain and predict the relationship between the predictor variables (procedural, interactional and distributive justice) and the outcome variable (perceived performance).

Table 4.4: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.615(^a)</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice

In the results presented above, the R-Square of 0.379 indicates a strong relationship between the three independent variables of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, and Interactional Justice on Perceived Organizational Performance. This means that 37.9\% of the variations in Perceived Organizational Performance can be explained by the independent variables: Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice.
Table 4.5: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>128.377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.792</td>
<td>31.908</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>210.555</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338.933</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Perceived Organizational Performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice, Interactional Justice

Table 4.5 above provides the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicate that the overall model was statistically significant (p=0.000, which is less than 0.05). Further, the results imply that the independent variables are good predictors of perceived organizational performance, as shown by the F-test (f = 31.908, p=0.000) and therefore, the model fits reasonably.

Table 4.6: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>7.871</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>2.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>1.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>2.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Perc Org Perform

The optimal model was:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon \]
Where;

\[ y = \text{Perceived Organizational Performance} \]

\[ \beta_0 = \text{Constant} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{Interactional Justice} \]

\[ \beta_1 = \text{Proportionate change in perceived performance for every unit change in interactional justice} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{Procedural Justice} \]

\[ \beta_2 = \text{Proportionate change in perceived performance for every unit change in procedural justice} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{Distributive Justice} \]

\[ \beta_3 = \text{Proportionate change in perceived performance for every unit change in distributive justice} \]

Therefore,

\[
\text{Perceived Organizational Performance} = 2.027 + 0.367 \times \text{Interactional Justice} + 0.232 \times \text{Procedural Justice} + 0.276 \times \text{Distributive Justice}.
\]

This means that for every unit increase in the value of interactional justice, it is expected that perceived organizational performance will increase by 0.367 (B=0.367, p=0.003). The relationship between interactional justice and perceived organizational performance is therefore statistically significant. For every unit change in Procedural Justice, it is expected that perceived organizational performance will increase by 0.232 (B=0.232, p=0.063). The relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational performance is therefore statistically insignificant. For every unit change in distributive justice, it is expected that perceived organizational performance will increase by 0.276 (B=0.276,
The relationship between distributive justice and perceived organizational performance is therefore statistically significant. As such, an improvement in interactional justice and distributive justice would lead to a corresponding improvement in perceived organizational performance. However, an improvement in procedural justice may not lead to a significant improvement in perceived organizational performance.

4.8. Chapter Summary

This chapter provides the results and findings of the study with respect to the collected data from the respondents. The findings based on the background of the respondents are given in the first section followed by findings of specific variables that is Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Interactional Justice. Finally, the chapter covered inferential statistics which included correlation statistics and regression analysis. The next chapter focuses on the conclusions and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents discussions, conclusion and recommendation of the study, with the objective of discussing the usefulness and applicability of the research. The chapter first presents a summary of the study. The discussion, conclusion, recommendations for improvements for the study are presented in line with the study research objectives. Recommendations for further research are also presented in this chapter.

5.2. Summary

The study examined the effect of organization justice on perceived performance in the high-end dining industry in Kenya. The study had three research objectives: establish the relationship between procedural justice and perceived organization performance; establish the relationship between interactional justice and perceived organization performance; and establish the relationship between distributive justice and perceived organization performance.

The population constituted employees of a leading high-end dining restaurant in Kenya who were 700 employees. The sample size of the study was 255 respondents. A structured self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data. These included frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviation, correlation, and multiple regression analysis. The data was presented in figures, tables, and supported by the researcher’s interpretation. Of the 255 questionnaires distributed, 248 responses were received, a 97% response rate which is acceptable. 248 respondents completed the survey with the mean of 4.37 out of 7.00 on a seven-point Likert scale with a standard deviation of 1.455. 52% of the respondents were female and 48% male. Of the 248 respondents, 248 respondents, 105(42.3%) were in the age bracket of 18 -25 years, 104 (41.9%) between 26-35 years, 33 (13.3%) between 36 - 45 years, 4 (1.6%) in the 46 – 65 range, with only 2 (0.8%) above 66 - 75 years. The highest percentage
of respondents had attained diploma level education, (65% representing 166 respondents), 25% (64 respondents) had degree level education, and 10% (26 respondents) secondary level education. The research collected data from respondents in different tenure categories. 72 (29%) of respondents had worked in the restaurant for less than 1 year, 78(31.5%) for 1-2 years. 65 (26.2%) for 3-4 years, 27 (10.9%) for 5-6 years, 4 (1.6%) for 9-10 years. Finally, 2 (0.8%) of respondents had worked in the restaurant for more than 15 years. Finally, 2 (0.8%) of respondents had worked in the restaurant for more than 15 years. The findings are attributed to high turnover rates experienced in the Dining Industry in Kenya. 37 respondents, 14.9% were in supervisory roles, while 192, 77.4% were in non-supervisory roles.

This dynamic of most of the respondents being in non-supervisory roles enabled the respondents contextualize the questions on their perceptions regarding organization justice. Interactional justice shows a mean of 2.76 on a seven-point Likert scale with a standard deviation of 1.1595 for the 248 respondents. Procedural justice recorded a mean of 2.48 and standard deviation of 1.137 and number of respondents being 248. Finally, distributive justice recorded a mean of 2.71, standard deviation of 1.104, and number of respondents at 248. Reliability of the study was confirmed using Cronbach’s Alpha. Procedural justice had a coefficient of 0.905, with interactional justice a 0.917 coefficient, distributive justice at 0.858 and perceived organization performance at 0.912. All variables depicted a Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.65 and below 0.95.

This represented high level of reliability and on this basis, the scales used is reliable for the set of questions in this study. The correlation analysis results showed a strong and positive correlation between interactional justice and perceived organizational performance (r=0.564, and p<0.05). The other two independent variables, procedural justice and distributive justice also have a positive significant correlation with perceived organizational performance, with r=0.521, p<0.05, and r=0.535 and p<0.05 respectively. The Regression Coefficients showed that for every unit increase in the value of interactional justice, perceived organizational performance increases by 0.367 (B=0.367, p=0.003).
The study therefore concludes that the relationship between interactional justice and perceived organizational performance is therefore statistically significant. On the other hand, for every unit change in procedural justice, perceived organizational performance increases by 0.232 ($B=0.232$, $p=0.063$). The relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational performance is therefore statistically insignificant. Lastly, for every unit change in distributive justice, perceived organizational performance increases by 0.276 ($B=0.276$, $p=0.037$).

The relationship between distributive justice and perceived organizational performance is therefore statistically significant. The study therefore concludes that distributive justice and interactional justice have a positive and statistically significant relationship with perceived organizational performance, based on their p-values being less than 0.05. Procedural justice has a positive relationship with perceived organizational performance, but statistically insignificant since the p-value is greater than 0.05 (i.e. $p=0.063>0.05$). As such, an improvement in interactional justice and distributive justice would lead to a corresponding improvement in perceived organizational performance. However, an improvement in procedural justice may not lead to a significant improvement in perceived organizational performance.

5.3. Discussion

This section presents the discussions of each study variable i.e. procedural justice, interactional justice and distributive justice.

5.3.1. Procedural Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The study findings showed that there is a strong relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational performance ($B=0.232$). The findings are aligned with Baldwin (2015) who asserts that in an organizational setting, the importance of procedure is essential and led to the development of the voice principle which entails giving employees an
opportunity to submit information they have and voice their concerns before decisions that affect them are made. Baldwin’s study also states that this can be employed in situations such as the general day-to-day work life, management practice on formal and one-off procedures such as disciplinary procedures. The study findings were of the view that in any organizational setting, there must be a strong commitment by management for maintenance of systems to ensure that procedural justice is fostered.

The findings are similar to Cohen-Charash & Spector (2015) who argued that when procedures in an organization are characteristic of certain types of normally accepted principles, employees perceive the procedures are just. He, Zhu and Zheng (2013) also had similar findings in their study on how procedural justice impacts on employee performance and attitude. Their study concluded that organizations are increasingly trying to find solutions on how best to motivate employees and make them more engaged in their work. One of the more sensitive areas of procedural justice has been in the performance appraisal process. Given the positive relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational performance, it is important for managers to apply fairness in the appraisal process.

The study conclusion is supported by Greenberg (2017) who defined give principles of determining fair appraisal of employees. These are: soliciting and using employee input, ability to challenge evaluations, rater's familiarity with ratees' work, and two-way communication during the appraisal interview and the consistent application of evaluation standards. He further argues that sustained study of procedural justice is important in that it can help in the linkage of diverse organizational phenomena such as compensation programs and grievance-resolution procedures. However, the study findings are not aligned to Lau and Lim (2002) who were cautious about drawing a direct link between procedural justice and performance; choosing instead to state that the relationship between the two may be more complex than a simple direct relationship. Nonetheless, they argued that if managers can apply rules fairly and consistently and base rewards on performance and merit devoid of
bias, then it might lead to higher satisfaction, commitment and involvement. Procedural justice principles can therefore be applied to drive outcomes broader than performance, such as employee motivation and job satisfaction. However, despite the misalignment to Lau and Lim (2002), McFarlin and Sweeney (2016) state that fairness in a firm’s procedures may have a greater impact on organizational commitment than the fairness of outcomes (distributive justice).

5.3.2. Distributive Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The study concludes that employees who perceive unfairness in distribution of rewards decrease their contribution towards organization performance. Distributive justice has a strong relationship with the dependent variable, perceived organizational performance (B=0.276). The study findings are aligned to Cohen-Charash and Spector (2015) who argued that distribution of outcomes is an integral part of decision-making process in an organization, and has the ability to influence behaviour in the cognitive and affective sense. In their study, they argue that distributive justice also affects emotions. When decisions are seen to be unfair, employees may experience emotions such as sadness, anger, pride or guilt (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2015). In the context of this study, perceptions of sub-optimal distributive justice may affect employee emotions at the workplace, affecting their attitude when serving customers in the restaurants, and consequently performance of the restaurant.

The findings are also in line with Pillai, Williams and Tan (2001) who indicated that lack of distributive justice can cause employees to lower their job performance. Additionally, Pillai, Williams and Tan (2001) stated that other effects that it can have include reduced cooperation with colleagues, stealing, stress, reduced job commitment and satisfaction. In the context of this study, it is essential for managers to understand employee perceptions of distributive justice, with the objective of ensuring these perceptions do not affect work outcomes. The study findings are aligned to Olsaretti (2018), who extensively discussed the concept of distributive justice and argued that justice consists of giving every individual his or her due, or treating similar circumstances alike. She describes distributive justice as the
distribution of benefits and burdens to people, and entails balancing competing claims that are made in respect to benefits that are up for distribution. The conclusion of this study is also aligned to Biswas, Varma and Ramaswani (2013), who studied the effect of distributive justice on employee engagement. They argued that employees assess equity in organizational outcomes through comparative reference to an individual or group. From their study, it is important for managers and organizations to assess an individual’s input-output ratio vis-à-vis the rewards that accrue to a referent group or individual.

5.3.3. Interactional Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The study concludes that perceived organization performance is enhanced when situations are clearly, truthfully and adequately explained and employees are treated with courtesy, dignity and respect. The study findings showed that there is a strong relationship between interactional justice and perceived organizational performance (B=0.367). This is aligned to the findings of Cohen-Charash and Spector (2015) who argued that this form of justice is characterized by cognitive, affective and behavioral reactions towards superiors. The authors are quick to point out that scholars have identified that poor interactional justice experiences may evoke negative reactions.

The finding also relate to Barling and Phillips (2010) who concluded that interactional justice did influence withdrawal behaviors, trust in management and affective commitment. In their research, Barling and Philips (2010) advise organizations, to not only focus on outcomes and formal procedures, but to also pay attention to the perception of justice as is inherent in interpersonal interactions between employees and their supervisors or managers. The results of this study are aligned to Dai and Xie (2016), who concluded that when employees feel that they are being treated with fairness by their leaders, they come passionate and increase their morale. They underscore the importance of the source of information in determining the level and nature of interactive justice. More specifically, the personalities and behaviour of leaders determines the perceptions of interactive justice among subordinates. The study findings however differ from Ismail, Mashkuri, Sulaiman and Hock (2011) whose research
reveals that there is a positive and a weak relationship between interactional justice and employee performance. The weak and a positive relationship is also present in relation to organizational commitment and withdrawal behaviour. There is however a strong relationship between interactional justice and agent evaluation of authority and job satisfaction. In their study, they recommended that the behaviour of management should be characterized by politeness, respect and honesty. Interactional justice also has the potential to enhance unity amongst managers in an organization.

Findings and results are also aligned Mashkuri, Sulaiman and Hock (2011) who stated that employees are often sensitive to the quality of interactional treatment received from their managers. They also argue that the ability of a manager to use fair treatment in, for instance, determining the amount of pay and appreciating employees’ constructive suggestions goes a long way in enhancing perceptions of positive interactional justice. This may boost job satisfaction in organizations that observe principles of interactional justice. It also decreases employee misconceptions. Additionally, the findings align to Shin, Seo, Shapiro and Taylor (2015), who concluded that employees’ early commitment to change is positively and significantly associated with their later commitment, if they receive appropriate support from their leaders during change

5.4. Conclusions

The findings from this study are essential for leaders in Kenya, and across Africa in the following ways: (a) Understanding the impact of procedures, interactions and distribution of outcomes on employee perceptions of justice; and (b) Based on the linkages and relationships among the independent variables and the dependent variable, management can adopt justice principles that drive desired organizational outcomes.
5.4.1. Procedural Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The fact that the relationship between procedural justice and perceived performance is statistically insignificant means that employees would not necessarily perform better as a result of perceived justice in processes within an organization. This conclusion may however differ across cultural contexts, especially in societies where procedures, or the means of arriving at outcomes, are emphasized on. These findings and conclusions are essential in understanding how management decisions impact desired outcomes such engagement and commitment.

Inasmuch as the research shows that there is an insignificant relationship between procedural justice and perceived performance, McFarlin and Sweeney (2016) concluded from their research that the fairness in a firm’s procedures may have a greater impact on organizational commitment than the fairness of outcomes (distributive justice). This means that employees may continue to see an organization in good light even if confronted with an unfavorable outcome, such as low pay, as long as they perceive the organization’s procedures to be fair. It is therefore pertinent for managers and leaders to understand the interplay of the three independent variables (procedural, distributive and interaction justice) and the perceived importance of each against the other.

An in depth understanding of this would help leaders understand which justice principles to emphasize on in an organization setting. These findings are most interesting in underscoring the relationship between cultural nuances and employee perceptions of justice. In Kenya for example, employees may not care so much for the procedures in arriving at outcomes, as long as the outcomes (distributive justice), and the interactions in arriving at the outcomes (interactional justice), are perceived as fair. A manager must therefore seek to understand which justice principles employees lay more emphasis on, and effectively re-align procedures and policies in a manner that addresses employee concerns.
Based on recommendations from Pillai, Williams and Tan (2001), procedural justice is a crucial predictor of commitment, satisfaction and trust. Based on the strong relationship between procedural justice and perceived organizational performance, the study concludes that managers should apply rules fairly and consistently and base rewards on performance and merit devoid of bias. Effective application of these principles may lead to higher satisfaction, commitment and involvement. Additionally, managers should an active part of the decision-making process.

5.4.2. Distributive Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The study also shows a strong and positive relationship between distributive justice and perceived performance. This point to the age-old management dilemma of the extent to which an organization can reasonably meet employee needs in distribution of rewards. The study underscores the importance of ensuring that there is fair allocation of outputs to employees in an organizational set up. One of the ways this can be explored is assessing outputs based on level of employee input. Employee perceptions of fairness in distribution of outcomes ties in very closely with employee engagement. Consequently, low engagement more often than not leads to increased turnover.

On this basis, one may argue that high turnover rates in high-end dining restaurants is linked to low employee engagement levels. Managers in these establishments must therefore look beyond basic metrics of restaurant performance, e.g. sales, cost management and customer satisfaction, and understand internal levels of employee engagement. However, while most organizations struggle with finding this balance, it is important to adopt distributive justice principles that ensure that an employee’s ratio of their outcomes to inputs and the ratio of others’ outcomes to inputs as equal. In the context of this study, while a restaurant distributive outcomes may be relatively lower than other industries, it is important for management to: (a) communicate their procedure and policy in distribution of outcomes, (b) ensure there is fairness in an employee’s input/output ratio, against that of their peers, and (c) create an open communication channel to give employees comfort that justice principles
have indeed been applied in distribution of outcomes. Managers must consciously be aware of perceived levels of distributive justice, and measure employee perceptions of on this, as lack of distributive justice can cause employees to lower their job performance, reduce cooperation with colleagues, reduced job commitment and satisfaction. This dynamic is underscored by the fact that failing to make an equitable decision in relation to the above, may lead to the emanation of doubts as to the competence of the management. Organizations that are devoid of distributive justice may have declined employee performance, in the form of task performance, citizenship behaviour and counterproductive behaviour. The importance of this is underscored by the fact that lack of distributive justice leads employees to experience emotions such as sadness, anger, pride or guilt. It also determines an employee’s attitude towards a job, including job satisfaction.

5.4.2 Interactional Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The strong and positive relationship between interactional justice and perceived performance points to our need for relationships and positive relationships at the workplace. More specifically, the personalities and behaviour of leaders determines the perceptions of interactive justice among subordinates. These are: truthfulness, respect, propriety and justification. Leaders must communicate must in an accurate manner, and information ought to be presented in an open and forthright manner. Leaders should also treat employees with courtesy and accord them dignity. At no point must there be recourse to insults.

In the context of this study, managers must therefore be self-aware on their personalities and behaviours, and intentionally work towards adapting desirable leadership practices. When employees feel that they are being treated with fairness by their leaders, they become passionate and have high morale. This closely links to research that shows Africans are largely a collectivist culture. On the other hand, individualistic cultures may not place as much importance on interactional justice at the workplace. Additionally, in the age of digital media, leaders must also create a sense of interactional justice by, to the most reasonable
extent, limited electronic monitoring. Electronic performance monitoring and control systems (EPMCSs) have raised fairness and privacy concerns in many organizations. Specifically, computer monitoring is perceived as the most procedurally unjust. Leaders must therefore be be cautious in the type of monitoring used.

5.5. Recommendations

5.5.1. Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1. Procedural Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The study recommends that organizations should: (a) clearly communicate principles applied in application of procedures justice, (b) address aspects of procedural justice that employees are most sensitive to. These include but are not limited to promotions, disciplinary procedures, and performance appraisals, (c) communicate outcomes in application of procedural justice principles. These three aspects would enable employees compare application of procedural justice in an individual, peer and group context. Managers should also seek to understand the extent to which application of procedural justice impacts on desired outcomes. In some cultures, employees may not place as much emphasis on the procedure, as long as the outcomes (rewards) are perceived to be fair. Understanding these nuances across different organizations, job grades and cultures enables organizations adopt optimal justice principles.

5.5.1.2. Distributive Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

Conclusions from the study show that fairness in distribution of outcomes is an integral part of decision-making process in an organization, with the possibility of influencing desired outcomes such as employee motivation, engagement and performance. Therefore, the study recommends that organizations should ensure that employees have a perceived sense of distributive justice by providing (a) communicating procedures and policies in distribution of outcomes, (b) ensuring there is fairness in an employee’s input/output ratio, against that of their peers, and (c) creating an open communication channel to give employees comfort that justice principles have indeed been applied in distribution of outcomes.
In the context of this study, high-end dining restaurants that adopt these principles may have lower employee turnover, improved engagement and motivation, and ultimately, improved performance. Organizations that do not proactively manage and adopt principles of distributive justice end up negatively influence job performance by reducing the output of employees. For an organization’s leadership team, adoption of distributive justice principles includes striking a fair balance between an employee’s input and their output. The inputs may include hard work, skill, acceptance, enthusiasm, while outputs may include salary, recognition, promotions and bonus.

5.5.1.3. Interactional Justice and its effect on Perceived Performance

The study found out that employees attach themselves to supervisors that are fair in communication and relationships. The fairness of interactions and communication boost employee’s confidence, impacting positively on employee’s commitment to supervisor and making employees see themselves as part owners in the organization and therefore, the study recommends that the organizational managers or supervisors should communicate and relate properly with employees, in order to satisfy their customers and stakeholders. In the context of this study, managers must therefore be self-aware on their personalities and behaviours, and intentionally work towards adapting desirable leadership practices.

Managers must consciously adapt to and implement interactional justice principles, as this directly impacts on job satisfaction, as well as the potential to enhance unity amongst managers in an organization. In the context of this study, adoption of interactional justice principles reduces withdrawal behaviors, and increases trust in management and affective commitment. In this age of constant change within organizations, leaders need to adopt interactional justice to fuel employee support to change initiatives.
5.5.2. Recommendations for Further Research

This study brings out interesting perspectives on perceptions of justice in the High-End Dining Industry in Kenya. An area for further study would be comparing how these results vary across industries, for example manufacturing, financial services, public sector, among other industries. Additionally, further research is recommended in comparing these results to different cultures in Africa, and the World. This would benefit organizations, in as far as understanding nuances in application of different justice principles across cultures. Based on the cultural differences, a leader would subsequently apply different justice principles, guided by what is most important to the culture in question. The study also recommends an exploratory study of justice in the public sector, in terms of levels of taxation and other social charges (inputs) and benefits that accrue to the public in the form merit goods and services. This is most relevant, especially in an age where political upheavals such as the Arab Uprising are the norm.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: COVER LETTER

Maryanne Muchemi
P.O Box 15451 – 00100
Nairobi, Kenya

2nd February 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH WORK

I am a graduate student at United States International University (USIU) pursuing a Master’s of Science degree in Management and Organization Development. In partial fulfilment of the degree, I am undertaking a research project on “The effect of Organization Justice on Employee Performance in the High-End Dining Industry in Kenya”. The research will therefore provide information on the effects of organization justice on performance within your restaurant, and guide management on areas of improvement. This is not a test, and there are no right or wrong answers, it is your views that matter. Data obtained through this exercise will be strictly used for academic purposes only. We guarantee that your individual responses will be treated with ultimate confidentiality. Your identity shall remain concealed and the information collected will be analyzed and reported as group data. You are therefore encouraged to answer each question honestly and truthfully.

Thank you in advance.

Yours Sincerely,

Maryanne Muchemi
APPENDIX III: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Your company cares deeply about employee wellbeing and feedback. In order to hear from you, your organization partnered with researchers from the United States International University-Africa to hear your opinions, thoughts, and perceptions. Your Information that you provide shall be kept strictly confidential and nothing that may identify you personally shall ever be revealed. Your answers will NEVER be identified to you specifically. All answers and comparisons will be kept secret from ever identifying you individually. YOUR PRIVACY WILL BE PROTECTED AT ALL TIMES. This is also NOT a performance review for the top management, supervisors, the company, employees, or you. All answers stay ONLY with researchers and research workers. Once the research is finished, your paper answers will be destroyed in accordance with United States International University-Africa policies. Summary answers for whole teams as a group will be shared with management and will help train and improve the company.

Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is your age range?</td>
<td>18 – 25; 26 – 35; 36 – 45; 45 – 55; 55 – 65; 65 – 75; Over 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please circle a range)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your gender?</td>
<td>MALE or FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please circle answer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many years have you worked for This Company?</td>
<td>Less than 1; 1 - 2; 3 – 4; 5 – 6; 7 – 8; 9 – 10; 11 – 15;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68
you been an employee of this company?
(Please circle answer)

4. In addition to being an employee, do you also currently serve as a supervisor?
(Please circle answer)

Think about the different levels of this company as follows:

**Top management**: means the senior management team of the company.

**Supervisor**: means your direct boss here at the company.

For each statement below, circle the number that best describes your opinion using the numbers and descriptions found in each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 to a</th>
<th>To a</th>
<th>To a</th>
<th>To a</th>
<th>To a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Extent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.

a. Does **top management** treat you in a polite manner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Does your supervisor treat you in a polite manner?

2.

a. Does top management treat you with dignity?  
   1  2  3  4  5

b. Does your supervisor treat you with dignity?

3.

a. Does top management treat you with respect?  
   1  2  3  4  5

b. Does your supervisor treat you with respect?

4.

a. Does top management refrain from improper remarks or comments?  
   1  2  3  4  5

b. Does your supervisor refrain from improper remarks or comments?
a. Is top management straight-forward when communicating with you? 1 2 3 4 5
b. Is your supervisor straight-forward when communicating with you?

6.

a. Does top management explain decision-making procedures thoroughly? 1 2 3 4 5
b. Does your supervisor explain decision-making procedures thoroughly?

7.

a. Are top management’s explanations regarding procedures reasonable? 1 2 3 4 5
b. Are your supervisor’s explanations regarding procedures reasonable?
8. 

a. Does top management communicate details in a timely manner? 

b. Does your supervisor communicate details in a timely manner?

Now, please consider the procedures your supervisor uses to make decisions about evaluations, promotions, and rewards.

9. Are you able to express your views during those procedures?

10. Can you influence the decisions arrived at by those procedures?

11. Are those procedures applied
12. Are those procedures free of bias?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Are those procedures based on accurate information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Are you able to appeal the decisions arrived at by those procedures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Do those procedures uphold ethical and moral standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Consider the outcomes you receive from your supervisor, including their evaluations, promotions, and rewards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a Very Small Extent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Small Extent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Moderate Extent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Large Extent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Very Large Extent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do the outcomes of evaluations, promotions, and rewards reflect the effort that you have put into your work?

17. Are the outcomes of evaluations, promotions, and rewards appropriate for the work you have completed?

18. Do the outcomes of evaluations, promotions, and rewards reflect what you have contributed to your work?

19. Has your supervisor refrained from improper remarks or comments during the process of evaluation, promotions, and rewards?

20. Are the outcomes of evaluations, promotions, and rewards justified, given your performance?
Think about this company only and not any other company or organization that you may work or worked for.

For each statement below, circle the number that best describes your opinion using the numbers and descriptions found in each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. The quality of products, services or programs is above industry average.

22. The development of new products, services or programs is above
industry average.

23. Our ability to attract essential employees is above industry average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Our ability to retain essential employees is above industry average.

25. The satisfaction of customers or clients is above
industry average.

26. The relationship between management and other employees is above industry average.

27. Relations among employees in general are above industry average.

28. My organization’s marketing performance over the past 3 years is above
industry average.

29. My organization’s growth in sales over the past 3 years is above industry average.

30. My organization’s profitability over the past 3 years is above industry average.

31. My organization’s market shares over the past 3 years is above
industry average.

End of Survey