



MEDIATING EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL: A PILOT STUDY

***DR. AHMAD A. MAIYAKI **MRS LAMI MUSA YARO**

**Department of Business Administration and Entrepreneurship, Bayero University
Kano, Nigeria **Department of Business Administration, National Open University
of Nigeria, Abuja*

ABSTRACT

The paper test a small amount of sample data on the mediating effect of organizational justice on the relationship between job satisfaction and performance appraisal among secondary school teachers in Kaduna state. In conducting survey, it is paramount to examine the instruments to be used such as content and face validity, reliability and the normality of data need to be tested for consistency and reliability base on the on revised version by expert which comprises some Academicians and head teachers, a few data were analyzed using the statistical software SPSS version 25. The results reveal that the instrument is reliable for data collection and processing. In addition the data for pilot study show evidence of reasonable regularity.

Keywords: *Organizational justice, performance appraisal, job satisfaction. Pilot Study.*

Introduction

Performance appraisal is an important management tool for measuring employee job performance, clarifying personnel decisions such as promotion, demotion, or retention, as well as helping develop employee capacity through providing feedback or training. It also contributes to advancing supervisor–employee understanding and reinforces organizational values (Daley, 1992). Moreover, effective performance appraisal is believed to motivate employees to strive for performance improvement by linking appraisals to performance-contingent rewards (Perry, Petrakis, & Miller, 1989). In spite of considerable agreement that organizations can benefit from using performance appraisal, when it comes to its practice, its theorized benefits appear to remain under-fulfilled in some cases. Some studies found that neither supervisors nor employees support using it (Berman, Bowman, West, & Van Wart, 2019; S. E. Kim

& Rubianty, 2011). Especially in the public sector, anecdotal observations and survey findings indicate that the extrinsic component embedded in performance appraisal may cause a crowding out effect on employee motivation, resulting in perceived stress, demotivation, or even burnout (Kellough & Nigro, 2002). In addition, further evidence shows decreasing confidence in the efficacy, integrity, and fairness of public performance appraisal (Kellough & Nigro, 2002; Pearce & Perry, 1983). For example, T. Kim and Holzer (2016) explains the prevalent negative attitudes toward performance appraisal among federal employees. In his survey, some employees expressed concerns that their performance has not been fairly rated, whereas some supervisory-level employees perceive providing performance feedback as conflicting with other duties, and is therefore a distasteful chore. Moreover, the majority of the employees in this survey also believe that there is a quota system for performance ratings. Despite such problems and challenges, and given the lack of alternatives, the effective use of performance appraisals and their implementation remains a challenging task for public managers (S. E. Kim & Rubianty, 2011; Kuvaas, 2011). Similarly, most studies on performance appraisal was carried out in developed nations while the present study intends to be carried out in the north-west geopolitical zone in Nigeria. However, the purpose of the present study is to carry out a pilot study to validate the research instruments.

Literature Review

Concept of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an important element in any organization globally. The concept has so many definitions. The most notable among the definitions is the one given by Piccolo, Judge, Takahashi, Watanabe, and Locke (2005) who viewed it as a positive emotional state that comes from the assessment of individual's job and his job experiences". Job satisfaction encompasses emotional, cognitive, and behavioural aspect (Mohd Nadzir, 2015). The emotional side comprises of job-related feelings like boredom, anxiety, acknowledgement and excitement. The cognitive part on the other hand relates to beliefs regarding to individual job whether it is respectable, mentally demanding/challenging and rewarding. Also, the behavioural part is made up of employee's actions regarding to their work like tardiness, coming to work late, faking ailment in order to avoid work (Ebuara & Coker, 2012). Job satisfaction has also been conceived as the positive attitudes relating to emotional dispositions people may benefit from work or through different aspects of the work.

Concept of Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is another variable that could predict teachers' performance appraisal. This variable is an important organizational tool that possesses the prospect of making powerful gain for the organizations and employees. These gains

range from greater trust and commitment, optimum job performance, citizenship behaviour, customer satisfaction, to reduced conflict and employee job satisfaction (Viseu, Rus, & de Jesus, 2015). Also, there are mutual alteration expectations regarding inputs and outcomes in every job and employment relationship between employees and the organization (Chou, Seng-cho, Jiang, & Klein, 2013). The fairness of these alterations, the equity perception of employees about methods used within the organization, the behaviour of the organization towards employees and the reaction of employees to their perceptions all underlie organizational justice. Organizational justice is becoming one of the most important motivation theories and is now one of the leading research subjects in the field of organizational behaviour, working psychology and human resources (Cojuharenco & Patient, 2013). Employees pay attention to justice within their organization (Folger, 2018) and as a result, employees' perceptions of organizational justice can affect organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour, entrepreneurship and the organizational trust of employees (Zhang, 2014).

A pilot test is a trial of using small samples size of the study for a prior test before the full-scale sample of the study (Gay & Mills, 2006). This present study, therefore, carried out a pilot test in order to ascertain the instrument validity, reliability and getting glimpse of the condition in identifying and adjusting the problems accordingly. A little sample size of the study was carried out accordingly. The instrument validity refers to the extent to which the instrument is measuring what it is supposed to measure appropriately, and reliability refers to the extent to which an instrument is free from error, consistent and stable over time and across various items in the scale (Sekaran, 2010). Hence, this paper shows the pilot test result with respect to organizational justice, job satisfaction and performance appraisal in among secondary school teachers in Kaduna state.

Methodology

As stated in the previous sub heading, this study is concerned with pilot test of an ongoing research using small sample of teachers as respondents in accordance to recommendation of Malhotra (2008) that emphasized that pre-test sample size should be around 15 to 30 respondents, but it can be increased if the test involves several stages. Thus, a total of 38 copies of questionnaires were personally distributed among teachers, while 31 copies were completed and returned. However, 2 copies out of the 31 copies that were returned were not properly completed and thus, not included in the pilot test analysis. In other words, the pilot study utilized 29 copies dully completed and retured by teachers. In addition, Sekaran and Bougie (2010) clearly explained that the most usual test of inter-item uniformity reliability is

Cronbach's alpha coefficient. This is because the inter-item uniformity reliability is the most practical measures of pilot test, and the reliability measurement is termed to be the most popular value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). Thus, Cronbach alpha test is carried out in this paper so as to establish and examine the internal uniformity of the tool.

Instrumentation and Measurement of Variables

The study made use of a well-organized questionnaire comprising of closed ended multiple choice-questions was used for the pilot study. It is a known that mostly the items in the questionnaire are overwhelmed in measuring the respondents' perceptions. Thus, Likert-type scale is considered as the most effective and appropriate technique (Alreck & Settle, 1995; Miller, 1991). Therefore, a 5- point Likert scale was used to cover the independent, mediating and dependent variable so as to meet the requirement of measuring scales for latent construct in social science research (Churchill Jr & Peter, 1984).

Consequently the variables enclosed in the study are: organizational justice, job satisfaction and performance appraisal. The dependent and independent variables are multi-dimensional in nature. Section 1: consists of a set of nineteen (19) questions that seek to measure the level of performance appraisal. Section 2: contains twenty (20) items that is intended to measure organizational justice as perceived by the respondents. Section 3 measures job satisfaction which contains a set of five (5) questions. Finally, section 4: Consists of questions about the demographic facts of the participants. Merely the considerable items that will be used in answering the research questions are included in the survey. Moreover, reactive questionnaire are not included in order to obtain a higher response rate (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). The items of organization justice was adapted from the works of Niehoff and Moorman (1993). Performance appraisal was adapted from the works of Gabris and Ihrke (2001). Job satisfaction scale from the works of Andrews and Withey (1976) which consist of 5 items .

Reliability and Validity Tests Results

Content and Face Validity

This comprises making use of specialist in the related field to test few sample representation of respondents for the purpose of passing judgment on the appropriateness of the items chosen in determining a variable (Hair Jr, Money, & Samouel, 2007; Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). This entails orderly appraisal of scale in ensuring that the items are measuring theoretically what it ought to measure. Meanwhile, in ensuring the validation of this instrument, sample was distributed to

experts in the field of management sciences so as to get feedback regarding the sufficiency and appropriateness of the items under investigation. The researcher was able to seek some advices from scholars that participated in the last conference held at Yusuf Maitama University Kano that have experience in the related field of study, were given the questionnaire for the purpose of assessment and necessary observation of the measuring instruments.

Consequently, some observations were made; and few words were rearranged and rephrased, for the purpose of proper construct determination, in enhancing the respondents' ability to understand and answer the questionnaires appropriately. This process of consulting experts took the period of one week leading to the derivation of accurate questionnaire that was administered for the pilot study. It is imperative to note that a copy of the questionnaire is also attached for further observations and input by the panel before large scale distribution is carried out. Following delightful consideration of the observation by the specialist, the researcher came up a better version of the instrument which was eventually administered during the pilot study.

Reliability Test

In addition to the face and content validity, it is also important to undertake a reliability test. There are different forms of reliability test but internal consistency reliability test is the most common technique used by researchers (Green & Yang, 2015). This is the level at which items “dangle jointly as a set” as well as having the ability of independently measuring the alike concept regarding the level at which the items are associated with each other. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is the most accepted test of inter-item consistency reliability (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010), and thus, this study employed it to ascertain the internal consistency of the mechanism. Checking the accuracy and consistency of instruments is crucial (Hair Jr et al., 2007), despite the fact that construct measures were deduced from previous studies and literature, there is still need testing and validation (Hair et al., 2007), as carried out in this research. Also, Hair et al. (2007) made an observation that researchers usually consider a Cronbach alpha value of 0.70 as the minimum, but lower coefficients may be acceptable as well. The study analyzed the data with the application SPSS version 25 and the result shows that the items are reliable ranging from 0.732 to 0.944 and it is in accordance with past studies that applied same measurement and found it to be reliable (DeNisi & Murphy, 2017; E. Rupp, 2011; Parvin & Kabir, 2011; Tsai, 2011). Furthermore, Hair, Money, Samouel, and Page (2007) also stated that an alpha value of 0.70 as a slightest, nevertheless, lower coefficients may be adequate.

Table 1 indicates the grasp of the reliability outcomes. This may possibly perhaps be seen from the table that the result of pilot study shows that Cronbach's alpha values for the variable under examination are all above 0.70. Accordingly, given the recognized benchmark of 0.70 all the constructs are reliable. A critical look at the constructs shows that performance appraisal is multi-dimensional in nature consisting of three dimensions while organizational justice consists of three dimensions also. The only uni-dimensional variable in the study is job satisfaction.

Table 1: Reliability Result of Pilot Test

Construct	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
Performance appraisal		
Instrument validity	7	0.740
Distributive justice	7	0.944
Procedural Justice	5	0.975
Organizational justice		
Distributive justice	5	0.913
Interactional Justice	10	0.732
Formal procedures	6	0.848
Job satisfaction	5	0.867

Data Distribution

Usually the inferential statistical methods necessitate the completion of normality hypothesis (Pallant, 2011; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Regular data is the one that is reasonable, bell-shape, with the highest occurrence of scores in the middle and smaller distribution towards the extreme ends. Normality can be measured by using the values of skewness and kurtosis. Although skewness deal with the symmetry, kurtosis shows the degree to which the data is peak or flat (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Skewness and kurtosis have empirical measures in several statistical programs and thus, the metric variables of both Skewness and Kurtosis should fall within the range of -1.96 and +1.96 (Brown, 1997, 2011). Hence, the data of the present study was examined using skewness and kurtosis and it was discovered to be normal and they all fall within the normal range of -1.96 and +1.96 (Brown, 1997)

Conclusion

The purpose of this pilot study is to examine the reliability and validity of the measuring instruments before conducting large scale study. This study makes use of a few sample size of 29 cases for pilot test as specialist was used to effecting necessary corrections against larger study that would be conducted. Face and content

validity were observed in this study, while the relationship between the variables or constructs would be completely examined in the main study. More so, the inter-item reliability test revealed that all the studied items under the present study were reliable and above the minimum benchmark of 0.70; and that no item was deleted. Also, the skewness and kurtosis indicated that the data is normal as they all fall within the normal range.

References

- Alreck, P., & Settle, R. (1995). *The survey research handbook second edition*: Chicago, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Andrews, F. W., & Withey, A. (1976). *Social Indicators Of Well-Being: Americans Perceptions Of Life Quality*: New York: Plenum.
- Berman, E. M., Bowman, J. S., West, J. P., & Van Wart, M. R. (2019). *Human resource management in public service: Paradoxes, processes, and problems*: CQ Press.
- Brown, J. D. (1997). Skewness and kurtosis. *Shiken: JALT testing & evaluation SIG*.
- Brown, J. D. (2011). Quantitative research in second language studies. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 2, 190-206.
- Churchill Jr, G. A., & Peter, J. P. (1984). Research design effects on the reliability of rating scales: A meta-analysis. *Journal of marketing research*, 21(4), 360-375.
- Daley, D. M. (1992). *Performance appraisal in the public sector: Techniques and applications*: Abc-clio.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of applied psychology*, 102(3), 421.
- E. Rupp, D. (2011). An employee-centered model of organizational justice and social responsibility. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1(1), 72-94.
- Gabris, G. T., & Ihrke, D. M. (2001). Does performance appraisal contribute to heightened levels of employee burnout? The results of one study. *Public Personnel Management*, 30(2), 157-172.
- Gay, M., & Mills, G. (2006). *Airasian (2006). Educational research. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River*.
- Green, S. B., & Yang, Y. (2015). Evaluation of dimensionality in the assessment of internal consistency reliability: Coefficient alpha and omega coefficients. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 34(4), 14-20.
- Hair Jr, M., Money, H., & Samouel, P. (2007). P., & Page, M. (2007). *Research methods for business*: West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kellough, J. E., & Nigro, L. G. (2002). Pay for performance in Georgia state government: Employee perspectives on GeorgiaGain after 5 years. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 22(2), 146-166.
- Kim, S. E., & Rubianty, D. (2011). Perceived fairness of performance appraisals in the federal government: Does it matter? *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31(4), 329-348.
- Kim, T., & Holzer, M. (2016). Public employees and performance appraisal: A study of antecedents to employees' perception of the process. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(1), 31-56.
- Kuvaas, B. (2011). The interactive role of performance appraisal reactions and regular feedback. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Miller, C. (1991). Nam-Powers Scale. *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA, 338-350.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of management journal*, 36(3), 527-556.
- Pallant, J. (2011). *Survival manual. A Step By Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS*.

Parvin, M. M., & Kabir, M. N. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. *Australian journal of business and management research*, 1(9), 113.

Pearce, J. L., & Perry, J. L. (1983). Federal merit pay: A longitudinal analysis. *Public Administration Review*, 315-325.

Perry, J. L., Petrakis, B. A., & Miller, T. K. (1989). Federal merit pay, round II: An analysis of the performance management and recognition system. *Public Administration Review*, 29-37.

Sekaran, U. (2010). Bougie. 2010. *Research Methods For Business: A Skill Building Approach: USA: Wiley.*

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach. Wiley.*

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). Using Multivariate Statistics. Pearson Education. *Boston, MA.*

Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. *BMC health services research*, 11(1), 98.

Appendix

Dear Prof / Reader / Dr / Mr / Mrs / Ms,

ACADEMIC RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

I am a doctoral candidate at Bayero University Kano, currently working on my PhD thesis titled “The Mediating Effect of Organizational Justice On the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction And Performance Appraisal.

Thank you in advance for taking your valuable time to fill in this questionnaire. Please be assured that your responses will only be used for academic purpose. Hence, your identity will never be known throughout any part of the research process.

Thank you very much in anticipation of your responses.

Yours sincerely,
 Lami Yaro
 07031229174

Section One

Instruction: The following statements assess to what extent you accept the performance appraisal been carried out by your school in terms of instrument validity, distributive justice and Procedural Justice. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements based on the scale provided.

Strongly disagree	Agree	Slightly disagree	neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Description											
Instrument validity					1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1	Level of involvement in my performance evaluation has been adequate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
2	The new evaluation instrument is accurate and clear in standards and measures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
3	Feedback regarding my rated performance will be clear and helpful for improving.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
4	My supervisor takes the performance-appraisal process seriously.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
5	The goals developed for my performance period for 2020 are meaningful measures.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
6	My individual performance factors on my instrument are clear and valid measures of job related activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
7	the performance evaluation instrument designed for my position accurately measures what I do on the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	Distributive Justice						6	7		
8	The new performance evaluation system is a step in the right direction.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
9	The new performance-appraisal process will result in fair and unbiased assessment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
10	The new performance-appraisal process will result in better communication between myself and my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
11	Merit-Pay based on performance ratings is the most effective method for motivating employees to improve/sustain performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
12	I believe the amount of merit-pay I can earn through high evaluation ratings will make a noticeable difference in my future performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
13	The best workers in Nigeria receive the highest evaluation scores.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
14	The new performance-appraisal is well designed and should lead to better performance and work quality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
	Procedural Justice						6	7		
15	My supervisor possesses adequate knowledge and training to properly implement my performance evaluation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
16	My supervisor will utilize the new evaluation system to assess my performance objectively and without bias.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

17	if I have problems with my performance evaluation I can communicate my concerns openly to my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
18	The County has established a clear and reasonable appeals process for grieving both evaluation and merit-pay results.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
19	My supervisor will be ethical in how he/she scores my performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

Section Two

Instruction: In this section, we are interested in understanding the extent to which your firm has implemented organizational justice to you over your colleagues in the past three years. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements based on the scale provided

Strongly disagree	Agree	Slightly disagree	neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Distributive Justice		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	my work schedule is fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	I think that my level is fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	I consider my work load to be fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Overall, the reward I receive here are quite well	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	I fell my job responsibilities are fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Formal procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	Job decisions are made by the head teacher in an unbiased manner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	My head teacher makes sure that all employees are heard before job decisions are made.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	My head teacher clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	To make decisions, my head teacher collects accurate and complete information	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	All job decisions are applied consistently across all affected employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by the head teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Interactional Justice							6	7
12	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	treats me with kindness and consideration.							
13	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher treats me with respect and dignity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher is sensitive to my personal needs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher deals with me in a truthful manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher shows concern for my rights as an employee	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher discuss the implication of the decisions with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18	When decisions are made about my job, the head teacher offers explanation that makes sense to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	The head teacher explains very clearly any decision made about my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	The head teacher offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	Concerning decisions made about my job, the head teacher discusses the implication of the decision with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section three:

Instruction: The following describe statements assess the overall job satisfaction you have with your present job. Using the scale provided below to rate your job satisfaction

Strongly disagree	Agree	Slightly disagree	neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Description	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Job satisfaction							
1 How do you feel about your job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2 How do you feel about the people you work with	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3 What is it like where you work, the physical surroundings, the hours, the amount of work you are asked to do	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4 How do you feel about the work you do on the job- the work itself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5	How do you feel about what you have available for doing your job -I mean equipment, information, good supervision and so on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
----------	--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Cambridgenigeriapublications@gmail.com