

Effect of Organizational Justice on Employee Engagement in the Hospitality Industry

Robert Odhiambo Onyango, Robert Egessa and Patrick Ojera

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to assess organizational justice and employee engagement in the hospitality industry in North Rift region, Kenya. With a sample size of 234 respondents, an explanatory research design was used with a target population of 580 employees from star-rated hotels in the North Rift region. Questionnaires and interviews were used to gather information. SPSS version 25.0 was used to analyze the data using descriptive and inferential statistics. From the findings employee engagement and organizational justice have a strong significant relationship. Employee engagement was explained by organizational justice at 71.8%. The study's findings support the necessity to improve organizational justice in order to increase employee engagement. The findings of this study can assist the government (both national and county levels), as well as important stakeholders in the hotel industry, in identifying the need for developing organizational justice policies and practices to realize employee engagement.

Keywords: employee engagement, organizational justice.

Submitted : January 07, 2022

Published : July 04, 2022

ISSN: 2507-1076

DOI: 10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.4.1259

R. Odhiambo Onyango*

PhD student, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya.
(e-mail: robertonyango29@gmail.com)

Prof. R. Egessa

Associate Professor, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya.
Researcher, Dr Atwoli International Centre for Labour and Leadership Studies.
(e-mail: regessa@mmust.ac.ke)

Prof. P. Ojera

Associate Professor, Bomet University College, Kenya.
(e-mail: pbojera@gmail.com)

**Corresponding Author*

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

Globally, the strategic drivers of employee engagement are critical to staying competitive in the dynamically evolving hospitality business. In this context, hospitality enterprises should make employees feel the perception that organizational justice exists in the organization in order to achieve pre-determined organizational goals, provide high-quality service to their guests, and survive in their sector (Erklç *et al.*, 2018). As a result, instilling a favorable impression of organizational justice among hospitality personnel is critical to their happiness and engagement. Organizational justice, on the other hand, is earned through a series of management interventions and behaviors (Towler, 2019). As a result, the hospitality industry must devise appropriate strategies to improve organizational justice in order to improve and maintain their employee engagement.

Organizational justice is concerned with all aspects of workplace behavior, including superior treatment, remuneration, training availability, and gender equality (www.hrzone.com., 2021). Employees' perceptions of their organization's employee relations values and how these principles effect their behavior are embodied in organizational justice. Employees may not feel obligated or competent to question underlying organizational systems, therefore blame is usually ascribed to a person or group of people when organizational justice is poor. According to

Sheppard *et al.* (1992), there is a strong urge to name and/or blame the person, technique, or system that is thought to be at fault. As a result, employees will always respond to organizational justice by behaving in a certain way. In this context, it is thought that organizational justice is a universal predictor of employee and organizational results (Pan *et al.*, 2018). Demirkiran *et al.* (2016) found that if employees believe the organization's activities and policies are fair and honest, they will engage in more extra-role conduct, which is helpful to the organization's development. Employees, on the other hand, may respond to unjust treatment by engaging in a variety of bad behaviors e.g., theft, withdrawal, resistance, vandalism, sabotage, and reduction of positive behavior (Lilly, 2017).

For employee engagement, the organizational justice system should offer a distinctive and satisfactory link between human conduct and the organization. Employee engagement refers to how enthusiastic employees are about their jobs, how devoted they are to the organization, and how much discretionary effort they put into their work (Shuck *et al.*, 2011). Employee engagement has developed as a critical management activity for competing and performing in a dynamic and competitive environment, with a link to the organization's goals and objectives (Gupta & Sharma, 2016). Employee engagement, in contrast to job satisfaction, combines dedication and ardour; job satisfaction, on the other hand, is a more passive kind of employee wellbeing (Zer *et al.*, 2017). Employee engagement is influenced by employee perceptions of organizational justice (Zer *et al.*, 2017; Abbasi

& Alvi, 2012; Dai & Qin, 2016). Low employee engagement, on the other hand, is a serious concern for many businesses (Fraser, 2017; Marc, 2018).

Employee perceptions of fairness in their employment relationship, defined as organizational justice, suggest that these perceptions of justice are likely to influence employee behavior and attitudes in a positive or negative way (Colquit *et al.*, 2005). Employee engagement dimensions, such as vigour, dedication, and absorption, have a positive correlation with organizational justice dimensions (Viseu *et al.*, 2015; Lyu, 2016; Hassan & Jubari, 2010). Although the majority of study has been done on individuals, there is evidence that organizational justice occurs at the team level, notably in terms of team environment (Towler, 2019).

According to Rupp and Meghan (2017), justice research has become increasingly multilevel, as researchers have begun to investigate how shared perceptions of justice form within work groups and organizations (justice climate), as well as how perceptions and reactions to justice differ across cultural groups (e.g., organizational and national cultures). Despite the fact that employee engagement is seen as a critical construct by practitioners and academics, there is still a paucity of empirical research in the literature (Karatepe & Demir, 2014). Furthermore, because the majority of these studies used a cross-sectional rather than a longitudinal design, we can't establish a causal association between the variables. Furthermore, there is a scarcity of research on the relationship between organizational justice and employee engagement in the Kenyan hotel business

B. Purpose of the Study

To examine the effect of organizational justice on employee engagement in the hospitality industry in North Rift region, Kenya.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In a meta-analysis of the impact of organizational justice on employee performance conducted by Cohen-Charash and Spector (2011), the correlates of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice were examined, and it was determined that procedural justice is the most important determinant of employee performance, with distributive and interactive justice having almost no impact on employee performance. Because the scope of this study was limited to the performance outcome, it is necessary to examine the impact of organizational justice on other outcomes, such as employee engagement. The meta-analysis employed in this study has flaws, such as pooling, which may not be acceptable if effects aren't uniform or robust across studies. Because of mistakes in the methodology and the heterogeneity of research, meta-analysis might be misleading. The included studies were of poor quality, and there was no attempt to overcome publication bias. All of this lends support to the use of systematic analysis and met analysis in tandem. As a result, the current research used both in determining the impact of organizational justice on employee engagement in the hotel business.

Suliman and Kathairi (2013) investigated the relationships between workplace fairness, satisfaction, and performance: Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice have a large

and favorable impact on both self-rated and supervisor-rated performance, according to a survey conducted in the UAE and Arabic setting using a self-administered questionnaire to assess the study's five primary hypotheses. Although there are other outcomes of organizational justice besides performance, this study focused on organizational justice, satisfaction, and performance in state-owned firms. Apart from that, the study relied on self-administered questionnaires, which are susceptible to common method variance, which might skew parameter estimations. Due to their distinct characteristics from the private sector, the findings are also confined to state-owned enterprises. The current research addressed this gap by examining employee engagement as a result of organizational justice in the hospitality industry in Kenya, using interview schedules and questionnaires.

Organizational commitment and leader-member exchange (LMX) serve a mediating function in linking organizational justice and work performance, according to Wang (2010). Interactional justice has a considerable impact on employees' task performance, interpersonal facilitation, and workplace dedication, according to the study, which used questionnaires and recruited individuals from industries across the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, whereas distributive justice was found to have a large impact on task performance and a poor impact on job devotion, there was no significant impact on interpersonal facilitation. Rather, procedural justice was found to have a minor impact on job commitment, but no substantial impact on task performance or interpersonal facilitation. Unlike Cohen *et al.* (2011), Wang (2010) found that of the three components of organizational justice, interactional justice was the most important indicator of employee performance. Both researches focused on organizational justice outcomes in non-African nations, which cannot be applied to the Kenyan setting or hospitality business.

Nasurudin and Khuan (2011) conducted research on organizational justice, age, and performance among Malaysian telecoms employees. Customer contact staff in Malaysia's telecoms industry were polled using self-administered questionnaires. The study discovered that task performance is influenced by distributive and procedural factors in a significant and beneficial way. Although a strong and positive association between procedural justice and contextual performance was discovered, no such relationship was discovered between distributive justice and contextual performance. These findings contradicted those of Karwan, (2018), who found that academicians' perceptions of organizational justice and its dimensions, such as distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, are positively correlated with contextual performance and that organizational justice dimensions have a positive impact on contextual performance. This demonstrates a lack of consistency in organizational justice results. As a result, the current study looked at how organizational justice affects employee engagement in the hospitality business in Kenya.

Bakker *et al.* (2011), who conducted research on important topics about Work Engagement, concluded that work engagement is positively connected with job satisfaction and health among employees. Work engagement and organizational justice are relevant and crucial in today's enterprises because companies are looking for low-cost, high-

impact ways to promote their employees' psychological health and avoid costs associated with mental health issues like poor performance and absenteeism (Gaudet *et al.*, 2014). In addition, Cropanzano *et al.* (2011) claim that organizational justice is crucial to employees for three reasons in their study three pathways to organizational justice. To begin with, the long-term benefit indicates that employees want justice because it helps them to forecast and manage the outcomes, they are likely to obtain from their employers. Second, because employees are social beings who desire to be recognized and respected by important others, there is a social consideration. They consider being exploited or damaged by strong decision-makers in their organizations to be an instance of organizational injustice. Employees are worried about fair processes in their organization; thus, the third consideration is ethical. They believe it is the morally correct way for others to be treated in a company.

Employees must believe that they are receiving equal shares of allocated organizational resources in order for distributive justice to occur (Ghaderi *et al.*, 2012). In other words, distributive justice focuses on the equity of the economic and social consequences of the decision-making process, rather than the decision process behind the distribution of organizational outcomes (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2011). The foundations of distributive justice, as well as the theory that suggests distributive justice may have an impact on employee engagement (Abdul & Sattar, 2012). Education, knowledge, skills, effort, time, cognitive resources, and performance are all examples of job inputs for employees. Wages, promotions, social rights, awards, punishments, leave time, tasks, responsibilities, physical resources, and development facilities are all examples of organizational outcomes.

McFarlin and Sweeney (2011) used health-care professionals working in government hospitals in Varanasi to investigate distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. They found that distributive justice is a strong predictor of employee engagement. It's probable that women are focusing on distributive justice rather than procedural justice to remedy prior pay disparities, according to Ghaderi *et al.* (2012). According to research conducted to explain the allocation of resources outcomes in organizations, which appears to be more satisfying when employee perceived outcomes are fair, people compare the adequacy of outcomes with referred standard, distributive justice has a positive influence on job satisfaction and a negative influence on turnover intentions (Kaneshiro, 2014). Distributive justice has a direct impact on employee pay satisfaction. Distributive justice is a major predictor of employee happiness with their supervisor, indicating that they are treated fairly in terms of incentive allocation (Bakker *et al.*, 2011).

At a private jail, Lambert (2013) investigated distributive justice, procedural justice, and organizational civic behavior. Organizational justice should be vital in shaping the organizational citizenship conduct of correctional personnel, according to social exchange theory. Stress was significantly reduced by distributive justice. The favorable effects of organizational justice on employee behavior are hypothesized in this study, however it is conducted in a private prison and in a non-African setting. The current study addressed this gap

by examining how all aspects of organizational justice affect employee engagement in a Kenyan environment and in the hotel industry.

Deconinck (2010) looked into the effects of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' levels of trust, and discovered that when managers exercise distributive justice, employees have negative attitudes toward their workload and pay, which do not match their pay. Employee engagement was found to be best predicted by distributive fairness. This is supported by the fact that distributive justice reflects employees' judgments of fairness in the sharing of benefits. Organizational justice characteristics continue to be important in shaping employee behavior. However, these studies did not look at all of the variables to see how they affect employee engagement, implying that more research is needed.

Zapata Phelan (2013) presented the findings of two research, one in the lab and the other in the field. The study looked into the connection between intrinsic motivation and task performance. They came to the conclusion that procedural justice and task performance have a strong link to intrinsic motivation. On the other hand, they have demonstrated that interpersonal fairness has little bearing on intrinsic motivation or task performance. In the laboratory, they used undergraduate students in an introductory management course, but in the field, they used employees from various industries such as healthcare, telecommunications, and so on.

Furthermore, Fat *et al.* (2010) revealed that the two components of organizational justice have a considerable impact on employee motivation and commitment, work satisfaction, and turnover in a study of management and non-managerial staff. These studies, on the other hand, were done on students and employees using experimental and descriptive methods using just two dimensions of organizational justice, namely interpersonal and procedural justice, leaving out distributive justice and its impact on employee engagement. Furthermore, the employees were drawn from a variety of firms, each with its own set of characteristics, so generalizing the results would be misleading.

Employee engagement and high performance practices are linked to procedural justice, according to Khan and Usman (2012), since employees evaluate organizational activities favorably towards them when fairness in processes and practices is observed. Because procedural justice concerns the fairness of the decision-making process surrounding organizational results, the definition of those objectives is frequently more essential than the outcomes themselves (Liao *et al.*, 2009). This research was carried out in an Islamic faith, which is a distinct cultural environment than the current study. Furthermore, it only looked at one aspect of organizational justice, namely procedural justice, ignoring the others.

Ozlem *et al.* (2017) investigated the impact of organizational justice on employee engagement in Turkey's healthcare sector. The study focused on healthcare workers in a Turkish public hospital, and data was obtained from them. The relationships between sub aspects of organizational justice and job engagement were positive and moderate,

according to the results of the analyses. According to the regression study used to determine the effect of sub dimensions of organizational justice on work engagement, sub dimensions of organizational justice perception together explained 33% of total variance. As a result, it can be asserted that increasing corporate justice perception promotes employee work engagement in a statistically meaningful way.

In terms of work engagement, procedural justice had the most significant impact, followed by distributive and interactional justice. There are some limitations to applying the findings of this study to all employees in the healthcare industry. The participants in this study are limited to staff from one city and one state hospital in Turkey. This necessitates the use of larger samples in order to obtain more effective results that may be applied to various industrial situations. Another key aspect raised by various authors in regard to the impact of organizational justice on employee engagement is the cultural perspective (Jepngetich & Njue, 2013; Reithel *et al.*, 2012). Employees' emotions, attitudes, and behaviors are all influenced by cultural variety, it is a well-known truth (Wang *et al.*, 2010; Crawshaw *et al.*, 2013; Khan *et al.*, 2015). Employee perceptions of fairness in their job connection, defined as organizational justice, show that these perceptions of justice are likely to influence employee behavior and attitudes in a favorable or negative way (Hewitt, 2011).

Organizational justice, according to Greenberg (2001), is an attempt to define and explain the function of fairness in the workplace. Organizational justice and work engagement have the potential to have favorable consequences for both employers and employees, such as increased trust and commitment, enhanced job performance, more helpful citizenship behaviors, improved customer satisfaction, and reduced conflict (Kravina *et al.*, 2014). Shibaoka *et al.* (2010) conducted research on the development and validity of the Japanese version of the organizational justice scale, in which employees responded to the Japanese version of the organizational justice scale. The paper stated that organizational justice has recently gained attention as a predictor of employee mental and physical health.

Interaction justice drew attention in the written world as a result of the social growth of justice research in the 1990s. It denotes the degree to which interpersonal interactions are of high quality (Jepngetich & Njue, 2013). Bies and Moag put this type of justice on the table in 1986. Interaction justice is defined by Meryem and Ahmet (2017) as "the quality of interpersonal interaction in procedural processes executed for the employees by others" (Colquitt, 2001). Another definition specifies that interaction justice refers to the interpersonal behaviors of an administrator's judgments (Jiang *et al.*, 2012). Interaction justice refers to the conceptions of fairness in interpersonal (employee administrator) interactions rather than the distribution of rewards and the rules that govern this allocation. When communicating with their supervisors, employees demand justice. Interactional justice is a perception of justice among employees that is concerned with informing employees about the subjects of organizational decisions, as well as the attitudes and behaviors to which employees are exposed during the application of organizational decisions. It is based on peer-to-peer relationships (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2011).

To put it another way, it describes the type of attitude and behavior to which employees are exposed while supervisors do (distributive and procedural) operations (Greenberg, 1993; Liao & Tai, 2006). Interactional justice is said to be made up of two sub-dimensions: interpersonal and informational justice (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2007). The importance of compassion, respect, and regard in interpersonal relationships, particularly between employees and supervisors, is highlighted by interpersonal justice. On the other hand, informational justice is concerned with adequately informing employees in concerns of organizational decision-making.

Employee perceptions of the fairness of formal methods used to distribute rewards and incentives at work in terms of justice, social interaction, and employee engagement are referred to as procedural justice (Kaneshiro, 2014). As a result, employees' opinions of procedural justice are shaped by the fairness of managerial policies and procedures, particularly HR practices, which represent the informational source of their judgments of procedural justice (Suliman & Kathairi, 2013). Employees will be more motivated to comply with organizational requests and requirements if they believe their organization's decision-making and other related processes are impartial and nondiscriminatory (Reithel *et al.*, 2012; 2005). Various employee attitudes and behaviors, including as work performance, rule compliance, cooperation, and deference to authority, are predicted by procedural justice (Lambert & Hogan, 2013). However, there has been a scarcity of theories for organizational connections incorporating reciprocal norms. Employees' perceptions of the fairness of decision-making and the methods by which decisions are made, as previously stated, lead them to believe that the organization cares about them and is concerned about their well-being (Kaneshiro, 2014).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

An explanatory research design was used in this study. The research approach is suitable for identifying the degree to which variables are connected and formulating predictions about the occurrence of social or physical phenomena, according to Elahi and Dehdashti (2011). This design was chosen because it is closely related to the study's aims and may be used to assess the study hypotheses. Employees in Kenya's hotel business were the target population for this study. The target population is subdivided into the accessible population. The study's accessible population consisted of 568 personnel recruited from the North Rift Region's star-rated hotels. The selection of star-rated hotels in Kenya's North Rift Region was made with care from among the region's hotels.

A sample size of 234 was drawn from a total population of 568 employees to represent the whole population. From the target population of 568, Yamane (1967) sample size formula modified by Kent and Myers (2008) as cited in Etuk and Akpabio (2014) was used to select a sample size of 234 employees as shown below:

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

where:

n = Sample size;

N = Population size;

e = the error of Sampling.

This study allowed the error of sampling of 0.05. Thus, sample size was as follows:

$$n = \frac{568}{1+568 \times 0.05^2} = 234$$

According to Neyman's allocation formula, the sample size was distributed proportionally (Singh & Micah, 2013). The primary data was collected using both surveys and interviews. After piloting and testing for validity and reliability, interviews were performed to gather information from key informants (HR officers), and questionnaires were distributed to employees as the main instrument. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze quantitative data. Inferential statistics were used to make conclusions from sample data to the overall population, whereas descriptive statistics were used to define basic characteristics and summarize data in a straightforward and clear manner.

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Descriptive Results for Variables

The purpose of the study was to learn how respondents felt about the state of organizational justice and employee engagement in the hospitality industry in the North Rift Region in terms of star-rated hotels.

B. Organizational Justice and Employee Engagement

Employee views of fairness in terms of distribution outcomes, techniques used to establish these outcomes, and social components of distributive justice in the workplace are referred to as organizational justice. The purpose of the study was to determine how employees felt about organizational justice and employee engagement in hotels, and the results are provided in Table I below.

With regard to organizational Justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) enhances their engagement with the organization majority at 76.3% agreed from which 34.1% of the respondents agree to very great extent, 42.2% agree to a great extent, 16.2% moderate extent while a smaller percentage at 6.9% agree to a small extent while 0.6% agree to a very small extent that (Mean = 4.02 SD =0.915). From the interview schedule the respondents are of the opinion that the organization uses justice to enhance trust,

positive organizational relationships, and organizational commitment.

One of the respondents pointed that:

“Our hotel management understands what we the management needs and other employees need to know and communicate facts while being considerate of their effort and sensitive to their feelings. Besides we show support and understanding for the employees, even when mistakes are made and resolves issues fairly and procedurally”.

Majority of respondents at 81.5% agreed that the salary, they get is comparable to their job performance of which 18.5% of the respondents agree to very great extent, 63.0% agree to a great extent, 17.3% moderate extent while 1.2% agree to a small extent (Mean = 3.99 SD =0.638). With regard to the salary and benefits they get are comparable to other employees doing similar duties to the majority of them agreed at 75.3% were in agreement amongst which 24.3% of the respondents agree to very great extent, 51.4% agree to a great extent, while 24.3% to a moderate extent that (Mean = 4.00 SD =0.699). In addition, 89.0% agree that they have received a promotion in the past for performing their job well from which 18.5% of the respondents agree to very great extent, 70.5% agree to a great extent, 10.4% moderate extent while 0.6% agree to a small extent that (Mean = 4.07 SD =0.556).

C. Correlations

Table II shows that the lowest correlation in this study was between employee engagement and Organizational Justice (r=0.848**, p<0.01), indicating a strong positive relationship.

After establishing that a relationship existed between organizational justice and employee engagement from literature reviews and Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient tests, simple linear regression analysis was done.

TABLE II: CORRELATIONS

	Org Justice	Employee Engage
Org Justice	1	
Employee Engage	0.848**	1

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

Source: Research study 2020.

D. Simple Linear Regression Analysis

The study conducted a simple linear regression analysis to test hypothesis four which stated that:

H01: There is no significant effect of organizational justice on employee engagement in the hospitality industry in North Rift region, Kenya.

TABLE I: ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Statement	VSE	SE	ME	GE	VGE	M	SD
	%	%	%	%	%		
The salary i get is comparable to my job performance	0.0	1.2	17.3	63.0	18.5	3.99	0.638
The salary and benefits i get are comparable to other employees doing similar duties to mine	0.0	0.0	24.3	51.4	24.3	4.00	0.699
I have received a promotion in the past for performing my job well	0.0	0.6	10.4	70.5	18.5	4.07	0.556
In case of dissatisfaction supervisor listens to all employee’s dissatisfaction before making the decision	0.0	1.2	17.9	69.4	11.6	4.02	0.511
Policies and procedures are applied to all employees equally without considering age, sex, position etc.	4.0	16.2	5.8	34.1	39.9	3.90	1.211
When decisions are made about my job, the manager treats me with kindness and Consideration	0.6	9.8	15.0	41.0	33.5	3.97	0.967
Concerning decisions made about my job, the manager discusses with me the implications of the decisions	0.0	6.4	17.3	51.4	24.9	3.95	0.823
Organizational Justice (distributive, procedural and interactional justice) enhances my engagement with the organization	0.6	6.9	16.2	42.2	34.1	4.02	0.915

Key: 5 = Very Great Extent (VGE); 4 = Great Extent (GE); 3 = Moderate Extent (ME); 2 = Small Extent (SE); 1 = Very Small Extent (VSE).

TABLE III: EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE ON EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Model Summary						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	
1	0.848 ^a	0.718	0.717	0.246	1.969	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice.						
b. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement.						
ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.489	1	26.489	436.376	0.000 ^b
	Residual	10.380	171	0.061		
	Total	36.869	172			
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Justice						
Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	0.777	0.152		5.108	0.000
	Organizational Justice	0.793	0.038	0.848	20.890	0.000
a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement.						

Source: Research study 2020.

The effect of organizational justice on employee engagement in the hospitality industry in North Rift region, Kenya was established. The results were presented in Table III above.

The model summary results in Table III indicated that there is a strong positive and significant correlation between organizational justice and employee engagement ($R=0.848^a$). The coefficient of determination (R square) of .718 which indicated that the model explained only 71.8% of the variation or change in the dependent variable. The meaning is that when a deliberate effort is put to ensure organizational justice will certainly cause a variation on employee engagement. The remaining proportion of 38.2% can be explained by other factors other than organizational justice. Adjustment of the R square did not change the results substantially, having reduced the explanatory behavior of the predictor from 71.8% to 71.7%. This means that the model is fit to be used to generalize the findings. This implies that when the hospitality industry strategically embraces organizational justice then the level of employee engagement is likely to vary.

F values of 436.376, a p-value of 0.000 being less than 0.05, indicates that the model is statistically significant in explaining the relationship between organizational justice and employee engagement. An unstandardized coefficient represents the amount of change in a dependent variable Y due to a change of 1 unit of independent variable X (Hayes & Preacher, 2014). Therefore, a coefficient of 0.793 indicated that a unit change in organizational justice leads to 0.793 units of positive change in employee engagement. Therefore, organizational justice and employee engagement model can now be presented as follows:

$$Y = 0.777 + 0.793X_1 + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

T-test was used to identify whether the predictor was making a significant contribution to the model. Since the t-statistic is significant, the study rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that organizational justice was significant (p-value = 0.000) in positively influencing employee engagement in the hospitality industry in the North Rift

Region Kenya. Therefore, organizational justice significantly affects employee engagement in the hospitality industry in the North Rift Region Kenya. These findings are supported by Gaudet, Tremblay and Doucet, (2014). Khan and Usman (2012) who also found a positive and significant effect of organizational justice on employee engagement.

V. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

According to the findings, organizational justice has an impact on employee engagement in the hospitality business in Kenya's North Rift region. In reality, enhancing organizational justice is the only way to increase employee engagement. The findings of this study support this assertion. Employees are satisfied and content when they perceive equity in the workplace. Employees will be motivated and dedicated to a company if the ratios of inputs and outputs are balanced. Job happiness and staff engagement are influenced by employee perceptions of corporate justice. From the findings of the current study organizational justice affects employee engagement in the hospitality industry in North Rift Region (R square) of 0.678, $t=18.965$, $P<0.05$ with F value of 359.683a p-value of 0.000 being less than 0.05. Gaudet, Tremblay, and Doucet all agree with this conclusion (2014). In a study on procedural justice and organizational performance, Khan and Usman (2012) found that procedural justice is linked to employee engagement and high-performance practices because people see organizational activities favorably when fairness in processes and practices is observed. Organizational justice, on the other hand, has no effect on employee engagement, according to Herminingsih (2017). This means that the hospitality business should make sure that organizational justice is upheld to the point of encouraging employee engagement.

VI. CONCLUSION

Establishing organizational justice in the workplace is a powerful strategy that may be used by companies that want to boost employee engagement. Organizational justice-

promoting policies are effective in attracting and retaining the happiest and most motivated employees, resulting in increased employee engagement. The need for organizational justice remains reachable, as it would almost surely result in higher employee engagement among employees in Kenya's North Rift Region's hospitality business. Employee engagement and organizational justice have a favorable and significant relationship, according to the findings of this study. The null hypothesis was rejected as a result of this. The conclusion of this finding is that, in order to achieve high employee engagement, the hotel industry in Kenya's North Rift Region should prioritize organizational justice over other high-performance work practices.

Organizational justice and employee engagement are determined to be based on employee engagement theory and social exchange theory, according to a previous literature review and the findings of this study. As a result, organizational justice is one of the most essential high-performance techniques for cultivating a positive work-related attitude among an organization's personnel. This means that management must be able to understand when different elements of organizational justice should be used to increase employee engagement. This argument is based on the belief that a healthy superior-subordinate relationship is dependent on the degree of organizational fairness, which is critical for employee engagement and organizational performance. Throughout order to guarantee and preserve employee engagement, the study suggests that solid organizational justice be maintained in the hospitality industry's human resource strategy components and procedures. Because of its good effect on employee work behavior, combining all of the features of organizational justice should be a primary issue for organizations.

REFERENCES

- Abdul, K. A., & Sattar, A. (2012). Impact of organizational justice on employee engagement in banking sector of Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 12 (5), 643-649.
- Adonopoulous, J. (2016). Understanding employee engagement during organisational crises. *Deakin University PhD*.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). *Employee engagement: 10 key questions for research and practice* (pp. 3-19). Edward Elgar.
- Amir, M. S., Habibeh, H., Mostafa, M., Sanaz, J., Azadeh, S., & Kolsoum, S. (2016). Social exchange theory and attachment theory: combination of sociological and psychological approaches to form a biopsychosocial viewpoint to human social and interpersonal relationships. *International Journal Of Humanities And Cultural Studies ISSN 2356-5926*, 1.
- Arrowsmith, J., & Parker, J. (2013). Delivering employee engagement: a neo-pluralist departure for HRM? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14),2692-2712.
- Ashley, P. A. (2002). *Ética e responsabilidade social nos negócios*. São Paulo: Saraiva.
- Baker, B. (2005). *The good, the bad and the ugly: the mediating role of attribution style in the relationship between personality and performance*. North Carolina State University.
- Bakker, A., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 20, 4-28.
- Balain, S., & Sparrow, P. (2009). *Engaged to perform: a new perspective on employee engagement (White Paper No. 09/04)*. Retrieved 11 1, 2018, from Retrieved from Lancaster University website: www.lancaster.ac.uk.
- Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and Human resource management*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Bridoux, F. (2004). *A resource-based approach to performance and competition: an overview of the connections between resources and competition (No. IAG Working Papers (2004/110))*. UCL.
- Cameron, C., & Miller, D. L. (2015). A Practitioner's Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2), 317-372.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Cameron, K. S., Quinn, R. E., DeGraff, J., & Thakor, A. V. (2014). *Competing values leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Cania, L., & Korsita, B. (2015). Knowledge management: the key to sustainability of economic crisis. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(1), 548.
- Caplan, J. (2013). *Strategic Talent Development. Develop and engage all your people for business success*. London.UK: Cogan Page.
- Carleton, E. (2009). Happiness at work: using positive psychology interventions to increase worker well-being. *Masters' dissertation. Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia*.
- Cheruyiot, J. K., Kimutai, G., & Kemboi, A. (2017). Effects of employee engagement factors on staff turnover in the hospitality industry: A survey of rated hotels in Uasin Gishu County. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 5(6), 231-258.
- Chmielewski, D. A., & Paladino, A. (2007). Driving a resource orientation: reviewing the role of resource and capability characteristics. *Management Decision*, 45(3), 34-61.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2011). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(4), 278-321.
- Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2009). Business research: a practical guide for undergraduate and post-graduate students. 3rd edition, Palgrave Macmillan Construction Industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 10(5), 333-342.
- Crawford, E. R., Rich, B. L., Buckman, B., & Bergeron, J. (2013). *The antecedents and drivers of employee engagement. In Employee engagement in theory and practice* (pp. 71-95). Routledge.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2011). Three roads to organizational justice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20(4), 1-113.
- DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(12), 1349-1355.
- Demerouti, B., Schaufeli, W., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Nachreiner, F. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-527.
- Dunn, T. J., Baguley, T., & Brunsden, V. (2014). From alpha to omega: a practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. *British Journal of Psychology*, 105(3), 399-412.
- Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees. *American Psychological Association*.
- Fabian, O. U., & Ike, E. O. (2017). *Linking Perceived Organizational Frustration to Work Engagement The Moderating Roles of Sense of Calling and Psychological Meaningfulness*. Retrieved 11 14, 2018, from journals.sagepub.com.
- Gennard, J., & Judge, G. (2010). *Managing Employment Relations, 5th Edition, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development*. London: CIPD House.
- Ghaderi, S., Saidat, A., & Shams Mourkani, G. (2012). A study of the relationship between perception of organizational justice and work engagement among Isfahan high school teachers. *Journal of New Educational Approaches*, 7(1), 49-72.
- Good, P. (2013). Permutation tests: a practical guide to resampling methods for testing hypotheses. *Springer Science & Business Media*.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
- Hartog, D., & Verburg, R. (2004). High performance work systems, organizational culture and firm effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 14(1), 55-78.
- Hewitt, N. K. (2011). Emotional and intellectual commitment. Employee Engagement, *Journal of Job Satisfaction*, 3(2), 2-4.
- Huselid, M. (2010). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635-72.
- Jamrog, J. (2004). The Perfect Storm: The future of retention and engagement. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(3), 26-33.
- Jenkins, S., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Context matters: examining soft and hard approaches to employee engagement in two workplaces.

- International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2670-2691.
- Kaneshiro, P. (2014). *Analyzing the organizational justice, trust and commitment relationship in a public organization*. Arizona: Northcentral University.
- Kappel, M. (2018). *How To Establish A Culture Of Employee Engagement*. Retrieved 07 01, 2018, from www.forbes.com.
- Kent, J., & Myers, N. (2008). *The citizen is willing, but society won't deliver: The problem of institutional roadblocks*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Sustainable Development.
- Kurtzman, J. (2017). *Why is employee engagement in the hospitality industry important?* Retrieved 04 10, 2018, from.rewardian.com.
- Kuvaas, B. (2008). An exploration of how the employee-organisation relationship affects the linkage between perception of developmental human resource practices and employee outcomes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(1), 1-25.
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). The association of distributive and procedural justice with organizational citizenship behavior. *The Prison Journal*, 93(3), 313-334.
- Lau, C. M., & Ngo, H. Y. (2010). The HR system, organizational culture, and product innovation. *International business review*, 13(6), 685-703.
- Laura, B. (2017). *Major Issues Facing the Hospitality Industry in 2017*. Retrieved 6 11, 2018, from impos.com.au.
- Liao, H., & Toya, K. (2009). Do they see eye to eye? Management and employee perspectives of high-performance work systems and influence processes on service quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 371-391.
- Liao, W. C., & Tai, W. T. (2006). Organizational justice, motivation to learn, and training outcomes. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(5), 545-556.
- Marchington, M., & Wilkinson, A. (2013). *Human resource management at Work People Management and Development 5th edition*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (2016). *Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry*. Retrieved 6 11, 2018, from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.
- Meryem, A., & Ahmet, C. A. (2017). The effect of human resource management practices on employees' work engagement and the mediating and moderating role of positive psychological capital. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(1), 363-372.
- Nasurdin, A. M., & Khuan, S. L. (2011). Organizational justice, age, and performance connection in Malaysia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 21(3), 273-290.
- Nazir, K. (2016). *Hospitality industry key to growth*. Retrieved 10 26, 2018, from www.standardmedia.co.ke.
- Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., & Hulin, C. L. (2010). *Job attitudes and employee engagement: Considering the attitude "A-factor"*. *The handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research, and practice*, 43-61. researchgate.net.
- Noe, R., Hollenbeck, J., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. (2010). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage (7th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Norasiken, A. R. (2015). Determinant of employee engagement and knowledge management for enhancing employee engagement. *E-Proceeding of the International Conference on Social Science Research, ICSSR 2015*. Meliá Hotel Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Pornmit, K. (2016). The importance of employee engagement in the hospitality industry. *Dusit Thani College Journal*, 10 (1), 42-69.
- Reddy, P. N., & Acharyulu, G. V. (2008). *Research Methodology and Statistical Tools*.
- Rich, B., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Sen, S., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2010). Does doing good always lead to doing better? consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38 (2), 225-43.
- Shiladitya, M. (2018). *How are stars decided for hotels (e.g. 5 star hotel, 7 star hotel), and who governs these stars?* Retrieved 10 27, 2018, from www.quora.com.
- Shuck, B., & Rocco, T. (2013). HRD and employee engagement. In K. Truss C, Alfes., R. Delbridge, A. Shantz, & E. Soane, *Employee Engagement Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: a new look at the interface between nonwork and work. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(3), 518.
- Suliman, A., & Kathairi, M. (2013). Organizational justice, commitment and performance in developing countries: The case of the UAE. *Employee Relations*, 35(1), 98-115.
- Turnipseed, D. L., & Rassuli, A. (2005). Performance perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviours at work: a bilevel study among managers and employees. *British Journal of Management*, 16(2), 231-244.