

## **Effect of Organisational Justice on Academic Employee Commitment in Public Universities in Kenya**

By

Olukemi Olufunmilola Asemota<sup>1,3\*</sup>, Godwin Norensa Osarumwense Asemota<sup>2, 3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Entrepreneurship, Technology, Leadership, and Management, College of Human Resource Development, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nairobi, Kenya.

<sup>2</sup>University of Rwanda, Kigali, Rwanda.

<sup>3</sup>Morayo College, Nairobi, Kenya.

ooasemota@gmail.com\*(+254746942809), asemotaegno@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

Tertiary institutions in Kenya operate in a highly competitive business environment. Some of the challenges government-owned Universities face include low academic employee commitment. It can be poor employment conditions and unfairness in work-related processes and procedures. The study determines the effect of organisational justice on academic employee commitment in public universities in Kenya. The study used a cross-sectional research design. The target population comprises all the full-time and part-time academic staff of the selected public Universities in Kenya. Permission was sought and obtained from the institution of study, the National Commission for Science and Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI), the Kenyatta University Ethics Committee, and the selected Public Universities in Kenya. Over 400 questionnaires were administered only to academic staff (full-time and part-time) by the 11 trained research assistants and the researcher. 288 out of the 358 expected sample sizes yielded a 94.6% Cronbach alpha coefficient. The stratified random sampling technique was employed to represent all subgroups. The data collected used a 1-5 Likert-scale questionnaire and open-ended questions. The data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 25). Over 54.7% of the respondents agree that organisational justice affects academic employees' commitment to Public Universities in Kenya. The overall mean score is 3.85, and the standard deviation is 1.71. In sum, the findings emphasise the importance of promoting organisational justice. Human resource practitioners ensure transparent policies from entry to exit are established and fairly executed without bias. Practitioners should also foster organisational justice by enacting impartial recruitment processes, performance management, and workload distribution.

**Keywords:** Academic employee, commitment, Kenya, public universities, organisational justice.

## **Effect of Organisational Justice on Academic Employee Commitment in Public Universities in Kenya**

By

Olukemi Olufunmilola Asemota<sup>1,3\*</sup>, Godwin Norensa Osarumwense Asemota<sup>2, 3</sup>

### **Introduction**

With the advent of global education transformation, higher educational institutions (HEIs) in East Africa and Kenya have witnessed tremendous changes over the past years (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, & Nyang'au, 2022). Both public and private tertiary institutions in Kenya operate in a highly competitive business environment (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were & Nyang'au, 2022). The paper examines the effect of organisational justice on academic employee commitment in public universities in Kenya. The Higher Learning Institutions (HLI) in Kenya have witnessed significant growth and enlargement since the 1980s when the government could not competently cover the scope of monetary demands of Higher Education (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, & Nyang'au, 2022; Kavit, 2017; Kiboii, 2013; Ng'ethe, 2013). Consequently, Higher Education Institutions, particularly public universities in Kenya, have been battered with various challenges that have affected their ability to function as institutions of excellence. Researchers reported that commitment is low among academic personnel due to factors such as whether workload distribution is fair or unfair, and also in the areas of rewards, promotion, and decision-making and other attendant employment matters that may result in injustices, inadequate and non-competitive salaries (Asemota, 2024, Lawal, 2022, Kavit, 2017; Ng'ethe, 2013).

### **Statement of the Problem**

Commitment in organisations should be reciprocal and ascertained by the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964; Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, and Nyang'au, 2022). Organisations demonstrate their allegiance (commitment) to their workers by the provision of conducive working conditions and infrastructure, fairness, the opportunity for advancement, supervisors' support, and non-toxic co-worker relationships (Asemota, 2024, Asemota, Were, and Nyang'au, 2022, Ahmed & Nawaz, 2015). Robbins and Judge (2013) show that workers recognise their company as supportive when compensation is justified, participate in decisions affecting their jobs, and win managers' support. The higher institution work environment is a mini-organisational system part of a mega society with varied informal and formal relationships, academic, socio-economic, political, and employment (Oludeyi, 2015).

The Higher Learning Institutions (HLI) in Kenya have witnessed significant growth and enlargement since the 1980s when the government could not competently cover the scope of monetary demands of Higher Education (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, Nyang'au, 2022; Kavit, 2017; Kiboii, 2013; Ng'ethe, 2013). Consequently, Higher Education Institutions (public universities) have been battered and encumbered with various problems that have affected their ability to function as institutions of excellence. Researchers reported that commitment is low among academic personnel due to factors such as unfair workload distribution, rewards management system, promotion, and decision-making processes, and other attendant employment injustices, inadequate and non-competitive salaries, and delayed claim payment (Asemota, 2024, Lawal, 2022, Kavit, 2017; Ng'ethe, 2013). The study examined the effect of organisational justice on academic employee commitment in public universities in Kenya.

### **Higher Learning Institutions in Kenya**

Tertiary Learning Institutions in Kenya commenced in 1922 when Makerere College, Uganda, was a small technical college and later enlarged to meet the demands and needs of the East African Community (Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar), as well as Zambia and Malawi (Asemota, 2024). In the 1940s and early 1950s, only Makerere College was offering tertiary education in East Africa until 1956, when the Royal Technical College started in Nairobi (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, and Nyang'au, 2022; Kavit, 2017; Kiboiy, 2013; Ng'ethe, 2013). In 1963, the Royal Technical College metamorphosed into the University College, Nairobi, following the establishment of the University of East Africa with three constituent colleges in Nairobi, Dares Salaam, and Kampala (Asemota, 2024; Kavit, 2017; Kiboiy, 2013; Ng'ethe, 2013). The University of Nairobi became the first public Higher Institution in Kenya. All government-owned universities in Kenya have experienced significant growth and expansion as aligned with the governmental goals to improve equity, the economy, and the educated populace (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, and Nyag'au, 2022; Kavit, 2017; Ng'ethe, 2013).

### **Review of Related Literature**

#### **Organisational Justice**

Many factors affect employees' commitment to the organisation they work with. One organisational justice perception is that workers assess management's actions and behaviours towards them as fair, moral, and realistic (Asemota, 2024; Turgut, Tokmak, & Gucels, 2012). Organisational justice is how staff feels about how fairly they have been treated in the workplace (Asemota, 2024; Hiariey & Tutupoho, 2020; Nwibere, 2014). It explains the importance of fairness in the work environment (Hiariey & Tutupoho, 2020). Organisational justice centres on workplace fairness that affects or impacts various organisational and individual work-related elements like leadership, organisational commitment, turnover intentions, and other organisational-related behaviours (Asemota, 2024; Malik & Naeem, 2011).

Four dimensions of organisational justice: distributive, procedural, interactional (interactive), and informational justice (Asemota, 2024; Lawal, 2022; Hiariey & Tutupoho, 2020; Nwibere, 2014; Turgut et al., 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2011). Distributive Justice: the fairness that the staff perceives by evaluating their efforts and the rewards associated with the commitment made compared with other staff within the organisation (Nwibere, 2014; Turgut et al., 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2012). Procedural Justice implies personnel in organisations are concerned about the form, processes, or steps on how decisions are made that concern them (Asemota, 2024, Ari & Çağlayan, 2017; Turgut, Tokmak, & Gucels, 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2011). Dinc (2015) examined the relationship between perceived fairness and organisational commitment and observed a limited number of studies on this subject matter. Interactive Justice: interactional or interactive fairness focuses on interpersonal relationships, behaviours among employees, and the fairness of communication within organisations (Asemota, 2024; Nwibere, 2014; Turgut et al., 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2011). Informational justice indicates how information explains the procedure or decision (Lawal, 2022).

Organisational justice in the context of this study refers to the processes and procedures of resource allocation, workload distribution, and rewards amongst academic employees without prejudice and discrimination (Asemota, 2024). Prescriptors categorised under organisational justice are procedural, distributive, and interactional. Organisations have

concerns about employees' feeling of organisational fairness because of shaping attitudes and workers' work-related behaviour (Asemota, 2024; Komodromos, 2014). The concept of employees' perception of trust and fairness has been in empirical literature for more than twenty-five years. Thus, it has been considered important in organisations, particularly in the competitive business environment. With the highly competitive global market, organisations cannot succeed and survive without their employees' effort and commitment (Asemota, 2024; Komodromos, 2014).

Extensive research has been conducted on employees' perception of organisational justice, which indicates that organisational fairness has both positive and negative impacts on outcomes important to workers and employers (Asemota, 2024; Adeniran & Oshineye, 2022). Such outcomes are namely: organisational commitment, cooperative work behaviours, trust, and job satisfaction. More specifically, prior research in the domain of organisational justice showed that its characteristics correlate negatively to turnover intention but are positively associated with trust, job satisfaction, and commitment to the organisation (Asemota, 2024; Komodromos, 2014). Nwibere (2014) indicates organisational justice as being fair to them and their job. Organisational justice mainly centres on workplace fairness which affects or impacts various organisational and individual work-related elements such as leadership, organisational commitment turnover intentions, and other organisational-related behaviours (Malik & Naeem, 2011). The authors further describe organisational justice as workers' feelings concerning their care by the employer, whether it is honest, and whether the outcomes of these processes are impartial or partial. Hassan (2002) identified the fairness of the outcome factors as salary, salary raises, recognition, incentives, promotion, and fringe benefits. Scholarly evidence on organisational justice and its influence on work-related outcomes like organisational commitment are vital for researchers and business organisations to examine (Asemota, 2024; Malik & Naeem, 2011).

However, studies on whether or not fairness perception can enhance lecturers' job satisfaction in Higher Educational Institutions in Pakistan are scanty (Malik & Naeem, 2011). Dinc (2015) also submits that the studies of the relationship between perceived organisational commitment and justice were limited. In the empirical literature, researchers believe that justice in the workplace is a fundamental requirement for the effective functioning of organisations and also for the individual well-being within the organisation (Asemota, 2024; Ari & Çağlayan, 2017; Malik & Naeem, 2011). Fairness (Nwibere, 2014) impacts the dominant culture of the organisation. Three dominant justice (fairness) rules that regulate justice outcomes are the needs, contribution (equity), and equality rules. The equity rule is merit-based depending on the opinion that hard-working employees or staff should earn the highest incentives above others. It is merit or impartiality, high achiever, higher dimensional productivity, or performance (Nwibere, 2014). The needs rule depends on the principle of equality (egalitarianism). It focuses on members having a similar share of rewards with no consideration for employees' individual exerted efforts. It is useful when the organisational goal maintains and sustains social agreement or harmony. The third description of fairness depends on the need norm, with the belief that every organisation member should receive rewards in proportion to their needs. This principle is employed when the organisation aims to enhance individual interest (Nwibere, 2014).

Earlier scholars have demonstrated the impact of culture on defining fairness. Americans favour the notion of equity, while equality is much more favoured in Nigeria (bandwagon annual promotion policy in the Nigerian Civil Service), many other African countries, and Asian and Scandinavian countries (Nwibere, 2014). Three dimensions of organisational justice identified include distributive, procedural (process), and interactional

(interactive) justice (Asemota, 2024; Ari & Çağlayan, 2017; Nwibere, 2014; Turgut, Tokmak, Ismail, Gucel & Cem, 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2011). Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice are critical in an individual's perception of fair treatment. They all form part of the organisational justice construct (Nwibere, 2014). Fairness became more applicable in organisational behaviour research, through the work of scholars like Blau (1964) and Adams (1965). Distributive justice refers to the resources apportioned or allocated to respective employees (allocation decision). It is the fairness that the staff discerns by evaluating their efforts and the incentives associated with the commitment made in comparison with other staff within and outside the organisation (Nwibere, 2014; Turgut, Tokmak, Ismail, Gucel, & Cem, 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2012; Hassan, 2002).

According to Ari and Çağlayan (2017) and Nwibere (2014), distributive justice refers to impartiality in the decision for work-related rewards and other organisational favours. Findings from the data analysis show that distributive justice positively impacts organisational commitment and citizenship behaviour (Asemota, 2024; Ari & Çağlayan, 2017). These findings show how workers may have viewed the continuous and fair distribution of organisational favours as an indication of their organisational commitment to them. It would exchange such employer action with complimentary positive work-related attitudes and behaviour. Nwibere (2014); Turgut et al., (2012); Malik and Naeem (2011) considered distributive justice as a vital factor that fosters a company's effectiveness. It is a type of justice based on equity theory, which focuses on the assessment made by workers about their work outcome in the form of promotion and salary offered by their organisation compared with the exerted efforts.

The authors found a positive relationship between the dimensions of organisational justice with organisational commitment. In studies by Ari and Çağlayan (2017); and Malik and Naeem (2011), the findings show a positive and significant relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment. Higher levels of workers' perception of distributive justice increases employees' commitment (Ari & Çağlayan, 2017). Procedural justice (process decision) implies that personnel in organisations are concerned about the form, processes, or steps how decisions are made that concern them (Ari & Çağlayan, 2017; Nwibere, 2014; Turgut, Tokmak, Ismail, Gucel, & Cem, 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2011).

Ari and Çağlayan, (2017) and Dinc (2015) examined the relationship between perceived justice and organisational commitment and observed the limited studies on this subject matter. Ping, Xin, Yen, Aisy, and Ting (2017) investigated organisational commitment among academic employees of Private Universities in Malaysia. They found that perceived organisational support and procedural justice correlated with organisational commitment. They recommend the government, human resource practitioners, and other administrators, focus on perceived organisational support and procedural justice to enhance academic commitment and increase the retention rate among the workforce. From the foregoing, workers are not only concerned about the decision made but equally bothered about the process that brought about the decision (Turgut et al., 2012).

When workers perceive that their employer is fair in decisions that affect reward distribution and its processes, this will translate into work behaviours of commitment, fairness in everyday function, and fairness in every human relation. It is equally vital to staffing shaping their work-related behaviours, actions, and inactions (Nwibere, 2014). Interactional or interactive justice focuses on interpersonal relationships, behaviours among employees, and the fairness of communication within organisations (Nwibere, 2014; Turgut, Tokmak & Gucel, 2012; Malik & Naeem, 2011). It further explains the quality of the interpersonal treatment staff receive within their work environment and the degree to which



workers feel respected by their supervisors or employers (Nwibere, 2014). Malika and Naeem (2011) explained that interactional justice is vital for workplace environment. It is particularly so because of its link with fair and unfair treatment. Empirical evidence shows that there are two sub-categories of interactional justice, namely; interpersonal and informational justice.

### **Employee Commitment**

Commitment, from organisational behaviour literature is defined as a high-level subconscious (psychological) and social bond to someone or something in a social activity. It consists of presumptions of personal benefits, elements of individual character, and investments of devotion and dedication (Asemota, 2024; Asemota, Were, & Nyang'au, 2022). Organisational commitment (OC) has several theoretical definitions. According to Liou (2008), OC mirrors a person's persistence in making sacrifices for the organisation's success. Its preoccupation with the organisation is the person's devotion to organisational activities. It entails a belief in and acceptance of the goals and values of the organisation. It is the willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organisation and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organisation (Asemota, 2024; Lawal, 2022).

Oludeyi (2015) asserts that job commitment is more of a psychological concept than environmental factors of the workplace. It comprises the employees' relationship with the organisation that has implications for continuing or not with the organisation. Job commitment includes attitudes toward the organisation that attaches the individual employee to the organisation (Ari and Çağlayan, 2017). It is a process that makes the individual employee increasingly integrated with the organisation. Job commitment has three components: employees' readiness to exert efforts on behalf of the organisation, workers' acceptance of organisational goals and values, and workers' desires to stay with the organisation.

Other researchers have categorised commitment as organisational membership, employee's current position, employee's predictive potential, and the differential relevance of motivational factors (Oludeyi, 2015). Lee and Chen (2013) define organisational commitment as the strength of an individual's recognition, allegiance, and psychosocial attachment to the organisation's values. Susanty and Miradipta (2013) suggest it measures employees' dedication, readiness to work hard, and willingness to remain with the employer. Job commitment cannot be fully defined without reference to the work of Meyer and Allen, as cited by Oludeyi (2015).

It connects an individual to a course of action relevant to one or more targets on the job. Workers demonstrate this commitment in three basic ways that shape behaviour: affective, continuance, and normative (Ari and Çağlayan, 2017).

Organisational commitment has been the topic of organisational research for over 30 years (Fisher, Boyle & Fulop, 2010). Asemota, 2024; Adeniran & Oshineye, 2022; Ari and Çağlayan (2017); and Jeet and Sayeeduzzafar (2014) see commitment in three different levels: (a) an attachment between an employee and the organisation (affective commitment); (b) perceived costs associated with exiting the organisation (continuance commitment); and (c) a duty to remain a member of the organisation (normative commitment). These themes culminate in behavioural and attitudinal components of commitment, regardless of whether it is individual or organisational commitment. Asemota, 2024; Adeniran & Oshineye, 2022; Ari and Çağlayan (2017); Jeet and Sayeeduzzafar (2014) explain the three-component model of commitment in terms of organisational commitment experienced simultaneously as three mindsets of affective, normative, and continuance organisational commitment.

## **Theoretical Review**

### **Equity (Justice) Theory**

Adams (1965) postulated Equity theory and opines that workers evaluate their association with their organisation by examining the benefits they derive from their employers. Dinc (2015) explains the process theory of motivation. Associated with the works of Adams (1965), Dinc (2015) reported in his findings that fairness is associated with job motivation which may affect employees' reactions and attitudes in an organisation. Furthermore, staff assesses the bonding or connection between them and their organisation, their contributions, and the rewards they obtain in return. Also, rewards are benefits an employee receives from their organisation like compensation, desirable duties at work, respect, and prominence (Adams, 1965; Dinc, 2015). When employees sense inequality between contributions to their organisations and rewards obtained, it leads to dissatisfaction and unhappiness in the workplace. These diminish their commitment, performance, and contributions to their industry. These lead to discrepancies between efforts and rewards or exit from the job. Equity theory depends on three basic assumptions: individual's moral systems that fair distribution of reward is fundamental; staff expect fair and just or equitable returns on their job contributions, and beliefs that staff who perceive themselves in inequitable conditions seek to reduce inequity (Bigirimana et al., 2016).

### **Procedural Justice Theory**

Greenberg (1990) suggests that organisational justice theory focuses on fairness in the work environment. The organisational justice construct conceptualises three dominant dimensions: procedural, distributive, and interactional (relational) justice. Procedural justice focuses on the methods used to achieve the outcomes or the impartiality of the processes on the decisions made. Impartiality in the procedure and impartiality in the interpersonal treatment of staff tend to build trust and enhance closer and more open relationships among stakeholders (Asemota, 2024; Nwibere, 2014; Ngugi, 2012). It also produces obligations for the successor and candidates not selected for the job to remain loyal and dedicated to the organisation (Ngugi, 2012).

Furthermore, Ngugi (2012) indicates that procedural justice theory affects an employee's recognition of impartiality in two ways: by giving an individual outcome and practice control. Decision control involves the degree to which individuals have actual influence over the decision made. Process control concerns the degree and the procedure gives those affected by a decision an opportunity to express their views or provide feedback on the decisions made. It enables them to have an indirect means of decision control. Fairness in the decision relates to rewards distribution and other organisational favours (Asemota, 2024; Nwibere, 2014). Procedural justice theory supports the organisational justice variable by explaining the methods and manner in which issues that affect workers in the workplace are handled without injustices. This theory fits into this study in explaining how organisational reward, such as promotion, approval of annual leave and number of leave days, and a nomination for staff training, are reasonably processed and distributed among academic employees.

## **Methodology**

The study used a cross-sectional research design. The target population comprises all the full-time and part-time lecturers of the selected public Universities in Kenya. Permission was sought and obtained from the institution of study, the National Commission for Science and Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI), the Kenyatta University Ethics Committee, and the

selected Public Universities in Kenya. 10.0% of the sample size (36) was piloted (Kothari & Garg, 2013) in a Public University that was not part of the main study. The 31 respondents (86.1%) yielded a 92.6% Cronbach Alpha Coefficient. The designed questionnaire was subjected to face and content validity by expert judges, human resource management professionals, and practitioners (Taherdoost, 2016; Leedy & Omrod, 2010; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1990; Greenberg, 1990).

Over 400 questionnaires were administered to academic staff (full-time and part-time) by the 11 trained research assistants and the researcher. The returned questionnaires were first numbered and coded for classification. 288 responses out of the 358 expected sample size yielded a 94.6% Cronbach alpha coefficient. The stratified random sampling technique represented all subgroups. The data collected used a close-ended 5-point Likert scale questionnaire and open-ended questions (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010).

The data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 25). The researcher used nominal (classify), ordinal (rank), and interval (quantify) scales of measurement for the parameters under investigation. This paper analysed biographic data and descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics employed in the study calculated and encapsulated the attributes of the respondents in a concise, meaningful, logical, and efficient way. The results show that nine items (biographic data) statistically explained the socioeconomic information. It described the respondent's profile and the distribution of their information in terms of percentages and measure of dispersion (standard deviation). 11 items on the questionnaire measured organisational justice. 12 indicators measured academic employee commitment (affective, continual, and normative commitments) with four items on each parameter.

The descriptive statistics findings are in Tables 10 and 11 for organisational justice and academic employee commitment. The independent and dependent variables were analysed singly and presented in percentages, means, and standard deviations (Mishra, Pandey, Singh, Gupta, Sahu & Keshri, 2019). A 5-point Likert scale questionnaire gathered respondents' opinions and analysed them using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 25 (SPSS Vs 25). The 5-point Likert scale depends on the degree of respondents' views and ranges between 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree.

### **Research Questions**

The main research question utilised to measure the objective of this paper is:

#### **RQ1 Does organisational justice affect academic employee commitment in public universities in Kenya?**

The research question covers procedural, distributive, and interactional justice. The items on the questionnaire are numbers 23-33 for 11 indicators.

### **Findings and Interpretation of Results**

This demographic section presents the data analysis and the interpretation of the biographical information of respondents. The study sought to establish respondents' gender, marital status, institutions the respondents are working for, age of respondents, highest academic qualification, years worked in the institution, the nature of work, employment type, and current position. Biographic data assist researchers and stakeholders in discovering the patterns of respondent's general information distribution and profiles.



**Table 1 Gender of Respondents (Male or Female)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	163	56.6	57.2	57.2
	Female	122	42.4	42.8	100.0
	Total	285	99.0	100.0	
Missing	11.00	3	1.0		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 1 indicates that over fifty-six percent (56.6%) of male respondents, over forty-two percent (42.4%) of female respondents, and about one percent (1.0%) did not indicate their gender. The two genders' participated in the study. It shows no gender discrimination. It also suggests that each gender was allowed to participate in the study. It further implies that 42.4% involvement and representation of academic women instructors in the study is an improvement of the female entrance to the university academic labour force. This study authenticates the discovery from the UNESCO report (Galán-Muros, Bouckaert & Roser, 2023; Wendt, Gunnes & Aksens (2022) that academic women representation in Higher Learning Institutions has improved from 31.6% in 1974 to 43.6% in 2020 with irrefutable difference worldwide except for Black Africa where University female instructor's representation is persistently minimal (25.9% in 1995 compared with 25.2% in 2020). It also validates the findings from Hailu, Lee, Halkiyo, Tsotniashvili, and Tewari (2023); Ojwala, Kitada, Neat, and Buchingham (2022). Consequently, the Kenyan government should step up policies such as the provision of parental support programmes, funding policies to encourage women to pursue academic careers, raise more awareness, collaborate with Higher Educational Institutions to provide resources for research on gender balance in HEIs, and provision of parent's child care subsidies to increase the number of female University academic employees.

**Table 2 Marital Status of the Respondents**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	78	27.1	28.2	28.2
	Married	175	60.8	63.2	91.3
	Separated	10	3.5	3.6	94.9
	Widow(er)	7	2.4	2.5	97.5
	Divorced	7	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	277	96.2	100.0	
Missing	11.00	11	3.8		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 2 indicates that just over twenty-seven percent (27.1%) of the respondents were single, almost sixty-one percent (60.8%) were married, about three and a half percent (3.5%) were separated, over two percent (2.4%) were widowed, over two percent (2.4%) were divorced, and close to four percent (3.8%) did not specify their marital status. Results from the investigation depict that the majority of the respondents were married. It shows that the study

considered married, single, separated, widowed, and divorced. There was no discrimination based on marital status. Therefore, working in public universities in Kenya is based on your qualifications other than marital status. It advocates further that academic talent acquisition and final selection depend on qualifications and experience.

**Table 3 Age of Academic Employee**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-24	21	7.3	7.6	7.6
	25-29	37	12.8	13.4	20.9
	30-34	60	20.8	21.7	42.6
	35-39	38	13.2	13.7	56.3
	40-44	39	13.5	14.1	70.4
	45-49	31	10.8	11.2	81.6
	50 and above	51	17.7	18.4	100.0
	Total	277	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	11	3.8		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 3 specifies that over seven percent (7.3%) of the respondents were between 20 and 24 years old, close to thirteen percent (12.8%) were between 25 and 29 years old, about twenty-one percent (20.8%) were between 30 and 34 years old, just over thirteen percent (13.2%) were between 35 and 39 years old, about thirteen and a half percent (13.5%) were between 40 and 44 years old, close to eleven percent (10.8%) were between 45 and 49 years old, close to eighteen percent (17.7%) were over 50 years old, and close to four percent (3.8%) did not indicate their age. Over fifty-four percent (54.1%) of the respondents were below 40 years old, and over forty-four percent (44.4%) were over 40.

Different age groups participated in the study in Table 3. It shows that respondents had the opportunity to provide information on the data collection instrument. Both young and older academic employees from the chosen public universities in Kenya had an equal chance of being selected without segregation. The findings deduce that most lecturers (54.1%) fall between 20 and 39 years. It suggests that younger academic staff members are higher than senior academic employees in the chosen public universities. 24.3% of lecturers fall between 40 and 49 years despite only 17.7% being above 50. The University should invigorate and revitalise the discharge of established protocols of mentorship and training of younger academia in the chosen public universities in Kenya.

**Table 4 Highest Academic Degree**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	PhD	135	46.9	47.5	47.5
	Masters	126	43.8	44.4	91.9
	Bachelor(s)	23	8.0	8.1	100.0
	Total	284	98.6	100.0	
Missing	11.00	4	1.4		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 4 indicates that about forty-seven percent (46.9%) of the respondents hold a doctor of philosophy degree, about forty-four percent (43.8%) hold a master's degree, around eight percent (8.0%) hold a bachelor's degree, and over one percent (1.4%) did not state their academic qualifications. The outcomes show that most of the respondents have PhDs in the selected public universities in Kenya. It supports Kenya's Government policy of encouraging academic employees to possess PhD degrees to meet the Kenya 2023 Vision and Commission for University Education (CUE) Policy (Matheka, Jansen & Hofman (2020); Nganga (2019)).

**Table 5 Number of Years Working at the University**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-5 Years	118	41.0	45.6	45.6
	6-10 Years	66	22.9	25.5	71.0
	11-15 Years	42	14.6	16.2	87.3
	16-20 Years	16	5.6	6.2	93.4
	21-25 Years	8	2.8	3.1	96.5
	26-30 Years	6	2.1	2.3	98.8
	Above 30 Years	3	1.0	1.2	100.0
	Total	259	89.9	100.0	
Missing	11.00	29	10.1		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 5 indicates that about forty-one percent (41.0%) of the respondents have worked in the University for less than five years, close to twenty-three percent (22.9%) have between 6.0 and 10.0 years of experience, over fourteen percent (14.6%) have between 11.0 and 15.0 years' experience, over five percent (5.6%) have between 16.0 and 20.0 years' experience, close to three percent (2.8%) have between 21.0 and 25.0 years' experience, just over two percent (2.1%) have between 26 and 30 years' experience, about one percent (1.0%) have over 30.0 years' experience. Just over ten percent (10.1%) did not indicate the time spent in the University as workers. Around sixty-four percent (63.9%) have worked in the University system for less than 10.0 years. In sum, around sixty-four percent (63.9%) of the lecturers have worked in the University system for less than 10.0 years. The study sought to document the accumulated number of years that respondents have served in their University. The

findings demonstrate that lecturers have worked for different periods in their universities. The majority (63.9%) of the lecturers who participated in the study had worked between 0.0 and 10.0 years. It signifies that the lecturers were in a position to provide valuable and suitable information for the research.

**Table 6 Nature of Work at the University**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Full-Time Lecturer	177	61.5	62.8	62.8
	Part-Time Lecturer	105	36.5	37.2	100.0
	Total	282	97.9	100.0	
Missing	11.00	6	2.1		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 6 indicates that about sixty-one and a half (61.5%) of the respondents were full-time lecturers, about thirty-six and a half percent (36.5%) were part-time lecturers, and just over two percent (2.1%) did not indicate the nature of their lecturing work in the University. Most participants (61.5%) were permanent lecturers during the study. It suggests that the Universities chosen for this study offered permanent job opportunities to their academic employees and that the permanent academic staff members carry out the bulk of the work.

**Table 7 Employment Type of the Academic Employee**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Permanent Contract	144	50.0	51.4	51.4
	Non-Permanent Contract	136	47.2	48.6	100.0
	Total	280	97.2	100.0	
Missing	11.00	8	2.8		
Total		288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 7 indicates that about fifty percent (50.0%) of the respondents were on permanent employment contracts, just over forty-seven percent (47.2%) were on non-permanent contracts, and close to three percent (2.8%) did not indicate their employment contract types. The findings illustrate that the chosen public universities for the study offered permanent employment contracts to their academic employees, which is also complemented by non-permanent contracts offered to part-time and expatriate academic employees (47.2%).

**Table 8 Current Position at the University**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Professor	20	6.9	7.1	7.1
Associate Professor	20	6.9	7.1	14.3
Senior Lecturer	43	14.9	15.4	29.6
Lecturer	91	31.6	32.5	62.1
Assistant Lecturer	28	9.7	10.0	72.1
Tutorial Fellow	58	20.1	20.7	92.9
Teaching Assistant	20	6.9	7.1	100.0
Total	280	97.2	100.0	
Missing	11.00	8	2.8	
Total	288	100.0		

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 8 indicates that about seven percent (6.9%) of the respondents were Full Professors, about seven percent (6.9%) were Associate Professors, about fifteen percent (14.9%) were Senior Lecturers, over thirty-one percent (31.6%) were Lecturers, about ten percent (9.7%) were Assistant Lecturers, just over twenty percent (20.1%) were Tutorial Fellows, about seven percent (6.9%) were Teaching Assistants. Around three percent (2.8%) did not indicate their position in the University. Most respondents (15.0%) were in the lecturer position despite full Professors and Assistant Professors constituting only 6.9% in each category. These findings corroborate the UNESCO (Galán-Muros, Bouckaert, & Roser, 2023) report that top academic positions are sparse.

**Table 9 Institution**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
University of Nairobi	44	15.3	15.3	15.3
Moi University	50	17.4	17.4	32.6
Kenyatta University	49	17.0	17.0	49.7
Egerton University	36	12.5	12.5	62.2
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology	51	17.7	17.7	79.9
Maseno University	34	11.8	11.8	91.7
Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology	24	8.3	8.3	100.0
Total	288	100.0	100.0	

**Source: Field Data 2024**

Table 9 implies that over fifteen (15.0%) percent of the respondents were from the University of Nairobi, over seventeen percent (17.0%) were from Moi University, about



seventeen percent (17.0%) were from Kenyatta University, over twelve percent (12.0%) were from Egerton University, over seventeen percent (17.0%) were from Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, over eleven percent (11.0%) were from Maseno University and over eight percent (8.0%) were from Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology. The findings show a similar proportion of respondents from traditional universities despite the technological and relatively newly established universities expressing lower responses. It is proportional to the size of the staff population. Both conventional and technological universities provided the needed information for the study.

### **Descriptive Statistic Results**

This section presents the descriptive statistics results for the independent and dependent variables. The sub-sections analysed each variable and presented the results in percentages, means, and standard deviations. The results quantitatively showcase the analysis patterns, interpreted for clarity and meaningful decision-making for all stakeholders in academia. The 5-point Likert scale questionnaire gathered data and was statistically analysed using SPSS edition 25. The scale measured the degree of lecturers' agreement with each of the proposed independent variable statements listed in the sub-sections and tables on the questionnaire. The 5-point Likert scale ranged between 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree.

Items 23 – 33 on the questionnaire measuring organisational justice variables were analysed using descriptive statistics of percentages, mean, and standard deviation. The research questions answered questions on procedural, distributive, and interactional justice—the three dimensions of organisational justice. For measuring academic employee commitment twelve (12) items on the questionnaire were equally analysed using the descriptive statistics of percentages, mean, and standard deviation. The 12 indicators measured affective, continuance, and normative commitment dimensions.

### **RQ: Does organisational justice affect academic employee commitment in public universities in Kenya?**

The findings show that 54.7% agree that organisational justice affects academic employee commitment in public universities in Kenya. It emphasises the importance of fair workload distribution, consultative decision-making processes, fair reward distribution, supportive supervisor behaviour, and positive colleague interactions. Leaders (Asemota, 2024; Waheed & Shaheeda, 2018) should consult more with job holders to enhance commitment. The management techniques recommended include but are not limited to affiliative, compassionate, and people-oriented leadership styles, participatory management meetings, open communication, involvement in decision meetings, and consultation before making decisions to foster a more cooperative and collaborative work environment (Asemota, 2024; Waheed & Shaheeda, 2018). Leaders should allow input and feedback from lecturers and students before making important decisions. Policies that encourage consultative and participatory management styles should be adopted.

**Table 10: Organisational Justice**

Indicators	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	Mean	SD
Decisions on jobs are usually made without consultation with job performers	16.7	22.9	14.6	28.8	14.6	3.02	1.35
The process of allocating my workload is fair	8.7	15.6	8.0	47.9	17.7	3.02	1.35
The process of making decisions about me and my work at this University is fair	6.6	16.7	9.7	48.6	16.0	3.51	1.21
Rewards are distributed based on merit	11.8	22.9	13.9	36.1	10.8	3.52	1.15
Academic staff salaries and benefits are paid according to qualifications and experience	11.8	12.5	10.4	43.4	18.8	3.12	1.25
Academic staff are satisfied with their remuneration packages	19.1	33.3	13.9	20.1	7.6	3.46	1.28
My supervisor fairly rewarded me for the work I did	11.1	17.0	20.8	27.8	14.2	2.62	1.25
My supervisor's decisions about my job are kind and considerate	11.1	12.8	17.0	40.6	17.0	3.19	1.26
Academic staff cooperate and support each other in their scholarly tasks	7.3	11.1	10.4	48.3	20.8	3.40	1.24
My co-workers do not put each other down	8.0	19.8	8.7	38.9	21.9	3.66	1.15
Academic staff support each other in their scholarly tasks	8.3	13.9	7.3	38.2	24.0	3.48	1.27
Overall Mean						3.85	1.71

**N=288**

**Key:** Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Undecided=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5

**Source: Field Data 2024**

The findings regarding the effect of organisational justice on academic employee commitment in the selected national universities in Kenya are in Table 10. The responses on the indicators for organisational justice use a 5-point Likert scale. The scores were analysed using SPSS version 25 to calculate the percentage frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviations for each indicator assigned to measure organisational justice in the selected institutions. Table 10 shows the feedback pattern on the impact of organisational justice on academic employee commitment in chosen public universities in Kenya. The scale is based on the degree to which the respondents agreed, disagreed, or undecided on the independent variable statements listed in the table.

The percentage descriptive statistics results on indicators measuring organisational rewards are in Table 10. It shows that more than forty-three percent (43.4%) of the lecturers agree that the decisions on jobs were made without consulting the people performing those

jobs; above sixty-five percent (65.6%) of the lecturers agree that the process of allocating their workload was fair; about forty-seven percent (46.9%) of the lecturers agree that academic employees' rewards were distributed on merit; above sixty-two percent (62.2%) of the lecturers agree that their salaries and benefits depend on qualifications and experience; about twenty-eight percent (27.8%) of the lecturers agree that they were satisfied with their remunerations; about forty-two percent (42.0%) of the lecturers agree that their supervisors fairly rewarded them for the work done; above fifty-seven percent (57.6%) of the lecturers agree that their supervisors' decisions about their jobs were kind and considerate; just above sixty-nine percent (69.1%) of the lecturers agree that academic employees cooperate and support each other in their academic tasks; sixty-one percent (60.8%) of the lecturers agree that their co-workers do not put each other down and 62.2% of the lecturers agree that academic employees support each other in their academic tasks. Over 54.7% of the respondents agree that organisational justice affects academic employees' commitment to Public Universities in Kenya.

Furthermore, included in Table 10 are the descriptive statistics results on the mean scores and standard deviations on the indicators measuring organisational justice. The findings indicate that academic employees perceive allocating their workload to be relatively fair ( $M = 3.02$ ,  $SD = 1.35$ ), suggesting a perceived sense of fairness in the distribution of work responsibilities. Similarly, academic employees perceive the process of making decisions about themselves and their work in the university to be fair ( $M = 3.51$ ,  $SD = 1.21$ ), indicating a perceived sense of fairness in decision-making processes. Furthermore, the perception that rewards in the university are distributed based on merit ( $M = 3.52$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ) and that academic staff salaries and benefits paid according to qualifications and experience ( $M = 3.12$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ) contribute to the perception of organisational justice. Academic employees also report being satisfied with their remuneration packages ( $M = 3.46$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ), indicating a positive perception of the fairness of their compensation.

However, academic employees perceive that their supervisors do not always fairly reward them when considering their work ( $M = 2.62$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ). It suggests potential issues with perceived fairness in reward allocation by supervisors. Additionally, while academic employees perceive kindness and consideration from their supervisors when making decisions about their job ( $M = 3.19$ ,  $SD = 1.26$ ), there is room for improvement in this aspect of supervisor behaviour. Moreover, academic employees perceive a positive organisational justice climate concerning cooperation and support among colleagues in their academic tasks ( $M = 3.40$ ,  $SD = 1.24$ ). The perception that co-workers do not put each other down ( $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 1.15$ ) and that academic employees support each other in their academic tasks ( $M = 3.48$ ,  $SD = 1.27$ ) further contributes to a sense of organisational justice. The overall mean score is 3.85, and the standard deviation is 1.71.

These findings emphasise the importance of fair workload allocation, decision-making processes, reward distribution, supervisor behaviour, and positive colleague interactions in promoting organisational justice and subsequently influencing academic employee commitment in the chosen public universities in Kenya. Several earlier types of research reinforce and authenticate the findings regarding the power of organisational justice to stimulate academic employee commitment in universities. Research by Colquitt et al. (2013) investigated the interconnection between organisational justice and employee outcomes across various industries, including academia. The findings revealed that perceptions of fairness in workload allocation, decision-making processes, and reward distribution positively influenced employee commitment. It supports the present study's

findings that academic employees' perception of fair workload allocation, fair decision-making processes, and merit-based rewards positively influence their commitment.

In the study by Edeh and Ugwu (2019), the researchers explored the impact of organisational justice on employee commitment among academic employees. The results indicated that fair salary and benefits, including fair decision-making processes, significantly predicted higher levels of employee commitment. This finding aligns with the results of the present study, where academic employees' perception of fair salary and benefits and fair decision-making processes positively influenced their commitment. This study also corroborates the findings of Teshome, Bitew, and Gebremeskal (2021), Orajaka (2021), Tafamel and Akrawah (2019), Mustofa (2019), Gichira, Were, and Orwa (2016), Al-Gharaibeh and Albdareen (2015), Anjum, ul Haq, Usman and Hussain (2014), noted that organisational justice, distribution justice, have a beneficial and substantial interconnection with employee effectiveness while interactive justice has a valuable but minor interconnection with employee effectiveness. This finding supports the present study's result that academic employees' perception of merit-based rewards and fairness in supervisor behaviour contributes to their commitment.

**Table 11 Academic Employee Commitment**

Indicators	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	Mean	SD
I would be glad to spend the rest of my career with this University	12.5	15.3	13.9	36.8	19.4	3.36	1.31
I feel as if this University's problems are mine	13.5	21.9	12.2	34.7	14.2	3.15	1.31
I do not feel like "part of the family" at this University	26.0	27.4	10.8	26.4	6.9	2.60	1.32
I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this University	26.0	33.0	11.1	13.2	7.6	2.38	1.27
It would be difficult for me to leave my University right now even if I wanted to	15.3	17.7	13.9	31.9	19.8	3.24	1.37
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave this University now	11.8	26.4	14.9	26.0	19.1	3.14	1.33
It would not be too costly for me to leave this University now	17.0	31.3	12.8	24.3	11.8	2.82	1.32
I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up	19.8	25.3	12.2	22.9	17.0	2.92	1.42
One vital reason I continue to work at this University is my belief that loyalty is crucial and a moral obligation	7.6	14.6	11.1	40.6	24.3	3.60	1.23
I learned to believe in the value of the University	6.6	22.9	11.1	35.8	20.8	3.43	1.25
I do not feel it is right to quit my University if I get a better job offer elsewhere	20.8	34.0	10.4	16.7	15.6	2.72	1.39
I do not think being a University man/woman is sensible anymore	23.3	31.9	6.9	19.4	14.2	2.68	1.42
<b>Overall Mean</b>						<b>3.00</b>	<b>1.33</b>

N=288

**Key: Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Undecided=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5**

**Source: Field Data 2024**

The findings regarding academic employee commitment in the chosen public universities in Kenya are in Table 11. The responses on the indicators for academic employee commitment used a 5-point Likert scale. The scores were analysed using SPSS version 25 to calculate the percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations for each indicator assigned to measure academic employee commitment in the chosen institutions. Table 11 shows the feedback pattern of academic employee commitment in preferred public universities in Kenya. The scale is based on the degree to which the lecturers agreed, disagreed, or undecided on the moderating variable statements listed in the table.

The percentage descriptive statistics results on indicators measuring academic employee commitment are in Table 11. It shows that over fifty-six percent (56.2%) of the



lecturers agree that they would be glad to spend their career with the University; almost forty-nine percent (48.9%) of the lecturers agree that academic employees feel that the University's problems were theirs; around a third (33.3%) of the lecturers agree that academic employees did not feel like a "Part of the Family" at the University; almost twenty-one percent (20.8%) of the lecturers agree that they did not feel "Emotionally Attached" to the University; about fifty-two percent (51.7%) of the lecturers agree that they would find it very hard to leave the University right now, even if lecturers wanted to; just over forty-five percent (45.1%) of the lecturers agree that unwarranted lives disruptions can occur if they decided to leave the University now.

Furthermore, just over thirty-six percent (36.1%) of the lecturers agree that it would not be too costly for them to leave the University now; about forty percent (39.9%) of the lecturers agree that academic employees were not afraid of what might happen if they quit their jobs without having others lined up; almost sixty-five percent (64.9%) of the lecturers agree that one vital reason academic employees continue to work at the University is their belief that loyalty was crucial and it is also a moral obligation; over fifty-six percent (56.6%) agree that academic employees learned to believe in the values of the University; above thirty-two percent (32.3%) agree that academic employees did not feel it is right to leave their University if they got better job offers elsewhere and overall, more than a third (33.6%) of the lecturers agree that they did not think to be University men or women were sensible anymore.

Furthermore, Table 11 contains the mean scores and standard deviations on the indicators measuring academic employee commitment. The findings indicate that academic employees perceive that they would be happy to spend the rest of their careers with their university ( $M = 3.36$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ), which suggests commitment to their university. Similarly, they report that they feel that the University problems are theirs ( $M = 3.15$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ), indicating a level of emotional attachment to their University. Academic employees who do not feel like "part of the family" at the University are comparatively slight ( $M = 2.60$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ), demonstrating likely discontent with the university. The consciousness of emotional detachment from the University by the selected academic employees ( $M = 2.38$ ,  $SD = 1.27$ ), also suggests potential issues with affective commitment to their university. Furthermore, the perception that it would be challenging for academic employees to quit the University presently, granted that they desired to ( $M = 3.24$ ,  $SD = 1.37$ ) and that exceedingly much of lecturers' lives would be interrupted if they decided to abandon the University now ( $M = 3.14$ ,  $SD = 1.33$ ) further advance affective commitment. Still, the consciousness of lecturers concerning the predictor that it would not be too expensive for them to leave the University now is relatively low ( $M = 2.82$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ), and the perception of academic employees that they are not afraid of what might happen if they quit their jobs without having another lined up ( $M = 2.92$ ,  $SD = 1.42$ ) are relatively low and also suggest a potential deficit or decrease on continuance commitment which in the long run affect their overall commitment.

Academic employees report that one vital reason they continue to work at this University is their belief that loyalty is crucial and is morally obliged to remain ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ). It highlights a positive aspect of normative commitment by academic employees. Furthermore, academic employees' perception that they learned to believe in the value of the University ( $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = 1.25$ ), suggests a positive aspect of normative commitment where academic employees value their university. However, academic employees' perception that they do not feel it is right to leave their Institution if they get a better job offer elsewhere is relatively low ( $M = 2.72$ ,  $SD = 1.39$ ). Academic employees do not think being a University man/woman is sensible anymore and are also low ( $M = 2.68$ ,  $SD = 1.42$ ). These outcomes

demonstrate that normative commitment is powered adversely. It alters the long-term academic employee's commitment to the preferred public universities in Kenya.

These outcomes accentuate the prominence of academic employee commitment in affective, continuance, and normative commitment in the chosen public universities in Kenya. Several earlier types of research reinforce and authenticate the findings regarding academic employee commitment in HEIs. The outcomes of this study are consistent with previous research on the determinants that affect employee commitment in organisations. In particular, research by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) indicates that employees' viewpoints of organisational justice, which includes allotting, systematising, and synergistic justice, are important determinants of employee commitment. Therefore, the study's finding that organisational justice is a significant predictor of academic employee commitment is consistent with the previous research. Meyer and Smith (2000) established that organisational payments, such as acknowledgment and path development opportunities, are compelling determinants of employee commitment in healthcare.

## **Policy Implications and Implementation**

### **a. Systematise Organisational Justice as a Centre Human Resource Tactic**

Define dispersive, methodical, and collaborative justice as fundamental human resources ideology. Establish these regulations in faculty guidebooks, university acts, and recruitment

contracts. Furthermore, administer consistent drills for human resource officers, departmental

heads, and academic leaders on fairness management.

### **b. Consolidate Methodical Impartiality in Decision-Making**

Instrument understandable, authentic advancement, work distribution, and punitive measures. Authorise discussion with employees before strategic decision-making and create collaborative frameworks (e.g., departmental human resource task forces, combined faculty committees).

### **c. Guarantee Impartial and Superior Compensation Systems**

Institutionalise earnings and perks across similar positions and qualifications. Compensation

allocation ground rules are regulated by internal human resource auditors and connecting superior advancements and motivation to precisely stated accomplishments, and teaching or

research payoffs.

### **d. Enhance Supervisor and Line Manager Responsibility**

Create policies that support responsible supervisors for impartial dialogue and assessing accomplishment. Institute synergetic fairness as a proficiency in evaluating the achievement of

faculty leaders and instruct supervisors in empathy, response management, and dispute resolution.

**e. Enhance Employee Engagement and Consultation Mechanisms**

Systematise semiannual faculty feedback reviews with undisclosed paths to publish recognised unfairness and utilise the response to revise human resource codes and policies at the academic level and central human resource grades. Also, strengthen the faculty portrayal of the university executive boards and committees.

**f. Manage Discrepancies Between Permanent and Non-Permanent Faculty**

Audit and edit contracts to enhance the requirements and add non-permanent lecturers. Guarantee impartial access to research grants, professional growth, and committee collaboration. Furthermore, adjust work distribution and accomplishment expectancies across recruitment categories.

**g. Strategy on Comprehensive Leadership and Gender Fairness**

Cultivate assent and gender justice in promotions and institutional management. Buttress research and gender reviews in academic departments to narrow existing gaps, and institute parental relief policies, mentoring arrangements, and anti-irritation measures.

**h. Inculcate Justice Measurements into Institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**

Determine key performance indicators (KPIs) such as employee turnover, complaints, impartial promotions, and contentment with human resource processes. Couple KPIs to achievement contracts of human resource leaders and top executives. Also, narrate on fairness measurements in institutional annual reports to guarantee answerability.

**i. Create Organisational Culture About Legitimacy**

Establish a university culture in which responsibility, decorum, and communication are institutional values. Commend departments and leaders who champion impartiality and all-embracing practices. Also, develop a Justice and Ethics Committee or augment the current quality assurance functions to monitor equity or impartiality.

**j. According to National and Global Standards**

Assure agreement with: Kenya's Public Service Commission Human Resource Guidelines, Commission for University Education (CUE) benchmarks, ILO labour fairness standards, and UNESCO frameworks on academic rights and institutional governance.

The study authenticates that organisational justice significantly strengthens faculty undertaking, especially across affective and normative dimensions. Therefore, policies should exceed compliance, which vigorously stimulate organisational justice, order of merit, and dignified engagement within Higher Educational Institutions. Whenever academics perceive fairness in practices, procedures, compensation packages, and interpersonal dealings, they are more likely to be loyal, emotionally connected, and dedicated to the institution. These are vital for the retention and performance of top talent in universities confronting global competition and limited resources.

## **Conclusion**

The study established the effect of organisational justice on academic employee commitment in selected Public Universities in Kenya. The findings indicate that academic employees perceive allocating their workload relatively fair. Similarly, academic employees perceive making decisions about themselves and their work in the university to be fair. Academic employees expressed that rewards in the university are distributed based on merit and that academic staff salaries and benefits are paid according to qualifications and experience. These contribute to the perception of organisational justice. Academic employees also report being satisfied with their remuneration packages which indicates a positive perception of the fairness of their compensation.

However, academic employees perceive that their supervisors do not always fairly reward them when considering the work done. It suggests potential issues with biased reward allocation by supervisors. There is room for improvement in this aspect of supervisors' behaviour. Moreover, academic employees perceive a positive organisational justice cooperation climate and support among colleagues in their scholarly tasks. The perception that co-workers do not put each other down and that academic employees support each other in their scholarly tasks further contributes to a sense of organisational justice.

These findings emphasise the importance of fair workload allocation, decision-making processes, reward distribution, supervisor behaviour, and positive colleague interactions in promoting organisational justice and influencing academic employee commitment in the selected top Public Universities in Kenya. These findings revealed that perceptions of fairness in workload allocation, decision-making processes, and reward distribution positively influenced employee commitment. It supports the present study's findings that academic employees' perception of fair workload allocation, fair decision-making processes, and merit-based rewards positively influence their commitment.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the findings, the research suggests the following for improving academic employee commitment. Higher Educational Institutions in Kenya should provide more training and development opportunities for heads of departments (supervisors) to enhance their leadership and management skills. Communication channels can be established between supervisors and their lecturers to improve organisational justice. Furthermore, tertiary institutions in Kenya should ensure that HEIs policies and practices are fair, transparent, and equitable to all academic employees. It can be achieved by establishing clear policies and procedures for decision-making, ensuring equal opportunities for career development and advancement, and providing effective communication and feedback mechanisms for employees. Additionally, institutions should establish effective channels for resolving conflicts and addressing grievances fairly and without bias.

## References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social change. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 277-299.
- Adenira, A. J. & Oshineye, A. A. (2022). Impact of Organisational Justice on Organizational Commitment [A Study of Ogun State Property and Investment Corporation (OPIC), Ogun State] *International Journal of Operational Research in Management, Social Sciences & Education*, 8(1), February.
- Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., Ali, G., & Islam, T. (2015). Perceived organisational support and its outcomes. A meta-analysis of latest available literature. *Management Research Review*, 38(6), 627-639.
- AL-Gharaibeh, S., & Albdareen, R. (2015). Organisational Justice and Its Impact on The Commitment of Faculty Members to Work Ethics: Empirical Study on Private Universities in North Provinces. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(12), ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online).
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedent of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organisation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Anjum, Z-U-Z., ul Haq, A., Usman, M., & Hussain, N. (2014). Effects of Perceived Distributive Justice on Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of perceived organizational support. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(10), October.
- Ari, A. & Çağlayan, H. S. (2017). Relationship between Organizational Justice Perceptions and Organizational Commitment Levels of School of Physical Education and Sports Academicians. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(4).
- Asemota, O. O (2024). *Perceived Organisational Support on Academic Employee Commitment in Top Public Universities in Kenya*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Juja: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Asemota, O. O. & Asemota, G. N. O. (2022). Influence of Adherence to Academic Employee Work Contract on Academic Employee Commitment in Selected Kenya Public Universities. *Journal of Popular Education in Africa*, 6(11), 53 – 77.
- Asemota, O. O, Were, S. & Nyang'au, S. P. (2022). Organisational Reward as a Predictor of Academic Employee Commitment in Selected Public Universities in Kenya. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 6(11), 96 – 117.
- Asemota, O. O, Were, S. & Nyang'au, S. P. (2022). Influence of Working Conditions on Academic Employee Commitment in Kenya Public Universities. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 6(11), 77-95.
- Bigirimana, S., Sibanda, E. N., & Masengu, R. (2016). The Impact of Working Conditions on Academic Employees Turnover at Africa University, Mutare, Zimbabwe. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies*, 3(2), 91-98.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). *Organisational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace*. (8<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Dinc, E. (2015). Perceived Organisational Support as a Mediator of the Relationship between Effort-Reward Fairness, Affective Commitment, and Intention to Leave. *International Business Research*, 8(4), 259-269.



**Citation:** Asemota, O. O & Asemota, G. N. O. (2025). Effect of Organisational Justice on Academic Employee Commitment in Public Universities in Kenya. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(9), 39 – 64.

- Edeh, O. F., & Ugwu, J. N. (2019). Organisational Justice and Employee Commitment of Selected Private Secondary Schools Teachers in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 18-30
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organisational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organisational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Fisher, R., Boyle, M. V., & Fulop, L. (2010). How gendered is organisational commitment? The case of academic faculty. *International Journal of Organisational Analysis*, 18(3), 280-294.
- Galán-Muros, v., Bouckaert, M., & Roser, J. (2023). Policy Brief. The representation of women in academia and higher education management positions. *International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean*, 8, March. UNESCO-IESALC.
- Gichira, P. M., Were, S. M., & Orwa, G. O. (2016). Relationship between perceptions of distributive justice and employee commitment in health sector non-governmental organisations in Kenya. *European Journal of Human Resource*, 1(1), 1-25.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organisational Justice: Yesterday, Today & Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Hailu, M. F., Lee, E. E., Halkiyo, A., Tsotniashvili, K., & Tewari, N. R. (2023). Gender and Higher Education in African Universities: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Key Policy Mandates in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda, Mar. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*.
- Hassan, A. (2002). Organizational Justice as a Determinant of Organizational Commitment and Intention to Leave. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 7(2), 55–66.
- Hiariey, H. & Tutupoho, S. (2020). Organizational Justice in Higher Educations. JKBM (Jurnal Konsep Bisnis dan Manajemen) 6(2), 218-233.
- Jeet, V., & Sayeeduzzafar, D. (2014). A Study of Human Resource Management Practices and Organisational Commitment in Self-Financed Professional Institutions. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 2(1), 69-73.
- Kavit, G. (2017). The Role of Kenya's Formal Higher Education in Sustainable Development Within the Context of Globalization: *Springer International Publishing AG* 2017 W. Leal Filho *et al*, (eds.), Handbook of Theory and Practice of Sustainable Development in Higher Education, *World Sustainability Series*.
- Kiboij, K. L. (2013). The Dynamics of Students Unrest in Kenya's Higher Education: The Case of MOI University. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria, South Africa).
- Komodromos, M. (2014). Employees' Perceptions of Trust, Fairness, and the Management of Change in Three Private Universities in Cyprus. *Journal of Human Resources Management and Labour Studies*, 2(2), 35-54.
- Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2013). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (3rded.). New Delhi, India: New Age International.
- Lawal, A. A. (2022). Organisational Justice and Teachers' Job Commitment in Kwara State Public Primary Schools, Nigeria. *Attarbawiy: Malaysian Online Journal of Education* 6 (2), 1-10.
- Lee, C. C., & Chen, C, J. (2013). The Relationship between Employee Commitment and Job

- Attitude and Its Effect on Service Quality in the Tourism Industry. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 3, 196-208.
- Leedy, P. D. & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (9th ed.), New Jersey: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Liou, S-R (2008). An Analysis of the Concept of Organisational Commitment. Wiley Periodicals. *Nursing Forum*, 43(3), 116-125.
- Malik, M. E., & Naeem, B. (2011). Role of Perceived Organisational Justice in Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Higher Education Institutions of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(8), December.
- Matheka, H. M., Jansen, E. P. W. A., & Hofman, W. H. (2020). PhD students' Background and program characteristics as related to success in Kenyan universities. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 15, 57-71.
- Meyer, P. J. and Smith, A.C. (2000). HRM Practices and Organizational Commitment: Test of a Mediation Model. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 17, 319-331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.2000.tb00231.x>
- Mishra, P. Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C., & Keshri A. (2019). Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*, 22, 67-72.
- Mustofa, A. (2022). A Critical Review Study on the Effect of Distributive Justice and Procedural Justice on Organisational Commitment and Satisfaction. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal) *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 1-6.
- Nganga, G. (2019). Universities struggle to meet PhD and other targets, 13 April. Retrieved from <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=2019040813442377>.
- Ng'ethe, J. M. (2013). *Determinants of Academic Employees Retention in Public Universities in Kenya*, Unpublished PhD dissertation, Juja: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Retrieved from <http://ir.jkuat.ac.ke/>
- Ngugi, P.K. (2012). *Challenges Hindering Sustainability of Small and Medium Family Enterprises after the Exit of the Founders in Kenya*, Unpublished PhD dissertation, Juja: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Nwibere, B. M. (2014). Organisational Justice as a Determinant of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour in the Nigerian Work Environment: A Study of selected Universities in the Niger Delta Region. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(4), 191-205.
- Obalade, G.O. & Mtembu, V. (2023). Effect of Organisational Justice on Workplace Deviance in Nigerian Public Universities. *Acta Commerci* 23(1), a1091.
- Oludeyi, O. S. (2015). A Review of Literature on Work Environment and Work Commitment: Implication for Future Research in Citadels of Learning. *Human Resource Management Series*, 2, 5(11), 32-46.
- Ojwala, R. A., Kitada, M., Neat, F., & Buckingham, S. (2022). Effectiveness of gender policies in achieving gender equality in ocean science programmes in public universities in Kenya. *Marine Policy*, 144, 105237.
- Orajaka, U. P. (2021). Effect of Employees Commitment and Distributive Justice to the Reward of Management Practices in Some Selected Organizations in South East Nigeria. *South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics*, 9(4), 10-18.
- Ping, C.Y., Xin, C., Yen, D. Y. C., Aisy, H., & Ting, Y. S. (2017). Organisational Commitment among Academic Employees of Private Universities in Malaysia (Bachelor's thesis, University Tunku Abdul Rahman, Malaysia). Retrieved from <http://eprints.utar.edu.my/2512/1/BA-2017-1401501.pdf>

**Citation:** Asemota, O. O & Asemota, G. N. O. (2025). Effect of Organisational Justice on Academic Employee Commitment in Public Universities in Kenya. *Journal of African Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(9), 39 – 64.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organisational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organisational Behaviour* (14th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Susanty, A; & Miradipta, R. (2013). “Employee’s Job Performance: The Effect of Attitude toward Works, Organisational Commitment, and Job Satisfaction”. *Jurnal Teknik Industri*, 15(1), 13-24.

Tafamel, E. A., & Akrawah, O. D. (2019). Organisational Justice and Employee Commitment: Evidence from University of Benin. *SSRG International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 6(7), 84 - 91, <https://doi.org/10.14445/23939125/IJEMS-V6I7P113>

Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and Reliability of the Research Instrument; How to Test the Validation of a Questionnaire/Survey in a Research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management. (IJARM)* 5(3), 28-36.

Turgut, H., Tokmak, I., & Gucl, C. (2012). The Effect of Employees’ Organisational Justice Perception on their Organisational Commitment: A University Sample. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 4(2), 21-30.

Waheeda, A. & Shaheeda, F. (2018). Academic Leaders’ Leadership Styles in Higher Education Institutions in the Republic of Maldives. *International Journal of Education, Psychology and Counseling*, 3(10), 65-74. March.

Wendt, K., Gunnes, H., & Aksnes, D. W. (2022). International Migration of Researchers and Gender Imbalance in Academia the Case of Norway. *Scientometrics*, 127:7575–7591.