



Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies (ISSN: 2315-5086) Vol. 1(6) pp. 201-209, July, 2012  
Available online <http://garj.org/garjmbs/index.htm>  
Copyright © 2012 Global Advanced Research Journals

*Full Length Research Paper*

# **Organizational justice and behaviour of human resource in industrial organizations in South-West Nigeria**

**Akintayo, D. I. and Ayodele, O.A.**

<sup>1</sup>Department. of Human Resource Development College of Management and Social Sciences, Osun State University, Okuku Campus, Nigeria.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business and Private Law College of Law, Osun State University, Ifetedo Campus

Accepted 23 July 2012

**This study investigated the influence of organizational justice on behaviour of human resource in industrial organizations in South-West Nigeria. This was for the purpose of ascertaining the relevance of fairness in organizational practices to goal achievement in Nigeria. The study adopted ex-post-facto design. A total of 230 respondents were selected for the study, using proportionate stratified sampling technique. The instrument used for data collection was a set of questionnaire with reliability co-efficient of 0.88 using Cronbach alpha formula. The null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 alpha level using Pearson product moment correlation and t-test statistical methods. The finding of the study revealed that there was a significant influence of organizational justice on job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism behaviour of human resource in industrial organizations in South-West Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that human resource should be involved in planning and implementation of organizational programmes in order to motivate them towards job commitment, job involvement and reduction in absenteeism behaviour. Also, the wages and salaries should be subjected to continuous review and promptly paid in order to foster job commitment, job involvement and reduction of absenteeism behaviour among the workforce with corresponding effects on organizational goals.**

**Keywords:** Organizational justice and behavior, Human resource, Industrial organizations

## **INTRODUCTION**

The problem of unequal treatment of human resources in organization on the bases of gender, relationship, ethnicity, nepotism has received attentions of researchers in the recent times. Organizational justice refers to the ways and manner by which workers are treated at workplace with or without any prejudice and preference.

Research evidences among organizational behaviourists revealed that organizational justice has far reaching effects on organizational citizenship behaviour at workplace (Flowers, 2004; Chad, 2007 and Clement, 2008). Chad and Clement asserted that organizational justice with particular emphasis on the role of fairness in the workplace has had corresponding influence on labour turnover and absenteeism.

The issues of justice and fairness are key concerns to employees within an organization. Employees often ascertain whether their contributions to the organization

match the rewards they receive. They also judge the fairness of the decision-making process, see if the processes are consistently fair, and do not discriminate against any employee (Cohen, 1991). The main types of organizational justice are distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the dissemination of resources and the criteria by which they are distributed to the employees. It includes essential elements of equity, equality and need (Bies, Shapiro and Moag; Gilliland, 1994).

In contrast, procedural justice refers to the fairness of the processes and procedures used to determine results (Cropanzano, 1991). Employees trade their knowledge, skills, and abilities and motivation for rewards. The rewards can be tangible, such as income and intangible, such as being treated with respect, dignity, and fairness. This reciprocal exchange is grounded in social exchange theory (Blau, 2003) and the mutual transaction of benefits to each party shapes the social interactions. It is reasonable to assume that employees are more likely to respond favourably to fair treatment than unfair treatment. Indeed psychological theory states that the importance of fairness is a basic need for the well being and satisfaction of employees (Blau, 2003). Akintayo and Babajide (2008) submit that, employees who perceive that they are being treated without prejudice are more likely to have a high degree of satisfaction and continue their employment with the organization. Recently, interactional justice has come to the forefront and refers to the perceived fairness of interpersonal treatment by the employee's manager. Interactional justice perceptions are concerned with ensuring the employees are treated with dignity, sensitivity, and respect and whether manager's decisions are accurately communicated and explained to the employees (Ojo, 2009).

Moreover, employees who perceive they are not being treated fairly due to unfair interpersonal treatment or unfair procedures develop low job satisfaction and may seek alternative employment (turnover intention) with another organization in pursuit of equity ( Akintayo and Babajide, 2007). Thus, employees, who perceive strong levels of fairness (social exchange theory) will experience higher levels of job satisfaction.

However, much of the early researches on organizational justice explored employees' perception of the distributive and procedural fairness of specific organizational policies and decisions. For instance, researchers have examined employee perceptions of the fairness of selection and recruitment decisions. (Gilliland, 1993, Smatter, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman and Stoffey, 1993), performance appraisal system (Greenberg, 2007), job loss and lay offs (Brockner and Greenberg, 1990; Konovsky and Brockner, 1993), organizational treatment and job satisfaction (Akintayo and Babajide, 2007); and even an employee reactions to equitable reward in terms of satisfaction and performance. In the study on interpersonal treatment at workplace, Mikula, Penk and

Tanizer (1990) reported that a considerable proportion of the injustices which were reported did not concern distributional or procedural issues in the narrow sense but referred to the manner in which people were treated in interpersonal interactions and encounters. Similarly, Bes and Moag (1986) noted that employees are heavily influenced by interactional justice which refers to an individual's evaluation of the quality of interpersonal treatment experienced when organizational procedures are enacted.

Human resource behaviour is the area of interest that focuses on the impact that individual; group and structure have on behaviour within organization for the purpose of applying such knowledge towards improving organizational effectiveness (Williams 2009). In other words, human resource behaviour seeks to improve the people-organization relationship in such a way that people are motivated to develop teamwork that effectively fulfils their needs and achieve organizational goals and objectives.

Meanwhile, research evidences showed that the perceptions of organizational justice are related to critical job-related attitude such as job satisfaction, compliance and productivity. Keashley, Wilson and Clement (1994) found that experiences of hostile organizational behaviours were related to lower job satisfaction and affective job commitment. Further empirical evidence reports that there was a significant relationship between fair treatment at workplace and job satisfaction (Cobb and Frey, 1996, Fry and Gordon, 1989).

Organizational commitment or job commitment refers to the degree of identification an individual employee has with the vision and mission statements of an organization. Organizational commitment is defined as the degree to which the employee feels devoted to their organization (Spector, 2000). Thus, organizational commitment has become one of the most popular work attitudes studied by practitioners and researchers (Meyer, Allen and Smith, 1993; Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 2003). One of the main reasons for its popularity is that organizations have continued to find and sustain competitive advantage through teams of committed employees. Meyer, Gellatley, Goffin and Jackson, (2000) have found that committed employees are more likely to remain with the organization and strive towards the organization's mission, goals and objectives. Further research into this variable has concluded that commitment is a diverse construct.

Meyer and Allen (2003) submit that there is general acceptance that organizational commitment has three main facets: affective, continuance, and normative, each with its own underlying 'psychological states'. According to Meyer and Allen affective commitment refers to the emotional bond and the identification the employee has with the organization. For the employees the positives include enhanced feelings of devotion, belongingness, and stability. The authors argue further that continuance

(economic/calculative) commitment refers to what the employee will have to give up if they have to leave the organization or in other terms, the material benefits to be gained from remaining. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain with the organization because they feel they need to do so for material benefits. Therefore, if the employees believe that fewer viable alternatives are available their continuance commitment will be stronger to their current employer. Lastly, normative commitment or moral commitment (Jaros, Jermier, Koehler, and Sincich, 2003) reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization (Bentein, Vandenberghe and Stinglhamber, 2005). Jaros et al (2003) argue that the commitment is determined by being obligated to work in the organization, a sense of moral obligation following their parents, who may have been long-term employees of the organization therefore, a sense of duty to belong.

Furthermore, job involvement is a belief descriptive of the present job and tends to be a function of how much the job can satisfy one's present needs (Ojo, 2009). Williams (2009) reported that employees do not get involved on the job only for self-relational interest fulfillment; they also get involved in the job because they let their emotions play a role. Becoming highly involved in the job often times a response to emotional rather than rational needs. Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) found out that job involvement is correlated with job satisfaction and efficiency on the job among the seasoned teachers.

Generally, it is believed that job involvement by positively affecting employees' motivation and effort, leads to higher levels of in-role job performance (Brown, 1999). Prior research has indicated some support for this claim. For instance Brown and Leigh (1999) reported that job involvement had both direct and indirect effects via effort on performance. More specifically they found that the modest but statistically significant relationship between job involvement and performance became non significant when effort was inserted into the model, indicating the mediating effect of effort on the relationship. Muchinsky and Tuttle (2000) argued that occupation specific measures of job involvement should be created and consequently developed a measure of 'salesperson job involvement'. Their study uncovered a significant but positive relationship between one facet of their measure, 'relationship' involvement and performance.

Absenteeism behaviour refers to intermittent presence of workers at workplace and without attending to official duties at a specified period of time. Adler and Golan (2001) throw doubt on the progression thesis with their finding that although lateness was more strongly related to unexcused absences than to medical absences, the relationship between lateness and unexcused absences was not progressive. The authors also speculate that the

increasing absenteeism prior to termination noted in some studies may occur after the decision to terminate and may therefore not represent a process of progressive psychological withdrawal. In addition, they view lateness as a stable pattern of behaviour, contrary to an earlier indication.

A later study of absenteeism-turnover progression was inconclusive; its findings neither supported the progression hypothesis strongly nor negated it (Gupta and Jenkins 1992). Indications of a progression were found in one organization under study but not in a second. Since the organizations (and related samples of employees) were significantly different (the first at a 100-employee pet food-manufacturing plant employing 83% men and the second a bank organization of 20 branches employing 75% women), one may speculate that the research for universally applicable conclusions will be difficult indeed. Similarly, March and Simon (2002), after a study of the absenteeism-turnover relationship, argue "that there is no necessary relationship between absenteeism and turnover but when injustice is experienced in organization, and employee tend to exhibit absenteeism-turnover intention behaviour"

Despite the interest of researchers in the equity and fair play as an aspect of organizational justice, there have been little researches conducted on the impact of organizational justice on human resources' behaviour. Indeed, researches conducted in the area of organizational justice in Nigeria are very few. Even those researches conducted on organizational justice only focused on its relative impact on one of the human resource behaviour in isolation in both developed and developing countries of the world. Besides, most of the findings of the previous researches still require further empirical verification. Thus, the need for seeking empirical evidence on organizational justice as it affects multiple human resource behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism) in industrial organizations in South-West Nigeria.

### **What then is justice?**

Justice means fair and proper administration of laws (Black's Law Dictionary, p.881) Fairness in this context means fairness or reasonableness, especially in the way people are treated or decisions are made. Justice can also be seen as a system or application of law: the legal system, or the act of applying or upholding the law. When one dealt with somebody or something fairly, it could be concluded that justice had been done. In the case of *Inokoju v. Adeleke* (2007) 4 NWLR( pt.1025) 423 at 633 paras C-F), NIKKI TOBI JSC, said that:

Justice is a most important expression in the judicial system and the administration of justice. Justice in simplistic content means quality of being just, fair play and fairness.

In *FRN Plc v. May Medical Clinics and D.C. Ltd*, (2006) 4 N.W.L.R ( Pt.971) 442 at 478-479, paras A-C. Abdullahi, JCA, had this to say:

Justice is a two-way street, justice for the plaintiff and justice for the defendant (in relation to organizational justice and behaviour of human resource in industrial organizations in South-West Nigeria, it is justice for the employees and justice for the employer) – emphasis is mine. Justice simply means fair treatment...and justice in any case demands that the competing rights of the parties must be taken into consideration and balanced in such a way that justice is not only done but seen to be done.

C.H. Perelman, in his classic work *De La Justice* (C.H. Perelman, *The Idea of Justice and the Problem of Argument* (196) ), attempted to identify the various component of justice or the criteria by which justice can be assessed. He said:

1. Justice is done if what people receive is proportionate to the contributions they make.' To each according to his works.'

2. From another perspective, justice is attained when each man receives according to his needs. This is the welfarist concept of justice. 'To each according to his needs.'

3. To some others, justice entails the distribution of benefits and burdens according to personal merit. Thus, in a just society, the good receive the benefits while the bad receive burdens of life. 'To each according to his merit.'

4. From another standpoint, in a just society, benefits are distributed according to . rank. The higher the rank, the greater the advantages. The principle here is 'to each according to his rank.' Rank can be ascertained in various ways, including age, religious, social status, marital status, race, skin, colour and academic or professional qualification.

5. Justice can also be done to each according to his legal entitlement. From this viewpoint, the indices of justice are found only in the legal system. The law stipulates what is due to each man under different circumstances.

6. Finally, Perelman identifies a sixth form of justice, which is: to each the same thing. This form of justice is hinged on the concept of equality.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Against the foregoing, the study investigated the influence of organizational justice on job commitment, Human Resource behaviour (job involvement and absenteeism) in industrial organizations in South-West Nigeria. This was with the view to ascertaining the relevance of fair play in organizational practices to goal achievement in South-West Nigeria.

### **Objectives of the study**

Specifically the objectives of the study are to:

1 □□ Ascertain the influence of organizational justice on human resource behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism). job commitment of human resource in industrial organizations in Nigeria.

2 Find out the difference between the behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism) of respondents from public and private organizations on the basis of organizational justice.

3 Determine the significant difference in behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism) of male and female respondents on the basis of organizational justice.

4 Establish the differential perception of male and female respondents on organizational justice.

### **Hypotheses for the study**

The following four null hypotheses were generated and tested for the purpose of the study:

1 There is no significant relationship between organizational justice and human resource behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism).

2 There is no significant difference between the behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism) of respondents from public and private organizations on the basis of organizational justice.

3 There is no significant difference between the behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism) of male and female respondents on the basis of organizational justice.

4 There is no significant difference between male and female respondents' perception on organizational justice.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The ex-post-facto design was adopted for the study to determine the relative influence of organizational justice on job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism behaviour of the human resource in industrial organizations in South- West Nigeria.

### **Participants**

The target population for the study consists of all workers, who had spent at least three years in the selected organizations in South-West Nigeria.

### Sample and Sampling Technique

A total of 230 respondents were selected for the study using proportionate stratified sampling technique. Four organizations, two public (University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Power Holding of Nigerian Plc and two private (Wema Bank of Nigeria Plc and Nigerian Breweries Plc) were selected for the study using stratified sampling technique to reflect the two strata of organizations (public and private), age range (old and young) and gender (male and female)

Also, 148 (64.4%) male and 82 (35.6%) female respondents participated in the study. Although, both male and female respondents participated in the study, this data indicates that the selected organizations are male dominated. The age range of the respondents was 28-65 year with means score of 17.11 and standard deviation of 8.35. More so, 161 (70%) graduate and 69 (30%) non-graduate respondents participated in the study. The respondents, who have obtained University degree certificate, were classified as graduates while those respondents who have not attained University education were classified as non-graduates. However the respondents who have reached ages 40 and above were treated as old; those below age of 40 were treated as young respondents.

### Research instrument

Four sets of questionnaire were utilized for data collection. These include: Organizational Justice Scale (OJS); Job Commitment Scale (JCS), Job Involvement Scale (JIS) and Absenteeism Behaviours Scale (ABS). The questionnaire consisted of 40s items with four sub-scales. Section A of all the scales contains information on demographic characteristics of the respondents, which include: Name of organization, age, gender, marital status, highest educational qualification, working experience etc

### Organizational Justice Scale (OJS)

*Organizational justice* was operationalised using Niehoff and Moorman (1993) Organizational Justice Scale. The justice scale consists of three sub-scales: distributive justice, interactional justice and procedural justice. Distributive justice was measured using five items assessing the fairness of different work outcomes, including pay levels, work schedule and job responsibilities. ". Interactional justice has nine items and measured the degree to which the employees felt their needs were considered, and adequate explanations were made for job decisions, e.g. "when decisions are made about my job, the manager is sensitive to my personal needs". *Procedural justice* was designed to measure

formal procedures and had six items that measured the degree to which job decisions insured the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, an item example being "job decisions are made by my manager in an unbiased manner. The respondents were asked to rate the statements on Likert-type scale from 1 = to a very *small extent* to 5 = to a very *large extent*. The Cronbach's alpha for distributive justice, 43 procedural justice and interactional justice in this sample was 0.78; 0.97; 0.93 respectively.

### Job Involvement Scale (JIS)

This measure is based on a 10-item scale developed by Kanungo (1982). Sample items are: The most important things that happen to me involve my present job, Most of my personal life goals are job oriented, My active participation in planning and organizing organizational activities is recognize by my boss, Through job involvement, you fulfill the need for emotional experiences. You often remain beyond the required working hours, etc. The measure was assessed on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The Cronbach's alpha value for this scale was 0.82. But for the present study; the researcher reported Cronbach reliability co-efficient of 0.85

### Job Commitment Scale (JCS)

This is based on a 10-item scale developed by Allen and Meyer, (2000) but was modified by the researcher for measuring the organizational commitment of the workers. The author divides the scale into two subdivisions, affective and continuance commitment. Affective commitment has eight items, for example, "I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it". Continuance commitment has eight items, for example, "right now, staying with the organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire". The items are measured on a Likert type anchored scale from = *strongly disagree* (1), to = *strongly agree* (7). The Cronbach's alpha for organizational commitment in this sample was affective commitment 0.78 and continuance commitment 0.81. But for the present study; the researcher reported Cronbach reliability co-efficient of 0.81 for affective commitment and 0.87 for continuance commitment.

### Absenteeism Behaviour Scale (ABS)

This scale which contains 7 items was developed and validated by Allen and Meyer (2003). Sample items are: The treatment I received on the job is unfair, I usually absent myself from my job due to unfair treatment, I always feel unhappy going to office every day due to

**Table 1:** Summary of Pearson Product Moment Correlation Showing the Relationship between Organizational Justice and Human Resource Behaviour (Job Involvement, Job Commitment and Absenteeism Behaviour)

Variable	N	Mean	SD	R	P	Remark
Organizational Justice	230	18.34	10.21			
Job Involvement	230	20.67	9.37	.146	.001	Significant (P <0.05)
Job Commitment	230	19.23	8.87	.125	.000	Significant (P <0.05)
Absenteeism Behaviour	230	20.14	9.38	.165	.001	Significant (P <0.05)

unfair treatment, etc. The measure was assessed on a five-point scale (ranging from 1 = strong disagree, to 5= strongly agree). The Cronbach's alpha value for this scale was 0.73. For the present study, the researcher reported Cronbach reliability co-efficient of 0.88

### Administration of the instruments

The instrument was administered by the researcher with the help of three trained research assistants. The permission and approval for administration of the research instruments was obtained from the Director of Human Resource Management in the selected organizations in South-West Nigeria by the researcher. The researcher explained the purpose of the study and all aspects of the questionnaire to the respondents. They were made to understand that all information being provided will be treated with confidentiality and for the purpose of research only.

However, 287 copies of questionnaire were administered and 230 copies that were completely filled and returned were utilized for the purpose of the study. It took the researcher three weeks to administer and collect the questionnaire, due to the geographical location of South- West Nigeria.

### Data Analysis

The data collected through the questionnaire was collated and analyzed for the purpose of the study. The demographic information was analyzed using simple percentage and frequency counts. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation and t-test statistical methods were used to test the four null hypotheses generated for the study. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation formula was used to test hypotheses one while t-test statistic was utilized to test hypotheses two and three at 0.05 alpha levels.

### Presentation of Results

The results of the analyzed data were presented on the basis of the hypotheses generated for the study.

H01: There is no significant relationship between

organizational justice and human resource behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism)

The results in table 1 indicate that organizational justice had a significant positive relationship with job involvement,  $r = .146$ ;  $P < 0.05$  on the basis of organizational justice. Also, table 1 revealed that a significant relationship exists between organizational justice and job commitment,  $r = .125$ ;  $P < 0.05$  on the basis of organizational justice. Besides, table 1 showed that a significant relationship exists between organizational justice and absenteeism behaviour,  $r = .165$ ;  $P < 0.05$  on the basis of organizational justice. Thus hypothesis 1 was not confirmed.

Ho2: There is no significant difference between behaviour (job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism) of respondents from public and private organizations on the basis of organizational justice.

Table 2 shows that the respondents from private organizations were found to be

demonstrating job involvement than respondents from public organizations,  $t(228) = 17.05$ ,  $P < .05$  on the basis of organizational justice. Also, the result revealed that respondents from both public and private organizations were found to be demonstrating the same level of organizational commitment,  $t(228) = 15.78$ ,  $P > .05$  on the basis of organizational justice. The absenteeism behaviour was found to be higher among respondents from public organizations than those respondents from private organizations,  $t(228) = 113.67$ ;  $P < .05$  on the basis of organizational justice. The findings showed that there was a significant relationship between organizational justice and behaviour of the respondents under the present study from private and public organizations except for job commitment.

Ho3: There is no significant difference between behaviour ((job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism,) of male and female respondents on the basis of organizational justice.

Table 3 shows that the male and female respondents were found to be equally

demonstrating job involvement,  $t(228) = 8.43$ ,  $P > .05$  on the basis of organizational justice. Also, the result revealed that male and female respondents demonstrated the same level of organizational commitment,  $t(228) = 6.47$ ,  $P > .05$  on the basis of organizational justice. The absenteeism behaviour was found to be high among male and female respondents,  $t(228) = 7.57$ ;  $P > .05$  on the basis of organizational justice.

**Table 2.** Mean Standard Deviation and t-test-on Variation in Human Resource Behaviour Based on Organizational Justice by Type of Organization.

Variable	Type of Organization	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	P	Remark
Job Involvement	Public	119	20.45	11.88	228	17.05	.000	Significant (P<0.05)
	Private	111	21.56	12.34				
Job Commitment	Public	119	24.12	9.76	228	15.78	.231	Not Significant (P<0.05)
	Private	111	22.77	12.34				
Absenteeism Behaviour	Public	119	24.65	12.76	228	13.67	.002	Significant (P<0.05)
	Private	111	24.35	11.56				

**Table 3.** Mean Standard Deviation and t-test-on Variables by Gender.

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Df	t	P	Remark
Job involvement	Male	148	22.45	11.23	228	8.43	.432	Not Significant (P>0.05)
	Female	82	21.17	10.87				
Job commitment	Male	148	18.67	10.34	228	6.47	.367	Not Significant (P>0.05)
	Female	82	18.02	9.56				
Absenteeism Behaviour	Male	148	20.46	12.68	228	7.57	.543	Not Significant (P>0.05)
	Female	82	19.87	12.16				

The findings showed that there was a significant relationship between organizational justice and behaviour of the male and female respondents. Although, these findings require further empirical verification for possible generalization.

H04: There is no significant difference between male and female respondents' perception on organizational justice.

Table 4 reveals that there was a significant difference found between male and female respondents' perception on organizational justice in their organizations which is significant at 0.05 alpha level,  $t(228) = 6.12$ ;  $P < 0.05$ . This implies that there was a problem of equity in the distribution of justice and reward to male and female workers. This could possibly jeopardize interpersonal relations and job satisfaction of the workforce with fear reaching effect on job involvement, organizational commitment and absenteeism behaviour and productivity. Thus, hypothesis four was rejected.

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

The first hypothesis predicted that there is no significant

relationship between organizational justice and human resource behaviour (job involvement, job commitment and absenteeism behaviour). The hypothesis was not confirmed. The finding of the study revealed that there was a significant relationship between organizational justice and human resource behaviour. The finding implies that the treatment and reward system adopted in the selected organizations in South-West Nigeria has really impacted the human resource behaviour (job involvement, job commitment and absenteeism) at workplace. In essence, the human resource perceived the treatment and reward meted out for them when compared to the strength of service being rendered to the organizations as fair and equitable. The finding corroborates Akintayo and Babajide (2007); Keashley et al (1994); Cobb and Frey (1996), Fry and Gordon (1989) who reported that workers' perception of fair treatment in an organization tends to influence job satisfaction. However, the finding of the study disagrees with Clement (2009), Haniseh and Hulins (1990) who contended that interactional justice within an organization is significantly related to organizational retaliation behaviour, such as withdrawal and turnover behaviour. The finding of the study implies that organizational justice tends to

**Table 4.** Summary of t-test Analysis on Perception of Male and Female Respondents on Organizational Justice.

Sex	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	P	Remark
Male	148	20.45	12.47				
Female	82	18.78	11.28	228	6.12	.000	Significant (P <0 .05)

positively and negatively influence human resource behaviour ((job involvement, job commitment and absenteeism behaviour) depending on favorableness of organizational climate.

The second hypothesis postulated that there is no significant different between behaviour (job involvement, job commitment and absenteeism behaviour) of respondents from public and private organizations on the basis of organizational justice. The finding revealed that the kind of treatment provided in terms of placement of personnel, discipline, condition of service, increased wages and salaries, promotion at regular interval and conducive working environment had impacted the human resource behaviour at workplace. In essence, the human resource demonstrated positive behaviour (job involvement, job commitment and absenteeism) in both public and private organizations on the basis of organizational justice.

The finding supported the submission of Keashley et al (1994), Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) and Dittrich and Carrel (1979) who reported that the perception of fair treatment in an organization is significantly related to decreased turn-over intentions absenteeism and actual turnover rate among the workforce. Similarly, the finding of the study corroborates Akintayo and Babajide (2007) who submits that employees might react to perceived inequalities in their organizations by decreasing their normal organizational behaviours in terms of commitment and morale at work place. The finding implies that workers perception of organizational justice tends to influence their job commitment, job involvement and absenteeism behaviour at workplace.

The finding revealed that there was a significant difference between male and female respondents' perception of organizational justice that is prevalent in their work organizations. Thus, the hypothesis was not confirmed. In essence, the male and female respondents perceived organizational justice differently and unequal. This implies that the male and female respondents' contributions to the growth of their organizations were as a result of variation in their perception of the organizational injustice in terms of recruitment and promotion policies, equitable reward policy and treatment in their organizations.

By implications, this research is designed to create awareness on the part of the managers on the needs to pay attention to the policies and procedures associated with distributive justice, interactional justice, and procedural justice. It is important that the organization

examine the policies and procedures it implements to see if they are in alignment and enhance the social exchange relationship. Management needs to ensure that the employees are given a "voice" in the process, that their input is valued, resulting in the employee perceiving the procedure (procedural justice) as fair and hence will be more satisfied with their managers and have greater commitment to the organization (Meyer, et al., 2000). When employees are committed they identify themselves as being part of the organization, reciprocity and a social exchange relationship exists, creating a sense of fellowship (Meyer and Allen 2003). Some considerations could be given to managers receiving interactional justice training, increasing their fairness behaviour, to improve the social relationships between managers and employees, which could improve the workplace environment. Consequently, the managers would spend "less time, effort, and expense on problems with conflict resolution (Ojo, 2009). Indeed, the research of O'Driscoll and Beehr (2003) indicate the effects of the actions of managers upon the organizational employees in shaping their attitudes of job involvement. Thus, the results show that levels of job commitment and job involvement will increase if the human resource perceives that the procedures and outcomes, distributive and procedural justices are equitable and fair. Therefore, managers need to ensure that all policies and procedures are based on the principles of organizational justice.

## CONCLUSION

The study established that Organizational Justice has significantly influenced human resource behavior. The study further showed that the treatment and administration of reward system have far reaching effects on workers' level of job, commitment, job involvement and their presence at workplace.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of the study:

1. Human resource should be involved in planning and implementation of organizational programmes in order to motivate them towards job commitment, job involvement and reduction in absenteeism behaviour.
2. The wages and salaries should be subjected to



continuous review and promptly paid in order to foster job commitment, job involvement and reduction of absenteeism behaviour among the workforce with corresponding effects on organizational goals.

## REFERENCES

- Adler S, Jacob G (2001). Lateness as a withdrawal behaviour. *J. applied psychol.* 66:544
- Akintayo DI (2003): Influence of organizational climate on workers job performance in work organization in south-western Nigeria. *Journal of educational research*, 9(20): 78-96
- Akintayo DI, Babajide EO (2008): Impact of organizational treatment on job satisfaction among workers in selected tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *J.Edu. Manag.* vol 5, 69-83.
- Akintayo MO (2002): Labour-management relations and workers commitment in oyo state of Nigeria. *J. labour stud.* 4: 12-23.
- Allen NJ, Meyer JP (2000). The measurement and antecedents of affective continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *J. Occupational Psychol.* 63: 1-18.
- Ashforth BE, Humphrey RH (1995). Emotion in the workplace: A re-appraisal. *Human Relations*, 48(2): 97-125.
- Bentein K, Vandenberghe CVR, Stinglhamber F (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: A latent growth modeling approach. *J. Applied Psychol.* 90: 468-482.
- Bins RJ, Shapiro TO, Moag JS (2003). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In: R.J Lewicki, B.H. Shepard, and M. Bazerman (Eds) *Research on Negotiation in organization*, 1: 43-45.
- Blau P (2003). *Exchange and power in social life*. New york: Prentice Hall.
- Brockner J, Greenberg J (1990): The impact of layoffs on survivors: A Organization justice perspective. *Harvard Review*, 19(3): 78-89.
- Chad HP (2007). Organizational justice and productivity at workplace. *J. Labour Law and Justice*, 17(2): 45-54.
- Clement MA (2009). Approaches to minimizing work-family role conflict in organizations. *J. Sociol. Stud.* 10(2): 48-59.
- Cobb AT, Frey FM (1996): The effects of leader fairness and pay outcome on Superior- subordinate relations. *J. Applied Psychol.* 26: 140-1426.
- Cohen RL (1991). Justice and negotiation. *Research on Negotiation in Organization*. 23: 259-282.
- Cropanzano R (1991); Effects of organization justice on organization productivity. *J. applied Psychol.* 71: 600-701.
- Dietrich JE, Currell MR (1979). Organisation equity perceptions, employees Job satisfaction and department absence and turnover rates. *Organizational behaviour and Human performance*, 24: 29-40
- evaluation of causal model. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 39, 441-555.
- Fry GE, Gordon ME (1989). Workplace justice and job satisfaction as predictors of Satisfaction with Union and and management. *Acad. Manag. J.* 32(5), 851-366.
- Gilliland SW (1993): The perceived fairness of selection of system: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 694-734.
- Gilliland SW (1994): Effect of procedural and distributive justice on reaction to a
- Greenberg L (2007): Determinant of perceived fairness of performance evaluation. *J. Applied Psychol.* 71: 340-348.
- Gupta N, Jenkins GD (1992). *Absenteeism and turnover: is there a Progression?* *J. Manag. Stud.* 19: 395-412.
- Hanisch KA, Hullins CL (1990). General attitude and organization withdraw; An
- Jaros S, Jermier J, Koehler J, Sincich T (2004). Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equations models. *Acad. Manag. J.* 36: 951-995.
- Kanungo RN (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *J. Applied Psychol.* 11(3): 341-349.
- Keashley TA, Wilson VF, Clement HO (1994): Relationship between Interpersonal behaviour and job satisfaction *J. Industrial Psychol.* 4: 60-72
- Konovsky MA, Brockner J (1993): Managing victims and survivor lay off reactions: A procedural justice perspective. *J. Applied Psychol.* 46(2): 80-89.
- Konovsky MA, Cropanzano (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. *J. Applied Psychol.* 76: 698-707.
- Lassek F, Marshall G, Cravens D, Moncrief W (2001). Salesperson job involvement: a modern perspective and a new scale. *J. Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 21, 291-302.
- March JP, Simon HA (2002). *Organization*. New York: Wiley.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ (2003). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *J. Applied Psychol.* 78: 538-551.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ, Smith ST (1993). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *J. Vocational Behaviour*, 49(3): 252-276.
- Meyer JP, Allen NJ, Gellatly IR, Goffin L, Jackson NA (2000). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluations of measures and analyses of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *J. Applied Psychol.* 75: 710-720.
- Mikula G, Perik B, Tanizer M (1990): The impact of formal and interactional justice on organization outcomes. Paper present at the twelfth Annual Conference of Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St Louis, 445-527.
- Mowday RT, Porter LW, Steers RM (2003). Viewing turnover from the perspective of those who remain: The relationship of job attitudes to attributions of the cause of turnover. *J. Applied Psychol.* 66: 120-123.
- Muchinsky PM, Tuttle ML (2000). Employee turnover and absenteeism behaviour: An empirical and methodological assessment. *J. Vocational Behaviour*, 14: 43.
- O'Driscoll MP, Beehr GL (2003). Job stress and burnout. In M. O'Driscoll, P. Taylor, and T Kalliath (Eds.). *Organizational psychology in Australia and New Zealand* (p 188-211). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Ojo GA (2009). Dimensions in the study of job involvement and workers' job satisfaction in tertiary institutions in Ogun state. *J. Contemporary Issues and Productivity*, 11(2): 78-88.
- Selection system. *J. Applied Psychol.* 7(5): 69-701.
- Spector PE (2000). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice* (2 Ed.). USA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Williams KH (2009). Work on family conflict among the female managers in organization. *J. Gender Stud.* 9(1), 36-47