

## THE INFLUENCE OF ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE ON EMPLOYEES' COMMITMENT IN MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN OYO STATE, NIGERIA: IMPLICATIONS FOR INDUSTRIAL SOCIAL WORK

Ajala, E. Majekodunmi, PhD

### ABSTRACT

*Economic institutionalisation of work with its attended problematic side effects like ineffectiveness, straitjacketing of workers and reduced innovation makes management look for the corollary points of sense of duty (organisational justice) as operation parameters in the workplace for greater benefits of trust and commitment of staffers. It is against this background that this study investigated the influence of organisational justice on organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. The descriptive survey research design of ex-post facto type was used for the study. Two hundred and fifty (250) employees were randomly selected from five manufacturing firms from Industrial Estates in Ibadan, Oyo States. The respondents span across the four major job levels from senior management, middle management, supervisory and junior staff. The main instrument used for the study was a questionnaire tagged "Organisational Justice and Organisational Commitment Questionnaire - OJOCQ" with five sub-sections. Frequency counts and percentages were used to analyse the demographic characteristics of the respondents while Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis were used to analyse the research questions and hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Findings from the study showed that the joint contribution of the independent variables to the dependent variable was significant ( $F = 163.165$ ). It was found that there was significant and positive relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment. ( $r = .697$ ) Furthermore, there was significant positive relationship between procedural justice and organisational commitment ( $r = .739$ ) and that there was significant positive relationship between interactional justice and organisational*

*commitment ( $r = .715$ ). It was recommended that industrial social workers should advocate on behalf of employees and ensure that management of organisations give room for fair and just procedures (procedural justice and distributive justice) coupled with proper interaction (interactional justice) so that employees will be able to give better response to the organisation in terms of commitment, positive behaviour and increased productivity.*

**KEY TERMS:** Industrial social work, procedural justice, distributive justice, interactional justice, organisational commitment, manufacturing firms, Nigeria

*Department of Social Work, Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. Tel. No. +2348035653135 Email: majekajala@yahoo.com*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Business organisations are assumed to be basically economic institutions where exchanges of monetary payment for the performance of concrete tasks are basis for operation (Barley & Kunda, 1992). However, adherence to this thought without consideration of other possibilities has problematic side effects. For example, merit pay is sometimes ineffective (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2006), downsizing often has pernicious long-term effects (Pfeffer, 1998), and bureaucratic management can straitjacket workers and reduce innovation (Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007). Managements of workplaces sensing the aforementioned negative effect of economic institutionalisation of work are now looking into the corollary points of sense of duty (organisational justice) as operation parameters in the workplace for greater benefits of trust and commitment of staffers.

Organisational justice is a personal evaluation about the ethical and moral standing of managerial conduct. The

implication is that producing justice at the workplace requires that management should take the perspective of an employee (Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007). Also, Baldwin (2006) sees the term organisational justice as referring to the extent to which employees' perceive workplace procedure, interaction and outcomes to be fair in nature. These perceptions can influence attitudes and behaviour for good or bad which in turn will have impact on employees' performance, commitment and organisational success. People in all facet of life are naturally attentive to the justice of events and situations in their everyday lives, across a variety of contexts (Tabibnia, Satpute & Lieberman, 2008).

Furthermore, the concept of organisational justice has been discovered by various Work Psychologists under three distinct, though overlapping, as distributive, procedural and interactional.

These three forms of organisational justice tend to be correlated (Cropanzano, Bowen & Gilliland, 2007). They can be treated as three components of overall fairness

(Ambrose & Arnaud, 2005; Ambrose & Schminke, 2007) and the three components can work together. Each of the components has unique elements necessary for discussions in the utilisation of organisational justice in the work place (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: *Components of Organizational Justice*

1. Distributive Justice: Appropriateness of outcomes.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equity: Rewarding employees based on their contributions.</li> <li>• Equality: Providing each employee roughly the same compensation.</li> <li>• Need: Providing a benefit based on one’s personal requirements.</li> </ul>
2. Procedural Justice: Appropriateness of the allocation process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency: All employees are treated the same.</li> <li>• Lack of Bias: No person or group is singled out for discrimination or ill-treatment.</li> <li>• Accuracy: Decisions are based on accurate information.</li> <li>• Representation of all Concerned: Appropriate stakeholders have input into a decision.</li> <li>• Correction: There is an appeal process or other mechanism for fixing mistakes.</li> <li>• Ethics: Norms of professional conduct are not violated.</li> </ul>

3. Interactional Justice: Appropriateness of the treatment one receives from authority figures.
• Interpersonal Justice: Treating an employee with dignity, courtesy, and respect.
• Informational Justice: Sharing relevant information with employees.

Source: *Cropanzono, Bowen, and Gilliland, (2007)*

Distributive Justice (DJ): Distributive Justice refers to outcomes being distributed proportional to inputs based on equity principle. It is the subjective evaluation of the employees' to the extent to which outcomes such as wages, promotions, work roles and workloads are distributed fairly to the employees (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng, 2001). To achieve distributive justice if they are applied appropriately, three allocation rules are to be applied, they are equality (to each the same), equity (to each in accordance with contributions) and need (to each in accordance with the most urgency) (Cropanzano, et al., 2007). Therefore, distributive justice focuses on the degree of perceived fairness in the distribution and allocation of outcomes within an

organisation based upon the inputs (Price, Mueller, 1986; Rani, Garg & Rastogi, 2012).

Procedural Justice (PJ): Procedural Justice refers to the procedures/means by which outcomes are allocated, but not specifically to the outcomes themselves (Cropanzoni, et al., 2007). The emphasis here is on the importance of fairness of the methods or procedure used (decision criteria, control of the process) at workplace (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Folger & Konovsky, 1989; and Greenberg, 1990). Leventhal (1980); Leventhal, Karuza & Fry (1980) established core attributes that make procedures just. These are consistency, lack of bias, accuracy, correlation, representation of all concerned and consistency with ethical norms. Procedural justice is positively associated with the cognitive, affective and behavioural reactions at workplace, and enhances employees' psychological wellbeing with reputation feeling of life satisfaction by the employees (Elovainio, Kivimaki & Vahtera, 2002) and commitment to the job. Kim and Mauborgue (2005) stated that fair processes lead to intellectual and

emotional recognition which in turn create the trust and commitment that build voluntary cooperation in strategy execution of goals.

Interactional Justice (IJ): Interactional justice exists when decision makers treat people with respect and sensitivity and explains the rationale for decisions thoroughly. Therefore, interactional justice is the treatment that an individual or employees receives as decisions are made (Bies & Moag, 1986; Moorman, 1991 and Colquitt et al., 2001). Colquitt et al., (2001) suggested that interactional justice should be broken into two components namely interpersonal and informational justice. Interpersonal justice refers to the respect and dignity with which one treats another while informational justice refers to whether one is truthful and provides adequate justifications when things go badly. Bies and Moag (1986) identify some key aspects of interactional justice which can enhance people's perceptions of fair treatments. They are truthfulness (information given must be realistic and accurate, presented in an open and forth right manner), respect (employees treated with

dignity), propriety (statements and questions should never be improper or involve prejudicial elements such as racism or sexism) and justification (when a perceived injustice has occurred, giving explanation or apology can reduce or eliminate the sense of anger generated).

**Organisational Commitment:** Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) defined commitment as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organisation. They indicated that commitment has three components namely: an employee's belief in and acceptance of organisational goals and values; his/her willingness to work towards accomplishing the organisation's goals; his/her strong desire to continue as organisation member.

Meyer and Allen (1991) discussed three components of organisational commitment namely: affective, continuance and normative. According to them organisational members who are affectively committed to the workplace continue to work for the organisation because they want to. Therefore, affective commitment is

the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organisation. Beck and Wilson (2000) stated that employees that are committed to the organisation on the affective level because they view their personal employment relationship have been congruent to the goals and values of the organisation.

In defining continuance commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) looked at the calculative effect of the individual's perception or weighing of costs and risks associated with leaving the current organisation. They further stated that continuance commitment of employees is based on their commitment because they need to do so. So, continuance commitment is instrumental attachment to the organisation based on individual's association assessment of economic benefit gained (Beck and Wilson, 2000).

Normative commitment is a feeling of obligation to continue employment (Meyer and Allen, 1991). This normative component is viewed as the commitment employees consider morally right to stay in the company

regardless of the satisfaction derived from the organisation over time. Therefore, briefly put, commitment reflects in the forms of employee's intention to stay or leave the organisation, though it may be moderated with factors like opportunities available outside and normative pressure to stay on the job (Arif Hassan, 2002).

Therefore, Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) submitted that common to the three types of commitment, is the view that commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, and has implication for the decision to continue or stop membership in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with an organization because they want to, those with a strong continuance commitment remain because they have to, and those with a strong normative commitment remain because they feel they ought to (stay).

Lambert, Hogan and Griffin (2007) refers to organisational commitment as the state in which

employees' sense of loyalty with their respective organisation aligned themselves with organisational goals and values it. Therefore, fairness and justice offers opportunity to employees to have sense of belonging which is an element of organisational commitment. However, some researchers have shown correlation between distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. For instance, Lambert et al., (2007) found that procedural justice and distributive justice significantly contributed to employees' organisational commitment.

Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) in their two-factor model found that procedural justice is a better predictor of organisational commitment when compared with distributive justice. This finding was further supported by the finding of Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) that procedural justice has significant positive relationship with organisational commitment. Arif Hassan (2002) while investigating how perception of equity and justice come to play on employees' commitment to the organisation and intent to leave using the banking

industry found that both distributive and procedural justice made significant contributions to employees' organisational commitment and intent to leave. Colquitt et al., (2001) in meta-analytical review of organisational justice literature, pointed out that distributive and procedural justice were significant predictors of organisational commitment.

Also, Nazim and Shahid (2012) in investigating the relationship between organisational justice and organisational commitment and turnover intentions, established that both distributive justice perception and procedural justice perception had a significant relationship with organisational commitment and turnover intentions. Fariha, Sardar and Mozafar (2013) in investigating the relationship between organisational justice and organisational commitment of the staff of directorate of Youth and Sport of Chahar Mahal va Bakhtiari established that distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice have significant relationship with organisational commitment.

Furthermore, Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013) while looking into impact of perceived organisational justice on organisational commitment of a food and beverages firm in Nigeria established that both distributive justice and procedural justice have significant relationship with organisational commitment. In another study by Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani (2009) it was found that there is positive relationship between distributive and procedural justice with organisational commitment of medical college employees in India. Interdem with other findings, Najafi et al., (2011) found that educational experts of different universities had higher commitment levels by the provision of organisational justice. Ponnu and Chuah (2010) while investigating organisational commitment, organisational justice and employee turnover in Malaysia established that there is significant, strong and positive relationship between the organisational justice (procedural justice and distributive justice) and organisational commitment.

Also, Rhodes and Strees (1981) in their research found that pay equity was the most important contributor to the

prediction of organisational commitment for a group of cooperative employees, but was not a significant predictor of commitment for a group of conventional employees. Moreover, Quarles (1994), in examining promotion opportunities and evaluation criteria as mechanisms for affecting internal auditors' commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention found that satisfaction with promotion opportunities (distributive justice) and satisfaction with evaluation criteria used (procedural justice) directly correlated with organisational commitment for the respective groups. It is also seen from the research conducted by Zaman, Ali and Ali (2010) on private teachers in Pakistan that distributive justice and procedure justice had positive impact on organisational commitment.

## **STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

Employees in the manufacturing sectors are usually susceptible to change of jobs based on the fact that their skills are usually required in other similar firms and are usually enticed by would-be employers. Hence, their rate of turnover may be more frequent. Efforts are being

made by management to retain these employees haven't considered the cost of training and retraining when employees leave and new one is employed. The commitment of employees to organisations therefore call for concern, it is against this background that this study raises the following research questions and hypotheses to test whether there is correlation between organisational justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo States, Nigeria.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

(a): What is the joint effect of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria?

(b): What is the relative contribution of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice to organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria?

### **HYPOTHESES**

1. There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria.
  
2. There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria.
  
3. There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria.

## **METHODOLOGY**

**Research Design:** The descriptive research design of ex-post facto type was used for the study. It is found to be appropriate because the variables were not manipulated and it was easy to collect factual information about the independent and independent variables.

**Population:** The population of this study consists of all employees from manufacturing firms in Oyo States, Nigeria.

Sample and Sampling Technique: 300 employees were randomly selected from five manufacturing firms from Industrial Estates in Ibadan, Oyo States. Sixty respondents were randomly selected from each firm. Ibadan industrial estates of Oluyole, Eleyele and Ife Road were chosen because they represent the core concentration points for manufacturing firms in Oyo State. The respondents span across the three major job levels of senior management, middle management, and junior staff.

Research Instrument: The main instrument used for the study is a questionnaire tagged “Organisational Justice and Organisational Commitment Questionnaire - OJOCQ” with five sub-sections. Section A measured the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Sections B, C, D, and E measured Distributive Justice (DJ), Procedural Justice (PJ), Interactional Justice (IJ), and Organisational Commitment (OC) with a responding format of 4-point rating scale ranging from strongly

agree (SA) = 4, agree (A) = 3, disagree (D) = 2 to strongly disagree (SD) = 1.

**Distributive Justice Scale (DJS):** The instrument consists of five items measuring employees' perceptions of distributive justice. The items were adopted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993) "Justice as a Mediator of the relationship between Methods of Monitoring and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour". The adopted section after revalidation had a reliability value of 0.76.

**Procedural Justice Scale (PJS):** The instrument consists of five items adopted from Niehoff and Moorman (1993) "Justice as a Mediator of the relationship between Methods of Monitoring and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour". The adopted section after revalidation had a reliability value of 0.85.

**Interactional Justice Scale (IJS):** The instrument consists of nine items measuring the perceptions of the employees on interactional justice. The items were drawn from Niehoff and Moorman (1993) "Justice as a Mediator of the relationship between Methods of Monitoring and

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour”. The adopted interactional justice scale had reliability coefficient of 0.91.

Organization Commitment Scale (OCS): This consists of nine items adopted from Cook and Wall (1980) “Network attitude measures of trust, organisational commitment and personal non-fulfilment Scale” The revalidated reliability coefficient for OCS for this study gave 0.79 cronbach alpha coefficient.

Administration of the Questionnaire: Of the three hundred questionnaires administered, two hundred and eighty-seven were returned, properly filled and found useful for analysis. Frequency counts and percentages were used to analyse the demographic characteristics of the respondents while Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis were used to analyse the research questions and hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Participants demographic characteristics: Findings from the study showed that 80 (27.9%) were junior staff, 154 (53.6%) were middle level while 53 (18.5%) were management level. Of these respondents, 167 were male while 120 were female. The ages of the respondents ranged between 19 and 55 years with a mean age of 32.4 years. 177 respondents (61.6%) had tertiary education qualifications, 78(27.2%) had secondary certificates and 32(11.2%) had primary education. The least qualification of the respondents was the primary school certificate and the highest was doctorate degree. Meaning that, all the respondents are literate and could understand the questionnaire properly. The minimum work experience of respondent is 4 years; hence the issue of organisational citizenship behaviour is not strange to them.

Research Question (a): What is the joint effect of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on organisational commitment?

Table 2: *Multiple regression analysis showing the joint effect of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on organisational commitment*

R	R Square			Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
.796	.634			.630	3.8777	
A N O V A						
M	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.	R
Rg	7360.350	3	2453.450	163.165	.000	Sig.
Rs	4255.351	283	15.037			
T	11615.707	286				

Key: M=model, Rg=regression, Rs=residual, T=Total, R=Remark

Table 2 shows a simple linear regression of the joint contribution of the three independent variables (distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice) to the prediction of the dependent variable (organisational commitment). The model summary in Table 2 reveals a coefficient of multiple correlation ( $R = .796$ , multiple  $R^2 = .634$  and adjusted  $R^2 = .630$ ). This means that 63.0% of the variance in organisational commitment was accounted for by three predictor variables when taken together and the rest of 37% may be attributed to other factors. Furthermore, the analysis of variance for the regression yielded F-ratio of 163.165

(significant at 0.05 level), implying that the joint contribution of the independent variables to the dependent variable was significant and that other variables not included in this model may have accounted for the remaining variance.

Research Question (b): What is the relative contribution of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice to organisational commitment?

Table 3: *The relative contribution of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on organisational commitment*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Stand. Coefficient	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta Contribution		
(Constant)	1.612	1.337		1.206	.229
DJ	.342	.063	.287	5.450	.000
PJ	.383	.068	.343	5.597	.000
IJ	.281	.068	.251	4.159	.000

Key: DJ=Distributive justice, PJ=procedural justice, IJ=Interactional justice

Table 3 revealed the relative contribution of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice on

organisational commitment as shown by the beta weights in the descending order: Procedural Justice ( $\beta = .343$ ,  $t = 5.597$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), Distributive Justice ( $\beta = .287$ ,  $t = 5.450$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ), and Interactional Justice ( $\beta = .251$ ,  $t = 4.159$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ).

The above results in Table 3 showed that procedural justice was the most influential in determining manufacturing organisational commitment, followed by distributive justice and finally by interactional justice.

From Tables 2 and 3 above, results showed that there was significant, strong and positive relationship between procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice and organisational commitment. It is therefore seen that when employees have high perception of organisational justice (procedural justice, distributive justice and interactional justice) about their workplace their organisational commitment will be high. This finding is in line with the findings of McFarlin and Sweeney, (1992) that distributive justice is a more important predictor of personal outcomes such as pay

satisfaction, whereas procedural justice have strong effects of attitudes about institutions or authorities such as organisational commitment and trust in management (Folger and Konosvky, (1989); McFarlin and Sweeney, (1992). Also, the finding of this study is supported by the finding of Schminke, Ambrose & Noel, (1997) that both procedural justice and distributive justice contribute to individuals' perceptions of organisational fairness and subsequent organisational commitment. Furthermore, the above finding corroborates the findings of Aryee, Budhwar and Chen (2002); Ramamoorthy and Flood, (2004) that procedural and distributive justice was linked to higher level of organisational commitment.

### Hypotheses

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Table 4: *The relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment*

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Distributive justice	28.5854	5.3551	287	.697	.000	Sig.
Organisational Commitment	30.5122	6.3729				

From Table 4, it is shown that there was significant relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment. ( $r = .697$ ,  $n = 287$ ,  $P < .05$ ). The result shows that distributive justice influenced the organisational commitment in the study. The null hypothesis is rejected. This means that employees who have perception of distributive justice towards their organisation have high organisational commitment. This is in line with the finding of Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013) that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment. Furthermore, this finding was in line with the finding of Arif Hassan (2002) that both distributive and procedural justice made significant contributions to employees' organisational commitment and intent to leave. Also, the

above result corroborates the finding of Nazim and Shahid (2012) that both distributive justice perception and procedural justice perception had a significant relationship with organisational commitment and turnover intentions.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria.

*Table 5: The significant relationship between procedural justice and organisational commitment*

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Procedural Justice	29.0174	5.7162	287	.739	.000	Sig.
Organisational Commitment	30.5122	6.3729				

It is shown in Table 5 above that there was significant relationship between procedural justice and organisational commitment ( $r = .739$ ,  $n=287$ ,  $P < .05$ ). The result shows that procedural justice correlated

positively with organisational commitment in the workplace. Thus, the Null hypothesis is rejected. This is in line with the finding of Akanbi and Ofoegbu (2013) that there is a significant relationship between procedural justice and organisational commitment. Sweeney and McFarlin (1993) lend credence to this finding when they found that procedural justice is a better predictor of organisational commitment when compared with distributive justice. Also the finding was further supported by Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001); Colquitt et al., (2001) that procedural justice have significant positive relationship with organisational commitment. Moreover, the finding above was confirmed by the finding of Nazim and Shahid (2012) that both distributive justice perception and procedural justice perception had a significant relationship with organisational commitment and turnover intentions.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and organisational commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State, Nigeria.

Table 6: *The significant relationship between interactional justice and organisational commitment*

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	R	P	Remark
Interactional Justice	28.5122	5.6937	287	.715	.000	Sig.
Organisational Commitment	30.5122	6.3729				

It is shown in Table 6 that there was significant relationship between interactional justice and organisational commitment ( $r = .715$ ,  $N = 287$ ,  $P < .05$ ). The result shows that interactional justice correlated positively with organisational commitment in the study. The null hypothesis is rejected. This finding is supported by the findings of Nazim and Shahid (2012) that both distributive justice perception and procedural justice perception (interactional justice inclusive), had a significant relationship with organisational commitment and turnover intentions. Also, the above finding corroborates the finding of Fariha, Sardar and Mozafar (2013) that distributive justice, procedural justice and

interactional justice have significant relationship between organisational justice and organisational commitment.

## **IMPLICATIONS FOR INDUSTRIAL SOCIAL WORKERS**

Industrial social workers should ensure that management of organisations give room for fair and just procedures (procedural justice and distributive justice) coupled with proper interaction (interactional justice) so that employees will be able to give better responses to the organisation in terms of commitment, positive behaviour and increased productivity.

Industrial social workers should enhance organisational justice through advocacy with management so as to improve employees' job satisfaction, organisational commitment and retention.

All these will guarantee employees increase in performance, increase in organisational output and sustenance of both the organisation and the employees.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Employers should always ensure the presence of organisational justice in the workplace so as to create powerful benefits for the organisation in terms of trust and commitment from the employees.

That employers should have and put into practice organisational justice in dealing with their employees so as to bring about committed employees who will eventually see to the survival of the organisation through improved performance.

Managers and supervisors should develop; maintain proper and appropriate policies, and procedures that ensure organisational justice with a resultant development of organisational commitment from employees.

## **CONCLUSION**

From the research it is ascertained that organisational justice led to strong organisational commitment. This clearly shows that when perceived organisational justice

exist in the workplace, there is the generation of strong feeling of obligation towards their work organisation and become more committed to their work. Therefore, it can be concluded that fair procedures for job decisions, with appropriate allocation of resources and fair communication of decisions will result in high organisational commitment and increase in organisational productivity.

## **REFERENCES**

Akanbi, P. A. & Ofoegbu, O. E. (2013). Impact of perceived organisational justice on organisational commitment of a food and beverage firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(14), 207 -218.

Ambrose, M.L., & Arnaud, A. (2005). Are procedural justice and distributive justice conceptually distinct? In J.A. Colquitt & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ambrose, M.L., & Schminke, M. (2007). Examining justice climate: Issues of fit, simplicity, and content. In F. Dansereau & F.J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Research in multilevel issues*. Oxford, England: Elsevier.

Arif Hassan (2002). Organisational justice as a determinant of organisational commitment and intention to leave. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 7(2), 55 – 66.

Aryee, S., Budhwah, S. P. & Chen, X. Z. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a Social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 23(3), 267-285.

Bakhshi, A. Kumar, K. & Rani, E. (2009). Organisational justice perception as predictor of job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *International Journal of Business Management*, 4(9), 145 – 154.

Barley, S.R., & Kunda, G. (1992). Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 363-399.

Beck, N. M. & Wilson, J. H. (2000). Development of affective organizational commitment: A cross-sequential examination of change with tenure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 56, 114-136.

Bies R.J., & Moag J.S. (1986). International justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R.J. Lewicki, B.H. Sheppard, B.H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in organizations*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.

Colquitt, J.A., Conlon, D.E., Wesson, M.J., Porter, C. & Ng, K.Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25years of organisational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.

Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1980). Net work attitude measures of trust, organisational commitment and personal non-fulfilment Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39 – 52.

Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E. & Gilliland, S.W. (2007). The Management of Organisational Justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21, 34-48.

Elovainio, M., Kivimaki, M. & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organisational Justice: Evidence of a new psychological predictor of Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(1), 105-108.

Fariba, R., Sardar, M. & Mozafar, Y. (2013). Relationship of organisational justice and organisational commitment of the staff in general directorate of youth and sports in Chahar Mahal Va Bakhtiari Province. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(3), 696 – 700.

Folger, R. & Konovsky, M. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise

decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organisational Justice: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow, *Journal of Management*, 16:399-432.

Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social Behaviour: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

Kim, C. W. & Mauborgne., R. (1998). Procedural Justice, Strategic Decision Making, and the Knowledge Economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19 (4), 323-338.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L. & Griffin, m. l. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction and organisational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 35, 644 - 656.

Leventhal, G. S., Karuza, J. & Fry, W. R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation preferences. In, G. Mikula (ed.), *Justice and Social Interaction*. New York:Spinger-Verlag.

McFarlin, D. B. & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organisational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626 – 637.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualisation of Organisational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, pp. 61-98.

Meyer, J. P.; Allen, N. J. & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to Organisations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.78 No.4, pp. 538-551.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.

Najafi, S., Noruzy, A., Azar, K.H., Sajad Nazari-Shir Kouhi, N. S. & Dalvard, R. M. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organisational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour: An empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(13), 5241 – 5248.

Nazim, A. & Shahid, J. (2012). Relationship between organisational justice and organisational commitment and turnover intentions amongst medical representatives of pharmaceuticals companies of Pakistan. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(2), 201 -212.

Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a moderator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527 – 556.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R.I. (2006). *Hard facts, dangerous half-truths, and total nonsense: Profiting from evidence-based management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Pfeffer, P. (1998). *The human equation: Building profits by putting people first*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Ponnu, C. H. & Chuah, C. C. (2010). Organisational commitment, organisational justice and employ turnover in Malaysia. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(13), 2676 – 2692.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T. & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603 – 609.

Quarles, R. (1994). An examination of promotion opportunities and evaluation criteria as mechanisms for affecting internal auditors commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 6(21), 176 – 194.

Ramamoorthy, N. & Flood, P. C. (2004). Gender and employee attitude: The role of organisational justice

perceptions. *British Journal of Management*, 15, 247 – 258.

Rani, R., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2012). Organisational Justice and Psychological wellbeing of Police employees: A relationship study. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*. 1, 5, 183-194.

Rhodes, S & Steers, R (1981). Conventional vs worker-owned organizations'. *Human Relations*, 34(1), 1013-1035.

Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L. & Noel, T.W. (1997). The effect of ethical frameworks on perception of organisational justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), 1110 – 1207.

Sweeney, P. D. & McFarlin, D. B. (1993). Workers' evaluations of the 'ends' and the 'means': An examination of four models of distributive and procedural justice. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, 55, 23 – 40.

Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A. B., & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness: Preference fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science*, 19, 339-347.

Thibaut J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural Justice: A Psychological Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zaman, G., Ali, N., & Ali, N. (2010). Impact of Organizational Justice on Employees Outcomes: An Empirical Evidence. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 3 (1), 44 – 53.