

Impact of Perceived Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment of a Food and Beverage Firm in Nigeria

AKANBI, PAUL AYOBAMI

OFOEGBU, ONYEMA.EUGENE, Ph.D

Department of Business Administration
Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Ajayi Crowther University
Oyo, P.M.B. 1066, Oyo State, Nigeria.

Abstract

This research examined the role of organizational justice on organizational commitment in Nestle Nigeria PLC Agbara, Lagos State Nigeria. The objectives of the study were to ascertain the significant difference between procedural justice and perceived organizational commitment, and also to examine the significant relationship between distributive justice and perceived organizational commitment. In addition, the study ascertained the main and interaction effect of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational commitment. The study employed survey research using questionnaire to collect data from all categories of workers in the multi-national manufacturing company. Two hundred and fifteen employees of the company responded to the questionnaire. Four hypotheses were tested with t-test, correlation analysis and analysis of variance. The study indicated that organizational justice as measured by procedural justice and distributive justice can have a significant impact on the organizational commitment of multi-national company. The findings from the study also showed that there was a significant relationship between distributive justice and perceived organizational commitment. Based on the findings from this study, it is recommended that organizations should embrace justice in all ramifications of their practices with the employees to bring about committed employees.

Keywords: Organizational justice, procedural justice, distributive justice, organizational commitment

Introduction

Organizational justice is a key factor associated with the success of every organization. In order to keep employees satisfied, committed, and loyal to the organization, the organization needs to be fair in its system regarding distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. When employees feel that they are treated fairly by the organization in every aspect, they are inclined to show more positive attitude and behaviors like job satisfaction. Issues like allocating monetary resources, hiring employees in organizations, policy making and policy implications that affect decision maker and the people who are affected from such decisions require special attention in respect of justice (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Organizational justice is considered a fundamental requirement for the effective functioning of organizations. Fairness perceptions holds an important position in the decisions and processes as per human resource aspect (Thurston and McNall, 2010; Jawahar, 2007; Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001) such as pay, benefits and other compensation facets. In actual fact, fairness in compensation received, decisions regarding the compensation-related process and the way this information is communicated to all the employees hold an integral role in formulating the responses about the compensatory system (Nelson et al., 2008; Milkovich and Newman, 2008).

Organizational justice is an essential component and predictor of successful organizations. Organization that is fair and just in its procedures, policies, interactions and distribution systems, employees of that organization give better response to the organization (in terms of their positive behaviors and productivity). Enhancing organizational justice resulted in improved outcomes from employees. Managers should take actions to improve employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment so to decrease employees' turnover intension with the help of distributive and procedural justice (Elanain, 2009).

Cropanzano *et.al.* (2007) argue that organizational justice has the potential to create powerful benefits for organizations and employees alike include greater trust and commitment. Organizational justice refers to people's perception of fairness in organizations, consisting of perceptions of how decisions are made regarding the distribution of outcome (distributive justice) and the perceived fairness of those outcomes themselves (as studied in equity theory) (Greenberg and Baron, 2003). Equity has generally been conceptualized in terms of perceived fairness and operationalized as a three dimensional construct: distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Wat and Shaffer, 2005). The word equity connotes feelings of good, just, right and fair, and they are deeply embedded in our common heritage (Weller 1995). If people see a discrepancy between the rewards they are receiving for their efforts when compared to those of others (the rewards-to-work ratio), they will be motivated to do more (or less) work (Altman *et.al.* 1985).

Distributive justice concern people's perceptions of the fairness of the distribution of resources between people (Greenberg and Baron 2003). Its also refers to the perceived fairness of the amounts of compensation employee receive (Folger and Konovsky,1989). Therefore, distributive justice perspective focuses on the fairness of the evaluations received relative to the work performed (Greenberg 1986). Cropanzano *et.al.* (2007) distinguish three allocation rules that can lead to distributive justice if they are applied appropriately: equality (to each the same), equity (to each in accordance with contributions), and need (to each in accordance with the most urgency). Distributive justice is concerned with the reality that not all workers are treated alike; the allocation of outcome is differentiated in workplace (Cropanzano *et.al.* 2007). Dailey and Kirk (1992) found that employee may rationalize their desire to quit by finding 'evidence' which illustrates how unfairly rewards are distributed. Furthermore, distributive justice seems to play a salient role for employee in evaluating their employing organization (Loi *et.al.* 2006). Employee would be more attached to their organization if they cannot obtain the same benefits in another firm (Lee *et.al.* 2007).

Past research demonstrates that procedural justice often is more predictive of a variety of work attitudes, including organizational commitment (Warner *et.al.* 2005). The fairness of the decision making process itself seems to be more important than the actual amount of compensation that is received by individual (Tepstra and Honoree 2003). Cropanzano, Prehar, and Chen (2002) argued that, although procedural justice and interactional justice are distinct constructs, they are closely correlated. As pointed out by Tyler and Bies (1990), procedural justice is important in shaping interpersonal contexts, and thus it affects perception of interaction justice. Cropanzano *et.al.* (2007) argued that fair process lead to intellectual and emotional recognition, thus in turn, creates the trust and commitment that build voluntary cooperation in strategy execution. This, procedural justice perspective focuses on the fairness of the evaluation procedures used to determine ratings (Greenberg 1986). Folger and Konovsky (1989) found that opportunities for employees to express their feelings when evaluated predicted a measure of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation. If the process is perceived as just, employees show greater loyalty and more willingness to behave in an organizational's best interest (Cropanzano *et.al.* 2007).

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are in line with the hypotheses formulated which are as follows:

1. To determine the main and interactive effect of procedural justice and distributive on organizational commitment.
2. To explore the relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment.
3. To investigate the significant difference between procedural justice and organizational commitment.
4. To evaluate the significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Organizational justice is the employees' perception concerning the nature of treatment given to them in the organizations. The employees who are treated unjustly in their organizations become annoyed, frustrated and sometimes disoriented which result in inappropriate behaviour in the organization (Bieroff et al., 1986). Consequently they no longer remain satisfied and loyal with their organizations. Such employees are not committed and do not provide services to their organization for a long time. At whatever time they find better opportunity they leave the organization. Organizational justice was more logically explained by Deutsch (1985) stating that employees always desire fair dealing and equal treatment at the workplace.

Employees are concerned with both the fairness of the outcomes that they receive and the fairness of their treatment within the organization (Williams, Pitre, and Zainuba, 2002). The first fairness perception is distributive justice, and it addresses the organizational reward system (i.e., equity theory). The second perception is procedural justice, which involves the organization's decision-making procedures (Greenberg, 1990a). The third perception is interactional justice, where the study goes beyond decision outcomes and formal decision-making procedures to show that people also react to their perceptions regarding the social sensitivity of the interpersonal treatment they receive from decision makers (Bies and Moag, 1986). Researchers have suggested that these types of justice perceptions are important determinants of meaningful organizational outcomes (Folger and Konovsky, 1989; Greenberg, 1987). A number of theories suggest that perceptions of fairness and non-traditional types of job behaviors are related.

The research on distributive justice in organizations today focuses primarily on people's perceptions of the fairness of the outcomes they receive, that is, their evaluations of the end state of the allocation process (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). The concept of distributive justice has its basis in equity theory (Adams, 1965) and Leventhal's justice judgment model (1976a). While equity theory has focused on reactions to pay inequities, Leventhal studied the conditions under which people proactively employed various justice norms.

The major structural components of equity theory are inputs and outcomes. Inputs are described as what a person perceives as his or her contributions to the exchange, for which he or she expects a just return (Adams, 1965). Outcomes are described as the rewards an individual receives from the exchange, and can include such factors as pay and intrinsic satisfaction (Cohen & Greenberg, 1982). Adams (1965) argued that social behavior is affected by beliefs that the allocation of rewards within a group should be equitable, that is, outcomes should be proportional to the contributions of group members. In other words, equity theory argues that people are satisfied when the ratios of their own inputs to outcomes (i.e., rewards) equal the ratios of inputs to outcomes in comparison to others. Perceived inequity through this comparison feels unpleasant, and motivates people to reduce those unpleasant feelings (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998).

The presence of inequity will motivate people to achieve equity or to reduce inequity, and the strength of the motivation to do so will vary directly with the magnitude of the inequity experienced. In other words, Adams (1965) suggested that when allocation outcomes do not meet this criterion, people would perceive inequity distress and attempt to behaviorally or cognitively restore equity. Adams (1965) proposed six different modes of reducing inequity based on the theory of cognitive dissonance: (1) altering inputs; (2) altering outcomes; (3) cognitively distorting inputs or outcomes; (4) leaving the field; (5) acting on the object of comparison by altering or cognitively distorting the other's inputs or outcomes; or (6) changing the object of comparison.

Walster, Walster, and Berscheid (1978) have also attempted to predict when individuals will perceive themselves to be unfairly treated and how they will react to that perception.

The key to this theory consists of four interlocking propositions: (1) individuals will try to maximize their outcomes; (2) groups evolve definitions of equity and sanction group members on the basis of those definitions; (3) inequity leads to psychological distress proportional to the size of the inequity; and (4) such distress will lead to attempts to eliminate it by restoring equity. Individuals can arrive at the belief that distributive fairness exists by distorting perceptions, rather than by actually changing the situation (Leventhal, 1976a).

In summary, Adams's equity theory (1965) focused on the reactions to unfair outcomes. If an outcome is believed to be inappropriate relative to some standard, then the individual is likely to experience distributive injustice (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Equity theory employs a one-dimensional concept of distributive justice. The theory assumes that an individual judges the fairness of his/her own or others' rewards solely in terms of a merit principle.

Lind and Tyler (1988) introduced two models that describe why procedural effects occur. The models can be categorized based upon whether antecedents of justice appeal to the personal economic interests of the individual or to aspects of the interaction that the member values. One of these models is the traditional model of informed self-interest used by Thibaut and Walker (1975) and Leventhal (1980) in their theories of procedural justice. The other model is based on group identification processes and on the view that procedural justice is a central cognition in perceptions of the group (Lind & Tyler, 1988). These models represent an effort by researchers to explain the effects of procedural justice, rather than just demonstrating its widespread applicability.

The self-interest or instrumental model is based on the assumption that people try to maximize their personal gain when interacting with others. The model extends this assumption by hypothesizing that people will not only choose outcomes and procedures in which their interests are favored outright, but also procedures that are generally fair to themselves within a social group, a political system, or a work organization (Lind and Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1989). As noted earlier, Thibaut and Walker (1975), and Tyler (1987) suggest that people seek control over processes because they are concerned with their own outcomes. The opportunity to exercise voice over procedures is considered to enhance perceptions of procedural justice because such control could result in more favorable outcomes (Greenberg & Folger, 1983). In this model, the highest levels of perceived fairness were found when process control was allowed and capable of influencing the goal.

On the other hand, Thibaut and Walker's (1975) original conception of the shift from concerns with decision control to concerns with process control posits a recognition by people that they cannot always maintain complete control over their outcomes when interacting with others. When people join and remain in groups they come to recognize that other people's outcomes must sometimes be accepted and their own desires must sometimes be delayed. This is the case because others will remain in the group only if their own concerns are also sometimes addressed.

Thus, the self-interest model also simply claims that individuals may take a long term focus when evaluating their economic gains. In the case of group interaction, people gain more through cooperation in the long run than they gain alone, despite the economic compromises inherent in group interactions. As a result, people may become tolerant of short-term economic losses so long as they expect that advantageous outcomes will be forthcoming in the future (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Thus, short-term failures can be overlooked when there is some promise of future gain (Greenberg, 1990a; Shapiro, 1993). This self-interest perspective was the core of the first studies of procedural fairness (Thibaut & Walker, 1975).

Greenberg (1986b) found that people believe that the outcomes resulting from unfair procedures are themselves unfair, but only when those outcomes are trivial. However, more beneficial outcomes were believed to be fair regardless of the fairness of the procedure. Thus, the self-interest model suggests that concerns about procedures are dictated primarily by their effects. In other words, procedures are valued whenever they lead to desired results: that is, when they enhance a person's self-interest.

The group-value model has been proposed as a supplement to the self-interest model (Lind, 1995; Lind & Tyler, 1988). People are strongly affected by identification with groups, even when that identification is based on minimal common circumstances (Brewer & Kramer, 1986; Kramer & Brewer, 1984). Individuals in groups are more likely to put aside their own self-interest and act in a way that helps all group members than the pure self-interest models would predict (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The group-value model assumes that people are concerned about their long-term social relationship with the authorities or institutions acting as third parties, and do not view their relationship with third parties as short-term. Instead, people care about their relationship with the third party. Thus, the group-value model proposes three non-control issues that affect procedural justice judgments: the neutrality of the decision-making procedure, trust in the third party (decision-maker), and evidence about social standing such as expressions of politeness and respect. In a long-term relationship, people cannot always have what they want. Instead, they must compromise and defer to others' desires and needs (Tyler, 1989). Lind and Tyler (1988) suggested that people assume that, over time, all will benefit fairly from the application of fair procedures for decision-making. Therefore, people will focus on whether the authority has created a neutral arena in which to resolve their problem, instead of focusing on whether they receive a favorable outcome in any given decision. In any particular situation, people will be concerned with having an unbiased decision maker who uses appropriate factual criteria to make decisions.

In addition, the long-term nature of group membership leads people to focus on the intentions of third parties. The intentions of decision-makers are especially important because current interactions allow people to predict the future. Since people are in organizations for the long term, their loyalty depends upon their predictions about what will happen in the long term. Thus, if people believe that the decision-makers are trying to be fair and to deal equitably with them, they develop a long-term commitment to the group. Third, people care about their standing in the group. Interpersonal treatment during social interactions gives people information about their status within the group (Tyler, 1989).

When people view a procedure as affirming their status in the group, they will react in a strongly positive fashion. Conversely, when people see the procedure as being unjust because their status is ignored, they will react strongly to the procedural injustice (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Within this context, the group-value model suggests that people value procedures that promote group solidarity because they value long-term relationships with groups (Greenberg, 1990a). The group-value model argues that groups offer more than material rewards. Group affiliation is also a means of achieving social status and self-esteem. Thus, people tend to be aware of their positions within groups and the groups' potential for providing them with these valuable social rewards (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). People devote much of their energy to understanding the functioning of the various groups to which they belong and to participating in social processes within those groups. According to this model, affective relation within and between groups and cognitive constructions concerning those relations are potent factors of attitudes and behavior (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

Lind and Tyler (1988) claim that both the self-interest model and the group-value model have merit. Both models have received empirical support. For example, Reis (1986) found that procedural justice concerns are associated with the delay of gratification. In his study, Reis identified a wide variety of dispute resolution procedures and used multidimensional scaling techniques to identify the basic dimensions underlying those procedures. He found one dimension that was procedural in character, and variables loading on that dimension were related to views about the delay of gratification, that is, to viewing outcomes in a longer time-frame. Alexander and Ruderman (1987) examined the relationship between various procedural and distributive justice factors and six organizational variables, including job satisfaction, evaluation of supervisor, conflict harmony, turnover intention, trust in management, and tension-stress using a multiple regression analysis. They confirmed that procedural fairness is associated with lower levels of conflict and disharmony in organizations. "The finding that concerns about group harmony lead to an emphasis on procedural justice is consistent with a long-term self-interest perspective on procedural justice" (Lind & Tyler, 1988).

Most of the recently reported evidence, however, is consistent with the group value model. According to Lind and Tyler (1988), the reinforcement of procedural justice by process control is independent of favorable outcomes. That is, "the provision of voice enhances procedural justice, even in situations in which there is little objective reason to suspect that the exercise of voice will affect decisions" (Lind & Tyler, 1988: p. 194). For example, Early and Lind (1987) used structural equation modeling to test the role of personal control in procedural justice in both lab and field settings. No significant causal link between control judgments and procedural justice judgments was found in either study. In other words, control judgments did not cause procedural justice judgments.

Tyler (1989) conducted a study to test the group-value model by using three non-control issues: the neutrality of the decision-making procedure, trust in decision-makers, and indicators of social standing such as expressions of politeness and respect. He found that judgments about neutrality, trust, and social standing have an independent impact on judgments of procedural justice. Moreover, Miller, Jackson, Mueller, and Schersching (1987) found that decision fairness was more strongly associated with the extent to which the decision represented the interests of all group members than the extent to which it favored individuals. In sum, people react to procedural justice in ways that reflect both self-interest and cognitive and attitudinal reactions to group membership.

Organizational commitment is an important aspect in management literature. It refers to the state in which people sense loyalty with their respective organization, aligned themselves with organizational goals and value it (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Fang, 2001). Fairness and justice offers opportunity to the employees to feel sense of belonging which considered as significant interpreter in organizational commitment. Procedural justice gives the "employees to consider that managerial and organizational decisions are legitimate and this legitimacy promotes commitment of the employees to their organizations (Tallman, Phipps, & Matheson, 2009)". Robbins et al. (2000) proved the reciprocal association among distributive justice and procedural justice with organizational commitment. In another study, Lambert et al (2007) found that procedural justice and distributive justice significantly contributed to employees' organizational commitment. However, Griffin and Hepburn (2005) reported that correctional officers at Arizona did not perceive any significant association among organizational justice and organizational commitment. In Colquitt et al. (2001) meta-analytical review of organizational justice literature, he observed that distributive and procedural justice were significant predictors of organizational commitment. Aryee, Budhwar, and Chen (2002) and Ramamoorthy and Flood (2004) found that procedural and distributive justice were linked to higher level of organizational commitment.

As regards teachers, Zaman, Ali and Ali (2010) conducted a research on private school teachers of Pakistan and concluded that distributive justice and procedural justice had positive impact on organizational commitment. In another study, Bakhshi, Kumar and Rani (2009) reported positive relationship between distributive and procedural justice with organizational commitment of medical college employees in India. Likewise, Ponnu and Chuah (2010) investigated the relationship of justice and organizational commitment of the employees working diverse organizations at Malaysia, and found that perceptions of procedural justice and distributive justice positively but significantly explaining variance in organizational commitment. Consistent with the prior findings, Najafi et al. (2011) also concluded that educational experts of different universities reported higher commitment levels by the provision of organizational justice.

Methodology

Research design

The design for this study is a survey research design which measured two variables which is the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variables are procedural justice and distributive justice and the dependent variable is organizational commitment.

Sample and Data Collection

For the purpose of this research work, this study was limited to one multi-national organization in Nigeria. The multinational company sampled is Nestle Nigeria PLC. The company had a total population of about seven hundred employees, out of which a sample size of two hundred and fifty was drawn using stratified sampling technique stratified on the basis of management staff, senior staff, and junior staff of the company. Two hundred and fifteen questionnaires were retrieved and found usable for analysis. The type of data that was used for the study was primary data. The primary data was collected using questionnaire so as to enable the researcher obtain accurate and adequate information relating to the research work.

Research instruments

The study employed a questionnaire as an instrument for data collection. The questionnaire was divided into four sections. Section A measured the demographics of the respondents which includes age, sex, marital status, educational qualification, etc., B measured procedural justice, C measured distributive justice and D measured organizational commitment. The procedural justice scale is a 15 item scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) with a Likert scale scoring format ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to (SA) =Strongly Agree (7). Among the 15 items, six items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) measure the degree to which job decisions include mechanisms that ensure the gathering of accurate and unbiased information, employee voice, and an appeal process, while nine items (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15) measure the degree to which employees feel their needs are considered and adequate explanations are made for job decisions.

The Perceptions of distributive justice was measured with the Distributive Justice Index developed by Price and Mueller (1986). This five-item scale measures the degree to which rewards received by employees are perceived to be related to performance inputs. Each item asks for the degree to which the respondent believes that he or she is fairly rewarded on the basis of some comparison with responsibilities, education and training, effort, stresses and strains of job as well as performance. All reliabilities reported have been above .623, and the scale has shown discriminant validity in relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Moorman, 1991). Items are re-worded to accommodate the use of a 7-point scale ranging from (1) "Strongly Disagree" to (7) "Strongly Agree".

The scale for organizational commitment was adapted from organizational commitment questionnaire which was developed by Porter and Smith (1981). The scale is fifteen item questionnaires with Likert scoring format ranging from (SA) strongly agree (5) to (SD) strongly disagree (1). The instruments were revalidated and the cronach alpha reliability coefficient gave the following results; procedural justice=.69, distributive justice=.623, and organizational commitment=.78

Hypotheses of the study

1. There will be main and interactive effect of Procedural justice and distributive justice on organizational commitment.
2. There will be a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment.

3. There will be a significant difference between distributive justice and organizational commitment.
4. There will be a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.

Data analysis techniques

The demographic information was analyzed using frequency counts and simple percentages. Hypotheses for this research were analyzed with analysis of variance, Pearson's correlation and independent t-test. Hypothesis 1 was tested with analysis of variance, hypotheses 2 to 4 were analysed with Pearson's correlation while hypothesis 3 was tested with independent t-test.

Data Presentation, Analyses and Interpretations

Analyses of demographic information

Table 1: Table showing the descriptive statistics of demographics

Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	124	57.7
Female	91	42.3
Total	215	100.0
Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
18-25years	55	25.6
26-35years	117	54.4
36-45years	36	16.7
46-55years	7	3.3
Total	215	100
Marital Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Single	93	43.3
Married	112	52.1
Divorced	10	4.6
Total	215	100
Educational Background	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Postgraduate	69	32.1
B.Sc/HND	122	56.7
OND/NCE	20	9.3
SSCE	4	1.9
Total	215	100.0
Working Cadre	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Management Staff	44	20.5
Senior Staff	73	34.0
Junior Staff	98	45.5
Total	215	100.0

Source: Field Survey, (2012)

Table 1 shows that there are 124 (57.7%) male respondents and 91(42.3%) female respondents. It also shows that 55(25.6%) of the respondents are between 18 to 25 years, 117(54.4%) of the respondents are between the age of 26 to 35 years, 36(16.7%) of the respondents are between the age of 36 to 45 years and 7(3.3%) of the respondents are between the age of 46 to 55 years. The marital status of the respondents also show that 93(43.3%) of the respondents are single, 112(52.1%) are married, 9(5.0%) of the respondents are divorced while 10(4.6%) respondents are separated. The Educational Background of the respondents shows that 69(32.1%) of the respondents possess postgraduate certificates, 122(56.7%) of them have B.Sc/HND certificates, 20(9.3%) of the respondents have OND/NCE certificates, while 4(1.9%) respondents had SSCE certificates respectively. The table also showed the respondents working cadre. 44(20.5%) of the respondents are management staff, 73(34.0) are senior staff while 98(45.5%) of them are junior staff.

Testing of Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There will be main and interactive effect of Procedural justice and distributive justice on organizational commitment.

Table 2: Summary of Analysis of variance (ANOVA) showing the main and interactive effect of procedural justice and distributive justice on organizational commitment.

Variables	Sum of square	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Remark
Main Effect		2				
Procedural justice	267.028	1	11.610	2.627	.001	Sig.
Distributive justice	622.358	1	27.059	4.420	.000	Sig.
2 – way Interactions						
Procedural justice	393.362		11.610			
Distributive justice	587.776		27.059	25.436	.000	Sig.
Explained Main Effect	3435.124					
Residual						
Total	5024.124					

Source: field survey, 2012

Table 2 shows that there is significant main and interaction effect of procedural justice and distributive justice on organizational commitment. The hypothesis was significant with $F(3, 212) = 25.436, P < .05$. The hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment.

Table 3: Summary of Pearson’s Correlation showing the relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment.

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev	N	R	P	Remark
Distributive justice	28.7204	5.06458	215	.712**	.000	Sig.
Organizational commitment	59.1991	8.42661				

Source: field survey, 2012

The result from table 3 shows that the mean value of 28.7204 for distributive justice and 59.1991 for organizational commitment falls in between their minimum and maximum values. The standard error however was low with their values being 5.06458 and 8.42661.

From the correlation table, it indicates clearly that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment with correlation being significant at 1 per cent and $P < .05$. This was shown from the table based on the two tailed test result with $P = 0.00$ the result is significant and hence we accept the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant difference between distributive justice and organizational commitment.

Table 4: Showing Significant Difference Between Distributive justice and organizational commitment.

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Crit-t	Cal -t	DF	P
Distributive justice	215	28.7204	5.06458	2.306	-73.873	214	.000
Organizational commitment		59.1991	8.42661				

Source: field survey, 2012.

The table above showed that there was significant difference between Distributive justice and organizational commitment. $Cal -t = -73.873, Crit -t = 2.306, df = 214, P < .01$ level of significant). The result is significant at 1 per cent. The mean value shows a value of 28.7204 for distributive justice and 59.1991 for organizational commitment but with the calculated value of t greater that the tabulated value. We conclude that there is a significant difference between distributive justice and organizational commitment. The hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.

Table 5: Summary of Pearson Correlation showing the relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev	N	R	P	Remark
Procedural justice			215	.842**	.000	Sig.
Organizational commitment	59.1991	8.42661				

Source: field survey 2012

The result from table 5 shows that the mean value of 28.7204 for procedural justice and 59.1991 for organizational commitment falls in between their minimum and maximum values. The standard error however was low with their values being 5.06458 and 8.42661.

From the correlation table, it indicates clearly that there is a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment with correlation being significant at 1 per cent and $P < 0.05$. This was shown from the table based on the two tailed test result with $P = 0.00$ the result is significant and hence we accept the hypothesis.

Concluding Remarks

The results of this study generally support the hypotheses formulated in terms of the impact of organizational justice on organizational commitment. The study indicated that there was main effect of procedural justice and distributive justice on perceived organizational commitment. There was also interaction effect of distributive justice and procedural justice on organizational commitment. The study further supported the hypothesis that there was a significant relationship between procedural justice and organizational commitment.

Furthermore, there was a significant relationship between distributive justice and organizational commitment. The research also revealed that there was a significant difference between procedural justice and organizational commitment. Based on the analyses, it can be concluded that distributive and procedural justice could have their role in making employees committed in their organizations. Findings from this study were consistent with the prior research that distributive justice and procedural justice resulted into improved organizational commitment (Robbins et al., 2000; Aryee, et al. 2002; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004; Lambert et al. 2007; Bakhshi et al. 2009; Zaman et al. 2010; Ponnu & Chuah (2010); Najafi et al. (2011). Organizational justice issues in organizations should therefore be well managed since they are important determinants of job outcomes.

It is recommended that organizations should embrace justice in all ramifications of their practices in their dealings with the employees to bring about committed employees. This study also indicates empirical evidence of the impact of interpersonal working relationships on employees' justice perceptions. That is, the quality of interpersonal working relationships promotes employees' perceptions of fairness.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). *Inequity in social exchange*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2), New York: Academic Press, 267-299.
- Alexander, S., & Ruderman, M. (1987). The role of procedural and distributive justice in organizational behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 1,(2), 177-198.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Power and Exchange in Social Life*. New York: J Wiley & Sons.
- Bakhshi A, Kumar K, Rani E (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Int. J. Bus. Manage.*, 4(9): 145-154
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-40.
- Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in Social Relations*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bies, R. J., Shapiro, D. L., & Cummings, L. L. (1988). *Causal accounts and managing organizational conflict: It is enough to say it's not my fault?* Communication Research,
- Byrne, Z. S. (2005). Fairness reduces the negative effects of organizational politics on turnover intentions, citizenship behavior and job performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(2), 175-200.
- Cropanzano R., C. A. Prehar and P. Y. Chen (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 27 No. 3, 324-351.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. (2001). *The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-232.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze*. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *Interactional review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 317-372. New York: Wiley.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze*. In C. L. Cooper., & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of*
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. R. (2001). *Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 164-209.
- Dailey, R. C., & Kirk, D. J. (1992). *Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover*. *Human Relations*, 45,(3), 305-317.
- DeConinck, J. B., & Bachmann, D. P. (1994). Organizational commitment and turnover intentions of marketing managers. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10,(3), 87- 95.
- DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. (1987). *A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment*. *Human Relations*, 40,(7), 445-470.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and Need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues*, 31,(3), 137-149.
- Dunnette (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand
- Eisen berg, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*
- Elovainio, M., Kivimaki, M., Steen, N., & Vahtera, J. (2004). *Job decision latitude, organizational justice and health: multilevel covariance structure analysis*. *Social Science and Medicine*, 58, 1659-1669.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimaki, M., Steen, N., & Vahtera, J. (2004). *Job decision latitude, organizational justice and health: multilevel covariance structure analysis*. *Social Science and Medicine*, 58, 1659-1669.
- Elovainio, M., Van den Bos, K., Linna, A., Kivimaki, M., Ala-Mursula, L., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J. (2005). *Combined effects of uncertainty and organizational justice on employee health: Testing the uncertainty management model of fairness judgments among Finnish public sector employees*. *Social Science and Medicine*, 61(12), 2501-2512
- French, W. L., & Dittrich, J. E. (1978). *The personnel management process, human resources administration: instructor's manual*: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32,(1), 115-130.
- Folger, R., & Martin, C. L. (1986). Relative deprivation and referent cognitions: Distributive and procedural justice effects. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22,(6), 531-546.
- Greenberg & R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and Justice in Social Behavior*, New York, NY: Academic press.
- Greenberg, J. (1987a). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72,(1), 55-61.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1990a). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*

- Greenberg, J. (1991). Using explanations to manage impressions of performance appraisal fairness. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4,(1), 51-60.
- Greenberg, J. 1987. Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 72, 55-61.
- Greenberg, J., & Cohen, R. L. (1982). Why justice? Normative and instrumental interpretations. In J. Greenberg & R. L. Cohen (Eds.), *Equity and justice in social behavior*. New York: Academic press.
- Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). *Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations*. In P. B. Paulus (Eds.), *Basic Group Processes*, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). *Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey*.
- Hall, D. T., & Schneider, B. (1972). *Correlates of organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17,
- Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. (1970). *Personal factors in organizational identification*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 176-189.
- In H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in Social Relations*, 337- 351. New York: Plenum
- Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 317-372. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Karambayya, R., & Brett, J. M. (1989). Managers handling disputes: Third-party roles and perceptions of fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32,(4), 687-704.
- Konovsky, M. (2000). Understanding procedural justice and its impact on business organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 489-511.
- 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 organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 644-656.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 91-131). New York: Academic Press.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1976b). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in Experimental Social*
- Lind, E. A. (1995). Justice and authority relations in organizations. In R. Cropanzano & Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35,(3), 626-637.
- Meyer, J. P. (1997). Organizational commitment. In C. L. Cooper., & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 175-228. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1,(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74,(1), 152-156.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74,(1), 152-156.
- Moorman, R. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76,(6), 845-855.
- Mowday, R. T. (1991). *Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations*. In R. M.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Najafi, S., Noruzi, A., Azar, H. K., Nazari-Shirkouhi, S., & Dalvand, M. R. (2011). Investigating the relationship between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: *An empirical model*. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 5(13), pp. 5241-5248.
- Niehoff, B.P. & Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). Job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65,(5), 559-565.

- O'Reilly, C. A., & Caldwell, D. F. (1981). The commitment and job tenure of new employees: Some evidence of post decisional justification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 597-616.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71,(3), 492-499.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1993). Citizenship behavior and fairness in organizations: Issues and directions for future research. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6,(3), 257-269.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leader Quarterly*, 1,(2), 107-142.
- Ponnu, C. H., Chuah, C. C. (2010). *Organizational commitment, organizational justice and employee turnover in Malaysia*. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4(13), pp. 2676-2692.
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80,(2), 151-176.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Ramamoorthy, N., & Flood, P. C. (2004). Gender and Employee Attitudes: The Role of Organizational Justice Perceptions. *British Journal of Management*, 15, 247-258. Ramamoorthy, N., & Flood, P. C. (2004). Gender and Employee Attitudes: The Role of Organizational Justice Perceptions. *British Journal of Management*, 15, 247-258.
- Resource Management. In R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *The Social Side of Fairness: Interpersonal and Informational Classes of Organizational Justice*. Hillsdale, NJ:
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Summers, T. P., & Hendrix, W. H. (1991). Modeling the role of pay equity perceptions:
- 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.
- Tallman, R., Phipps, K., & Matheson, D. (2009). Justice perception in Medical Administrative Governance. *International Journal of Business Research*, 9(7), 147-155.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tyler, T. R. (1987). Conditions leading to value-expressive effects in judgments of procedural justice: A test of four models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (2), 333-344.
- Tyler, T. R. (1988). *What is procedural justice?* *Law and Society Review*, 22,(1), 103-135.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57,(5), 830-838.
- Walker, L., Lind, E. A., & Thibaut, J. (1979). *The relation between procedural justice and distributive justice*. *Virginia Law Review*, 65,(8), 1401-1420.