



Organizational Justice and Employees' Job Commitment in Beloxi Industries Limited Agbara, Ogun State, Nigeria

Olayinka Yusuf Sholesi¹, Adeshina Olushola Adeniyi²

Abstract: Employees' job dedication has been negatively impacted by a steady rise in organizational unfairness. Employees' engagement in Beloxi Industries Limited was assessed in this study in light of organizational fairness. To get a sense of what people thought, the researchers used a descriptive research design and a random sampling approach. Two hundred and four of the two hundred and forty-eight questionnaires that Beloxi industries Limited sent out were properly filled out. Using SPSS (21.0) software, regression and factorial analysis were adopted to test five hypotheses in this study. The study found that employees are more likely to stay in their jobs if they feel they are treated fairly in the workplace. According to the findings of the study, there is a 45.1 percent correlation between the three organizational justice components (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) and employee work commitment. However, it was shown that the most important factor affecting employees' dedication to their jobs is distributive justice. Employers should implement a fair method for determining employment decisions, as well as appropriate resource allocation and transparent communication, according to the study's recommendations.

Keywords: Employee's Job Commitment; Organizational justice; Distributive; procedural and interactional

JEL Classification: J28

1. Introduction

The long-term viability of a company is entirely dependent on the efforts of its personnel. Whether or not an organization is able to achieve its goals is directly related to the way its members think, feel, act, and think about things. People are naturally drawn to events and circumstances that appear to be fair in their day-to-day lives, regardless of the context in which they occur (Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gilland, 2007). Every day, workers' attitudes and behaviors are influenced by decisions made by organizations. If an individual believes the decision was unfair or biased, it might affect their attitude and behavior. Many firms are interested in the problem of fairness since the impression of unfairness can have a negative impact on job attitudes and employee loyalty to the workplace. Individuals' perceptions and reactions to fairness in organizations are referred to as "organizational justice" by Greenberg (1987). In terms of race, religion, equality, or law, it is the philosophy that underpins the moral justification of a certain action or decision.

¹ Department of Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management, Faculty of Management Science Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria, Corresponding author: yinkasho@yahoo.com.

² School of Management, IT & Governance, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, E-mail: 218085365@stu.ukzn.ac.za.

Organizational fairness is an important indicator of an organization's success. Equal compensation, equal opportunity for advancement, and fair hiring practices are all examples of challenges that might arise when it comes to ensuring justice in the workplace. There are three types of justice in the workplace, namely, distributive, procedural, and interactional (Cropanzano, et al., 2007). It is claimed that these three components of organizational justice are interconnected and may be considered as the broad instruments of fairness (Ambrose & Arnaud, 2015).

Employees and companies gain greatly from organizational justice, since it fosters a culture of trust and dedication (Cropanzano et al., 2007). The notion of distributive justice and the fairness of results are at the heart of organizational justice, which comprises of employees' impressions of how choices are made and the outcomes (Greenberg & Baron, 2003). In addition, organizational justice is concerned with the view of management decisions and practices by employees, as well as their impression of workplace justice (Eskew, 1993). When it comes to ensuring that people in a company are treated fairly in terms of work, incentives, punishments, salaries, and other benefits, this refers to the concept “organizational justice” (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Equal treatment for all workers strengthens employee loyalty and dedication to their jobs, and this is why organizational justice is so important to any business or institution.

There are three types of organizational commitment: affective, continuous, and normative. (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment is defined by Meyer and Allen (1997) as a person's emotional bond with identification, and participation in the organization. Commitment to the organization is seen as an awareness of the implications of quitting (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Kanter's (1968) definition of continuous commitment is that it relates to the advantages connected with ongoing engagement and the costs involved with departing the organization. This assumption boils down to an individual's assessment of the costs and hazards of leaving their current employer. Normative commitment, according to Meyer and Allen (1997), is a sense of duty to continue working. The authors claim that this moral duty originates either via a process of socialization in the society or through the organizations. As a result, employees feel obligated to return the company's generosity by continuing working with the organization. Workers' job commitment can be improved by managers using distributive and procedural fairness measures (Elanain, 2016).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The persistent occurrence of organizational injustice in the manufacturing industry, has apparently impacted negatively on employees' job commitment. Previous studies (Ayobami & Eugene, 2013; Yasar, Emhan & Ebere, 2014) have been carried out on organizational justice but little has been done to examine the effect of organizational justice on job commitment in the manufacturing industry. Employees in this industry are usually vulnerable to change of jobs based on the fact that they are not committed and are usually enticed by other employers. Justice and commitment in organizations therefore calls for concern. It is in the light of this that this study established the following research questions and hypotheses to test the perceived effect of organizational justice on employment job commitment in the manufacturing sector.

1.2. Research Objectives

The main objective is to examine the perceived effect of organizational justice on employee's job commitment. Other specific objectives of the research are as follows:

1. To examine the effect of distributive justice on employee's job commitment.
2. To examine the effect of procedural justice on employee's job commitment
3. To ascertain the effect of interactional justice on employee's job commitment.
4. To determine the relative effect of organizational justice on employee's job commitment.
5. To examine the joint effect of organizational justice on employees' job commitment

1.3. Research Questions

1. To what extent will distributive justice have effect on employees' job commitment?
2. To what extent will procedural justice have effect on employees' job commitment?
3. What is the effect of interactional justice on employees' job commitment?
4. What is the relative effect of organizational justice on employees' job commitment?
5. What is the joint effect of organizational justice on employees' job commitment?

1.4. Research hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant effect of distributive justice on employees' job commitment.

H₀₂: There is no significant effect of procedural justice on employees' job commitment.

H₀₃: Interactional justice does not significantly affect employees' job commitment.

H₀₄: There is no significant relative effect of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) on employees' job commitment.

H₀₅: There is no significant joint effect of organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) on employees' job commitment.

1.5 Literature Review

Individuals' perceptions of fairness in an organization are studied by Greenberg and Baron (2009). The authors argued that in order to keep employees who are pleased, loyal, and devoted to the company, companies must preserve fairness in their operations linked to justice. The perception of a higher level of fairness among employees leads them to view themselves as partners in the management process. Due to workers' sense of involvement in making decisions, workers are more likely to be committed and contribute to the success of the firm.

According to Deconik (2010), the notion of corporate justice typically leads to trust and increased employee engagement. Organizational justice calls for careful consideration of issues such as the distribution of financial resources and hiring practices, as well as any decisions that may have impact on senior management as well as the employees who will be directly affected (Greenberg, Colquitt, & Zapat-phelan, 2005). Wat and Shaffer (2005) noted that equity is typically understood as perceived

fairness and operationalized as a three-dimensional paradigm that includes distributive, procedural and interactional justice.

Workers' perceptions of whether or not benefits are allocated equitably is referred to as “distributive justice” (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Employees' perceptions of fairness in compensation, motivation, and other benefits are all factors in what Greenberg and Baron (2009) call “distributive justice,” which is a part of organizational justice. Distributive justice is concerned with the fact that not all employees are treated equally, and that the allocation of outcome is uneven in the workplace. If accruing earnings are not proper, suitable, or ethical, then such should not be distributed (Ozen, 2003a).

It has been argued that procedural justice refers to the tools and procedures used to ensure that decisions are made fairly (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Procedural justice is defined by Greenberg (1996) as the assessment of a person's character based on the processes or procedures employed in reaching a conclusion. Proper decision-making, consistent application of rules, accuracy of data, consideration of employees' opinions, and bias-free treatment of workers are some of the criteria for evaluating procedural fairness (Greenberg & Baron, 2009). Procedural justice, for Greenberg and Cropanzano (2001), must be adopted by every organization to ensure that decisions are made fairly and avoid unethical practices.

When it comes to justice, it's all about how the decision-makers' actions are seen. Interactional justice is defined by Cohen–Charash and Speitior (2001) as the manner in which the management treats receivers of justice in relation to organizational activities. It has to do with how an organization's decision-making process is carried out. Individuals' sense of fairness in their relationships with others are assessed by interpersonal justice, according to the practice of organizational fairness (Greenberg & Baron, 2009). A case of an employee getting fired from a company was described by Greenberg and Colquitt (2005). According to the authors, giving reasons for the employee's dismissal in a compassionate manner, left the employees with a favourable impression. Further, the employees agreed that the layoff was reasonable, and decided not to sue the company for wrongful termination (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005). This shows how critical it is for a company to promote a culture of interactional fairness. Interactional justice practices such as treating employees fairly contribute to a company's democratic image and goodwill.

An employee's level of commitment has been conceived in many different ways. For the most part, research into organizational commitment has focused on attitudes rather than behaviours. Having a culture of organizational loyalty means that employees are committed to the organization's goals and recognize the importance of that commitment to the organization (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Fang, 2001). According to Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974), the relative strength of a person's identification and/or membership in a certain group is what constitutes commitment. Porter et al. (1974) stated that there are three types of commitment, which include, a person's conviction in the organization's aims and ideals, individual's willingness to contribute to those goals, and individual's steadfast desire to remain a member of that organization. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), commitment to an organization can take three forms. The authors stated that affective commitment is the employee's emotional attachment to the company, and identification with and engagement in the organization. Employees who have an emotional commitment to the company believe that their personal relationships inside the organization are in line with its aims and values (Beck & Wilson, 2000a).

When it comes to commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) claim that it is based on an individual's view of what would happen if they were to leave their present organization and what would happen if they were to stay. The authors go on to say that an employee's commitment to staying on the job is founded on a belief in the importance of staying on. Continuous commitment is a result of an individual's judgment of the economic value derived from their engagement with the organization (Beck & Wilson, 2000). In contrast, normative commitment is a sense of responsibility to continue working with a company or group (Meyer & Allen, 1991). According to this definition, a person's ethical right to continue with an organization, notwithstanding the advantages received from it in the past, qualifies as a normative commitment. Although the intention of workers to remain or quit the company may represent their commitment, accessible options outside the company and normative pressure to remain at the workplace might impact their commitment (Hassan, 2002).

Commitment is a psychological condition that Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) believe is the basis for the employee's relationship with the business. People who have a strong affective commitment stay because they want to. Those who have a strong continuation connection stay because they have to, and those who have a strong normative connection to the company stay because they feel like staying. As an organizational commitment instrument, a feeling of fairness and justice ensures that employees have a sense of belonging. Studies in the past have demonstrated that distributive justice has a close association with procedural justice and interactional justice. For example, Lambert et al. (2007) discovered that employees' Job commitment was highly influenced by their perceptions of procedural fairness and distributive justice.

2. Theoretical Review

The theories reviewed include the following

1. Equity theory – by Adam Stacy (1963)
2. Expectancy theory – By Charles Green (1972)

In compensation, one of the most important concerns is the question of equality in remuneration. Employees should be compensated fairly and equally. Employees frequently complain that their compensation is insufficient in accordance to their efforts. Employees are so concerned about the concept of equity that they are not just worried about what they are paid, but also what others are paid. They are always comparing their compensation to that of their coworkers. An employee's sense of fairness is stated to exist if they believe they are being paid fairly for the work they do. On the other hand, if any employees are paid less than they deserve, it appears that there is a situation of inequality. Employers, according to Adam's research as referenced by Obisi (1996), care about not just how much they are paid, but also how much other people are paid.

Using the notion that a person experiences injustice when he believes that the outputs (salary, prestige, promotion) are equal to the inputs (effort), Adam (1963) changed the course of equity theory. According to Adam (1963), people would seek to restore equality in the ratio if they believe it isn't equal to their peers' perceptions.

2.1 Expectancy Theory

The expectancy theory of motivation assumes that employees anticipate for significant rewards or pay in return for a certain behavior or action. Employees have expectations of certain entitlement or pay as a result of labour effort. When employees' expectations from a particular job is realized, there is bound to be high commitment and share happiness. In Charles's study as cited by Obisi (1996), if the rewards an organization offers are commensurate or aligns with what the employee wants, expectancy has been realized.

Expectancy theory is not a one-way traffic. If an individual expected a certain amount of pay, such individual knows that certain efforts must be put in to achieve such a pay. Individual's expectations are realized only when the organization has matched that expectation with the efforts from the individual.

In Taylor's study as cited by Obisi (1996) identified four questions that could be asked

- i. What outcome does the job offer the employee?
- ii. How attractive do employees view these outcomes?
- iii. What kind of behavior or action must the employee demonstrate in order to achieve these outcomes?
- iv. How does the employee view the chances of achieving what is expected of him?

Two relevant theories were adopted to justify this research work. However, equity theory of motivation was adopted to underpin the study. This is because the equity theory of motivation is influenced by an individual's subjective judgement about the fairness of the reward that is accrued to the individual in relation to the inputs, and compared with the reward of others. There is need to strike a balance between the inputs and outputs of an employee in terms of efforts, loyalty, hard work commitment, and trust in supervisor. While the input is associated with the labour effort, the output refers to financial rewards and other intrinsic benefits such as, recognition, sense of achievement, praise, job security among others.

3. Methods

The positivism philosophical framework was applied to measure the influence of organizational commitment on job commitment. The descriptive research design was employed, and systematic random sampling technique was used to determine a target population of 700. The administration of questionnaire was used in the collection of quantitative data. The perceptions of the respondents were rated on a 4–point Likert scale. A sample size of 248 respondents was randomly selected from among the staff of Beloxxi Industries Limited. The instruments were adapted from Oge, Okoli, Ezeliora & Okeke, (2014). Further, the instrument was evaluated and scrutinized by experts from the Department of psychology and industrial relations and Human Resource Management Lagos State University, Ojo. A pilot study was conducted using 10 respondents from the same organization and a reliability coefficient above 0.76 was obtained using Cronbach alpha. Krejci and Morgan sample method was helpful in the determination of 248 sample size. Out of two hundred and forty-eight (248) administered questionnaire, two hundred and four (204), which represents 82.3% response rate were duly completed and returned, while 44 (17.7%) copies were not usable. This study made use of factor

analysis and regression analysis in testing the hypotheses using the SPSS (21.0) version in order to answer the research questions.

3.1. Analysis of Results

This section presents the validation of the research hypotheses through the process of dimension reduction test such as Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's test of Sphericity, and reliability test. After the performance of these analysis, regression analysis was conducted to comprehend the level of prediction between the variables. The table below shows the values of KMO, Bartlett's test and tests of reliability.

Table 1. Variables analysis

Variables	Mean	Std. Dev.	Cronbach α	KMO	Bartlett's test
Distributive justice	2.44	1.312	0.724	0.769	$p < 0.05$
Procedural justice	2.37	1.377	0.713	0.610	$p < 0.05$
Interactional justice	2.30	1.053	0.716	0.721	$p < 0.05$
Job commitment	2.29	1.310	0.816	0.704	$p < 0.05$

Source: Authors' compilation

Table 1 shows that all of the components were tested for reliability using Cronbach alpha, and all of the reliability values above the suggested 0.7 level. According to Kaiser (1974), the minimum value for sampling adequacy should be 0.5, which is what the KMO uses to assess if the responses obtained from the sample are appropriate. KMO values varied from 0.610 to 0.769 in Table 1, which indicates that sampling adequacy was adequate. The Bartlett's test showed a significant p value of 0.05 for all variables, indicating a strong correlation between them. Community test was performed to further test the validity of all the variables through the principal component analysis as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Community matrix

	Raw	Rescaled
	Extraction	Extraction
Distributive	1.16	0.671
Procedural	1.34	0.707
Interaction	1.07	0.551

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

To be eligible for further analysis, all variables had to have a value greater than 0.5 in Table 2 (communalities and variance). Otherwise, it may be difficult to proceed with the factor analysis in its current form. There is more than 70 percent of the variation in "Procedural Justice," whereas 67.1 percent of the variance in "Distributive Justice" and 55 percent of the variance in "Interaction Justice" are covered. Because of this, the regression analysis results may be trusted.

Table 3. Multiple regression analysis model summary on the interplay between distributive justice and employees' commitment

Model	R	R-square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	F	Sig.
1	0.451	0.203	0.112	2.43	1.71	4.92	0.041

Predictors: (Constant), Distributive Justice

Dependent variable: Employees' job commitment

The result from Table 3 shows that there significant 0.451 (45.1%) association exists between distributive justice and employee's job commitment. The value of determination which is the R^2 shows that 0.203 (20.3%) distributive justice accounts for variation in employees' job commitment. This indicates that 79.7% variation in employees' job commitment is explained by other variables.

On the test of hypothesis, the p value at 95% significant level (2 tailed) is 0.041. The alpha value is less than 0.05 which is the level of significance. That is, (0.041 < 0.05), therefore we reject H_0 that there insignificant association between distributive justice and employees job commitment and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Table 4. Multiple regression model summary on the effect of procedural justice on employees' job commitment

Model	R	R-square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	F	Sig.
1	0.482	0.232	0.008	2.420	1.732	2.51	0.015

Predictors: (Constant), Procedural Justice

Dependent variable: Employees' job commitment

The regression model in Table 4 shows that there is 0.482 (48.2%) significant association between procedural justice and employees' job commitment. The value of determination which is the R^2 shows that 0.232 (23.2%) employees' job commitment is explained by procedural justice. This shows that 76.8% variation in employees' job commitment is explained by other factors.

On the test of hypothesis, the p value at 95% significant level (2 tailed) is 0.015. The alpha value is less than 0.05 which is the level of significance. That is, (0.015 < 0.05), therefore we reject H_0 that there is no significant relationship between procedural justice and employees job commitment and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Table 5. Multiple regression model summary on the relationship between procedural justice and employees' job commitment

Model	R	R-square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	F	Sig.
1	0.210	0.042	0.000	2.431	1.706	2.435	0.049

Predictors: (Constant), Interactional Justice

Dependent variable: Employees' job commitment

The result shows that there is a 0.21 (21%) relationship between interactional justice and employees' job commitment. The coefficient of determination which is the R^2 shows that 0.042 (4.2%) employees' job commitment is explained by interactional justice. This shows that 95.8% variation in employees' job commitment is explained by other factors.

On the test of hypothesis, the p value at 95% significant level is 0.049 as revealed in Table 5. The alpha value is less than 0.05 which is the level of significance. That is, (0.049 < 0.05), therefore, we reject H_0 that there is no significant relationship between interactional justice and employees' job commitment and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Employees' job commitment was further regressed on the aggregate of organizational justice to validate the fourth hypothesis.

Table 6. Multiple regression analysis model summary of relative effect of organizational justice and employees' job commitment

Model	R	R-square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	F	Sig.
1	0.527	0.278	-0.11	2.432	1.724	3.12	0.035

Predictors: (Constant), Procedural, Distributive, Interaction

Dependent variable: Employees' job commitment

The result from Table 6 shows that there is 0.527 (52.7%) relationship between organizational justice and employees' job commitment. The coefficient of determination which is the R^2 shows 0.278 (27.8%) employees' job commitment is explained for by organizational justice. This shows that 72.2% variation in employees' job commitment is explained by other factors.

With regards to the test of hypothesis, the p value at 95% significant level is 0.035 as shown in Table 6. The alpha value is less than 0.05 which is the level of significance. That is, ($0.035 < 0.05$), therefore, we reject H_0 that there is no significant relationship between organizational justice and employees job commitment and accept the alternative hypothesis.

4. Discussion of Results

An association between distributive justice and employees' dedication to their jobs was determined to be 45.1 percent significant in this study. According to the findings, distributive justice is responsible for just 20.3 percent of the variance in employee work commitment, while other variables account for 79.7 percent of the variance. The study also found that the model is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level with a ratio of .041. There was a strong correlation between distributive justice and job dedication in prior studies (Akanbi 2013; Ajala, 2015).

Procedural justice has a 48.2 percent correlation with workers' job commitment, but only 23.2 percent of the variance in employees' job commitment is explained by procedural justice, while 76.8 percent of the variance in employees' job commitment is explained by other variables. This means that the model is significant at $p < 0.05$, which is ($0.015 < 0.05$). Because of this, we rejected H_0 and accepted H_1 . Additionally, the results of hypotheses three and four showed that there is a substantial correlation between interactional justice and workers' level of job commitment of 21% and 21%, respectively.

The model is significant at the $p < 0.05$ level, and the fourth hypothesis shows a 52.7 percent association between organizational justice and workers' job dedication, with a significant value of .035, 0.05, according to the results. Both the third and fourth hypotheses have their alternate hypothesis approved. Finding the most important components of organizational justice for workers' job commitment was also done using factorial analysis. The results of the factorial analysis reveal that distributive justice has the greatest mean of 2.44, followed by procedural justice with a mean of 2.37.

5. Conclusion

This study looked at the impact of perceived organizational fairness on employee commitment to their jobs. Organizational justice and employee dedication were found to have a favorable correlation. According to the study, employees' job dedication is significantly influenced by distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness. The study indicated that the three components of organizational justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) had a 45.1 percent, 48.2 percent, and 21 percent association with employee work commitment. Clearly, this illustrates that when there is a sense of organizational justice, there is a sense of duty towards work, and this makes people more devoted to their task. The findings of the factorial analysis also demonstrate that workers' job dedication is strongly influenced by the distribution of justice. Because fair methods for work decisions, with equal allocation of resources, and transparent communication of decisions will result in an increase in employee engagement and strong organizational performance, it is safe to assume.

5.1. Recommendations

Based on the findings and the conclusions drawn from this study on the perceived effect of organizational justice on employee's job commitment, the following recommendations were made:

- i. Organizations should establish fair procedures for job decisions.
- ii. There should be appropriate allocation of resources and fair communication of decisions.
- iii. Finally, organizations should embrace justice in all ramifications of their practices in their dealings with the employees to bring about committed employees.

5.2. Suggestion for further studies

The findings of this study indicate that more research be done to determine the impact of the Meyer and Allen (1991) components of organizational commitment (distributive, procedural, and interaction justice) on each component of organizational justice (Affective, continuance and normative commitment).

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an Understanding of Inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 422-436.
- Ajala, E. (2015). The influence of organizational justice on employee's commitment in manufacturing firms in Oyo State Nigeria: implications for industrial social work. *African Journal of Social Work*, 5(1), 92 – 130.
- Akanbi, P. (2013). Impact of perceived organizational justice on organizational commitment of a food and beverage firms in Nigeria, *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3 (14), 207-218.
- Ambrose, M., & Arnaud, A (2015). Are procedural justice and distribute justice conceptually distinct: Lawrence Erlbaum associates: United States.
- Ayobami P.A. & Eugene O.O. (2013). Impact of perceived organizational justice on organizational commitment of a food and beverage firm in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(14), 4: 207-218.
- Beck, N., & Wilson, J. (2000). Development of affective organizational commitment: A cross – sequential examination change with tenure. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 56(5), 1140-136.
- Cantern, G. (1968). The distribution of reward and resources in groups and organizations. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(9), 91-131.

- Carolina, M., Vicente, M., Jose P., & Russell, C. (2008). Organizational justice and extra role customer service: The mediating role of well – being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17(3), 327 - 348
- Chris, O. (1996). *Personnel management*. Jackbod Enterprises: Ibadan Nigeria.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Speitor, P. (2001). *The pole of justice in organization: a meta-analysis of organizational behaviour and human decision process*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Cropanzano T., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 5(12), 317-372.
- Cropanzano, R. Bowen, D., Gilliland, S. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34 – 48.
- Daniel, E (2012). Impact of human resources development and organizational commitment on financial sector employees in Nigeria. *Scientific Annals of the Alexandra Ioan Cuza” University of Iasi. Economic Science*, 59(2), 29 – 41.
- Deconik, J. (2010). The effect organizational justice, perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees’ level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 1349-1355.
- Elanian, M (2016). Job decision latitude, organizational justice and health, multi-level covariance structure analysis. *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 58, 1659-1669.
- Eskew, (1993). The pole of organizational justice in organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 257-270.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resources management*. Sage publications: Thousand Oaks: London.
- Greenberg, J. (2013). Organizational justice yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 201 -213.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, M. (2003). *Procedural justice, participation, and the fair process effect in groups and organizations*. Springer-Yerlag: New York.
- Greenberg, J., Colquitt, J., & Zapathelan-Phelan, C. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. *Handbook of organizational justice*. Mahwah, Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Hassan, A. (2002). Organizational justice as a determinant of organizational commitment and intention to leave. *Asia Academy of Management Journal*, 7(2), 55 – 66.
- Javad, E., & Davood, G. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(2) 85-91.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Griffin, M. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(4) 644 – 656.
- Lawler, E. (1968). Equity theory as predictor of productivity and work quality. *Psychological bulletin*, 70(3), 596-610.
- Meyer j., Allen., N., & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three – component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78(4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resources Management Review*, 1(5) 61-98.
- Michael S., Jeremy, B., Frank, W., & Daniel, T. (2010). Organizational justice and individuals, withdrawal: Unlocking the influence of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(3), 368-390.
- Obisi, C. (1996). *Industrial relations*. Freeman Productions: Agbowo Ibadan.
- Okocha, B. & Success, A. (2016). Organizational justice and employee satisfaction. *International Journal of Advanced Academy Research in Social and Management Sciences*, 2(9), 1 – 11.
- Ozen, J. (2003). Organizational justice as the key to trust in organization. *Trust in social sciences*. Ankara: Vadi Publishing.
- Porter L & Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59(3), 603 – 609.
- Wat, D., & Shaffer, M., A. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Review*, 34(4):406-422.
- Yasar, M., Emhan, A., & Ebere, P. (2014). Analysis of organizational justice, supervisor support, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Studies*, 5(3), 37 – 45.