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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between organisational justice and employee commitment of private secondary school teachers in Nigeria using survey design. Twenty (20) private secondary schools were selected in Bayelsa State using simple random sampling. Four hundred and eighty (480) teachers were surveyed. Sample of two hundred and fourteen (214) was determined using Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table. Two hundred and fourteen (214) copies of questionnaire were administered to the teachers but one hundred and eighty three (183) copies were correctly filled and returned. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (rs) was used to analyse the hypotheses. It was found that organisational justice has positive significant association with employee commitment. This study concludes that organisational justice measured in terms of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice enhances employee commitment in selected private secondary schools in Nigeria.
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INTRODUCTION

In every workplace it is assumed that employers of labour will treat all their employees equally irrespective of tribe, culture and ethnic background. But it is not always so especially in some private secondary schools in Nigeria where the proprietors, directors or administrators have taken advantage of high rate of unemployment situation in the country; treat university school leavers as slaves in their quest for providing jobs for them. Some of the school owners decide what to pay each teacher even when their academic qualifications are not the same. This abnormality has caused many graduates to withdraw their services from teaching in many private secondary schools due to injustice meted on them while those who don’t want to leave remain calculatedly committed as a result of lack of job alternatives. Owners of private secondary schools take decisions that affect their teachers negatively thereby cultivating a multiple effect on the pupils or students been taught by the same teachers. Leadership behaviour in some of these high schools shows that authority is centralized, theory x becomes their assumption as well as initiating structure practices. Both teachers and non-teaching employees are usually coerced to pay more attention to work than their wellbeing.

In addition, teachers are usually harass, intimidated by owners of these high schools by letting them know that they can be lay-off any time and hence, lowering their commitment to teaching services. Most times, one teacher can be assigned to teach two to three subjects for more than three classes daily. This implies that such teacher is doing the job of three teachers and receiving a pay of one employee. It does not also stop there; sometimes teachers are been used as domestic servants in the homes of these proprietors as messengers including errand drivers after school hours. For instance, there was a scenario in one of the private high schools where a teacher was used as school bus driver for good one year but he was not paid for it. This same teacher teaches business studies for all junior classes as well as computer studies for both senior and junior classes including primary sections. This injustice has affected the profitability of the high schools without them knowing. It has also lowered their performance in terms of national and international examination rankings. Little did these proprietors, directors and administrators know that a worker who feels unjustly treated will not be committed to the work he/she is paid to do. Most of these problems arise as a result of inequality in terms of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice to the teachers. Distributive justice in this case refers to when schools pay workers differently while procedural justice refers to how the teachers perceives the procedure of payment. On the other hand, interactional justice is concerned with how the school owners convey the message of these payments to the teachers.

Drifting from the above mentioned unfair treatment of employees, when employees are committed in their jobs especially in the high schools; more students are usually attracted thereby increasing the population of the schools which in turn increases their profits. Let it also be known that attractions of fresh students are made possible by the teachers who make recommendations through word-of-mouth to parents on how good their school is. It was also revealed that seventy percent of the pupil/student admitted was made possible by teachers’ recommendation. In other words, without teachers’ recommendation to parents, owners of high
schools will spend a lot of money in advertisement. This has given positive credentials to employee commitment as organisational behaviourists and scholars have affirmed in the preceding paragraph.

Nevertheless, McShane and Von Glinow (2018) affirmed that commitment of employees in the workplace has contributed positively to organisational performance and growth. Jones and George (2017) added that employee commitment has promoted many private businesses around the world including service and manufacturing organizations. When workers are committed to their organization, existence of conflict is usually minimal quite apart from reduction of organisational politics. Commitment promotes team cohesiveness, goal congruence, orderliness and knowledge dissemination. Interestingly, employee commitment is the driver of many service organizations including secondary and tertiary institutions. However, scholars such as Choudhry, Philip and Kumar (2011); Owolabi (2012); Najaf, Keivan and Shahnaz (2012); Iqbal (2013); Fatima, Abd and Omar (2014); Hengky and Nur (2014); and Geeta and Renu (2015) have investigated the influence of organisational justice on factors that shape workers attitudes and behaviour but most of their studies did not focus on employee commitment especially in private secondary schools in Nigeria.

It is against this argument that this study wants to investigate the relationship between organisational justice and employee commitment of private secondary schools in Nigeria with the preceding objectives and hypotheses formulations derived from the literature.

**Objectives of the study**

The main objective of this study is to examine the relationship between organisational justice and employee commitment of private secondary schools in Nigeria. Specifically, the study seeks to:

i) Investigate the relationship between distributive justice and affective commitment
ii) Examine the relationship between distributive justice and continuance commitment
iii) Identify the relationship between procedural justice and affective commitment
iv) Ascertain the relationship between procedural justice and continuance commitment
v) Investigate the relationship between interactional justice and affective commitment
vi) Identify the relationship between interactional justice and continuance commitment

**Research Hypotheses**

Based on the specific objectives above, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

HO1: distributive justice has no significant relationship with affective commitment
HO2: distributive justice has no significant relationship with continuance commitment
HO3: procedural justice has no significant relationship with affective commitment
HO4: procedural justice has no significant relationship with continuance commitment
HO5: interactional justice has no significant relationship with affective commitment
HO6: interactional justice has no significant relationship with continuance commitment
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Organizational justice
Griffin and Moorhead (2014) elucidated that organisational justice is how people working in the organization view whether they are treated fairly or not. Robbins and Judge (2018) stressed that organizational justice is concerned with how employees feel about management and decision makers on how they treat them at work. Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland (2007) viewed organizational justice as an individual assessment about workplace ethical conduct and moral standard. Moorman (2009) contended that organizational justice is concerned with a situation on how workers conclude about their treatment in their jobs and how these views affect their performance at work. Baldwin (2006) argued that it is the extent to which workers view workplace procedures, interactions, and rewards to be fair in nature, which fairness, often, will only become relevant and tangible when violation of said justice occurs. Owolabi (2012) asserts that it is the idea of workers that an action or decision is morally right or wrong. Researchers have investigated organisational justice and other workplace variables using different types of methodologies and geographic scopes as can be viewed hereunder. Ismail (2009) investigated the effect of pay for performance and interactional justice on job satisfaction of one hundred and thirty two employees in Malaysia. Ismail’s findings revealed that interactional justice is significantly associated with pay for performance as well as with job satisfaction. Sania and Siraj (2013) investigated the impact of distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, temporal justice, spatial justice on job satisfaction of banking employees in Karachi, Palistan. Karachi. Findings of their study indicate that distributive justice, interactional justice, temporal justice has significant association with job satisfaction. Aondoaver and Ernest (2013) investigated the impact of distributive justice and age on organizational citizenship behaviours of non-teaching staff of Benue State University. It was found that distributive justice has a significant association with organisational citizenship behaviour dimensions. Ghulam, Ikramullah, Khurram, Muhammad and Nadeem (2011) examined the impact that distributive and procedural justice has on employees’ commitment in Pakistan. It was found that both procedural and distributive justice have positive and significant effect on employees’ commitment. Iqbal (2013) investigated the correlation between procedural, distributive, interactional and work performance in Pakistan. Iqbal’s finding showed that employee’s perception about procedural and interactional justice has a great affect on their job satisfaction.

Distributive justice: McShane and Von Glinow (2018) elucidated that distributive justice is about employee perception of fairness in how organization reward employees for their contribution and sacrifice in the organization. Griffin and Moorhead (2014) affirmed that distributive justice refers to workers’ view about the fairness in terms of rewards and other valued outcomes that are equally allocated within the organization. Choudhry, Philip and Kumar (2011) posited that distributive justice is associated with workers view after comparing their rewards with their colleagues. In another dimension, Lambert (2003) accentuates that distributive justice takes the equal distribution of acquisitions among workers very seriously. Acquisitions here refer to goods, duties, services, punishments, opportunities, roles, statues, awards, promotions, salaries and wages (Memduhoðlu and Yildiz, 2014). For Luthans (2011),
distributive justice is the belief that employee’s have that everybody ought to get what they deserve. Jones and George (2016) asserted that distributive justice is concerned with worker’s view about the fairness of promotions, job assignments, pay as well as working conditions in the workplace.

**Procedural justice:** McShane and Von Glinow (2018) affirmed that procedural justice refers to how fairness the procedures used in distribution of resources were followed or not. Others viewed it as the perception of equity with respect to whether rules and regulations were followed in the process of rewarding or punishing a worker (Choudhry, Philip and Kumar, 2011). Colquitt and Chertkoff (2002) on their own contention stressed that procedural justice implies when firms follow equal processes like avoiding unfair distribution of wages, sharing information among employee and participating in decision making. Griffin and Moorhead (2014) contended that procedural justice is employee perceptions of fairness of the process used to ascertain various rewards. Jones and George (2016) viewed procedural justice as workers’ perception of the fairness of the procedures used in determining how rewards are distributed within the organization.

**Interactional justice:** This refers to fair communication between employee-employer or employee-employee (Choudhry, Philip and Kumar, 2011). Robbins and Judge (2018) perceived it as the degree to which an individual is treated with dignity and respect in the workplace. It also refers to how one worker treats another worker in the organization (Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland, 2007). Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng (2001) assert that interactional justice has two perspectives. The first perspective is informational justice which refers to whether one person is truthful and also provides adequate justifications when things go bad in the organisation (Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland, 2007). On the other hand, the second form is called interpersonal justice, which refers to the respect and dignity with which one treats another in the workplace (Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland, 2007).

**Theoretical Framework**
The theory that supports this study is equity theory that was propounded by Stacy Adams. Equity theory assumes that workers compare what they receive from their jobs such as salary, recognition, promotion with what the effort they put in the work such as their experiences and education (Robbins and Judge, 2018). What this means is that; if the employees’ perceives that their efforts are not commensurate with their pay, they will not put much effort in their job; but if they perceived that their pay equals their efforts, they will continue to be committed with the firm. Workers that are emotionally committed to the organization do so as a result of the outcome in the job while those who are normatively committed exercise that behaviour because of how fairly the organization is to them in terms of constant salary payment, medical allowances, housing allowances, promotion and supervisor support.

**Employee Commitment**
Both employee and organisational commitment will be reviewed in this section since commitment was originally domiciled within organisational setting. Employee commitment refers to the identification of employee to, and with his/her organization. Employee commitment also refers to employees’ attachment to a particular organization as a result its philosophies or
reputation. It can also be perceived as employee’s willingness to put more efforts in achieving firm objectives. Employee commitment was drawn from organisational commitment expanded by Allen and Meyer (1997). McShane and Von Glinow (2017) contended that organizational commitment represents the other half (with job satisfaction) of what some experts call “overall job attitude. Sinding and Waldstrom (2014) elucidated that organisational commitment is the extent to which an employee identifies his/herself with a firm and its goals. Jones and George (2017) affirmed that organizational commitment is the collection of feelings and beliefs that managers have about their organization as a whole. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) stressed that organizational commitment is the force that binds an employee to a course of action of relevance to one or more achievement. Ruokolainen (2011) contended that it is the degree to which employee internalizes or adopts the characteristics or perspectives of the organization, whereas Luthans (2011) on his view, argued that it is a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization; be willing to exert high levels of effort on behalf of the organization; and with a definite belief in, and acceptance of organisational philosophies.

Drawing from the above, Mullins (2011) opined that it refers to employee’s identification with and attachment to the firm. Organizational commitment represents the degree to which workers identify with the firm they are working for, how involved they are in the firm and whether they are prepared to leave it (Fu and Deshpande, 2013; Greenberg and Baron, 2008). Akpan (2013) perceived organizational commitment as the extent to which a worker associates with his/her firm, its goals and the willingness to remain in the firm. Another scholar Singh and Pandey (2004) argued that it showcases workers belief in the philosophies and targets of employer establishment as well as his/her willingness to expend attempt in their achievement with intention to remain working with the same firm. For Ketchand and Strawser (2001), it can be described as the bond that employees form with their employing enterprises. In another perception, Levy (2003) contended that organizational commitment is the strength of an employee’s identification with and involvement in the organizational day to day activities. Organisational commitment is a work attitude associated with workers’ willingness to be actively engaged in the work as well as firms life and subsequently remain employed in the same firm (Lok and Crawford, 2004).

**Measures of Employee Commitment**

The work of Allen and Meyer (1990) shows that organisational commitment has three components; affective, continuance and normative commitment.

**Affective commitment:** Affective commitment is concerned with worker’s emotional attachment to, involvement in, and identification with the firm they are working with (McShane and Von Glinow, 2018). It is also known as a psychological bond whereby an employee or worker chooses to be dedicated to and responsible for the firm (Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1997; Meyer, 1997; Solinger, van Olffen and Roe, 2008; Klein, Molloy and Brinsfield, 2012). Affective commitment simplifies the affection workers have for the organization they are working with. This may arise as a result of how their supervisors and managers treat them, prompt payment of compensation packages and so forth. It may also be as a result of the firm’s image on the society or positive social responsibility of the firm on the society.
Normative commitment: Luthans (2011) contended that normative commitment refers to workers’ feelings of obligation to stay with the firm because they feel it is the right thing to do. Normative commitment is also known as moral commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1997). For instance, workers that have benefitted from specialized training may find it as a moral obligation to remain and contribute to the firm since the training was paid for by the organization. Thus, normative commitment is in tandem with compensation received for not working for the organization.

Continuance commitment: Continuance commitment is also known as calculative attachment to the firm (McShane and Von Glinow, 2018). There are two forms of calculative attachments (Taing, et al., 2011; Vandenbergh and Panaccio, 2012). One type of continuance commitment is calculative commitment where worker feel that he/she have no alternative employment opportunity available. McShane and Von Glinow (2018) that this situation is mostly result of unemployment in the labor market. Luthans (2011) contended that this type of commitment is also based on the costs that the worker associates with leaving the firm and this may happen because of the worker loss his/her seniority for promotion or compensations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
Survey research design was employed in this study. The geographical scope of this study is Bayelsa State, Nigeria. Twenty (20) private secondary schools were selected in Bayelsa State using simple random sampling. Four hundred and eighty (480) teachers were surveyed. Sample of two hundred and fourteen (214) was determined using Krejcie and Morgan sample size determination table. Two hundred and fourteen (214) copies of questionnaire were administered to the teachers but one hundred and eighty three (183) copies were correctly filled and returned. Cronbach Alpha values between 0.70-0.80 were ascertained as reliability coefficients while face and content validity was employed. Dimensions of organisational justice and measures of employee commitment were measured with five items each on five point Likert scale ranging from 5= Strongly agree; 4 = Agree; 3= Disagree; 2 = Strongly disagree 1= Neither agree nor disagree. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (rs) was used to analyse the hypotheses with the aid of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS 20.0) while respondents’ characteristics (gender, educational qualifications, number of years in service) were analysed using frequency distribution.

RESULTS

| Table 1: Demographics Information of Respondents’ | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Gender                                        |           |                |
| Male                                          | 70        | 38.3           |
| Female                                        | 113       | 61.7           |
| Age-Bracket                                   |           |                |
| 41&above                                      | 18        | 9.8            |
| 31-40                                         | 129       | 70.5           |
| 20-30                                         | 36        | 19.7           |
| Years in service                              |           |                |
| 8&above                                       | 8         | 4.4            |
| 4-7                                           | 73        | 39.9           |
Table 1 above shows that seventy (70) respondents representing 38.3% were males while one hundred and thirteen (113) respondents representing 61.7% were females. The table also shows that eighteen (18) respondents representing 9.8% were between 41 years and above; one hundred and twenty nine (129) respondents representing 70.5% were between 31-41 years; thirty six (36) respondents representing 19.7% were between 20-30 years of age. In terms of the number of years in service, eight (8) respondents representing 4.4% have served their schools between 8 years and above; seventy three (73) respondents representing 39.9% have served their schools between 4-7 years; one hundred and two (102) respondents representing 55.7% have served their schools between 1-3 years. The academic qualifications of the respondents revealed that sixty eight (68) respondents representing 37.2% hold OND/HND diploma certificates; four (4) respondents representing 2.2% hold master degrees; one hundred and eleven (111) respondents representing 60.7% hold bachelor degrees.

**Analyses of Hypotheses**

*Table 2 – Bivariate analysis between distributive justice and affective commitment*

|                  | Distributive justice | Affective commitment |
|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| **Distributive justice** | Pearson Correlation | 1                    |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .770**               | .000                 |
| N                | 183                  | 183                  |
| **Affective commitment** | Pearson Correlation | .770**               |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000                 | 1                    |
| N                | 183                  | 183                  |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2 above shows the result of bivariate analysis between distributive justice and affective commitment. From the result, it was found that distributive justice has a positive significant relationship with affective commit. This implies that null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.

*Table 3 – Bivariate analysis between distributive justice and continuance commitment*

|                  | Distributive justice | Continuance commitment |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| **Distributive justice** | Pearson Correlation | 1                      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .794**               | .000                   |
| N                | 183                  | 183                    |
| **Continuance commitment** | Pearson Correlation | .794**                |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000                 | 1                      |
| N                | 183                  | 183                    |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above result shows the bivariate analysis between distributive justice and continuance commitment. It was found that distributive justice has positive and significant association with
continuance commitment (p<0.05; .000). This implies that null hypothesis is hereby rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.

**Table 4 – Bivariate analysis between procedural justice and affective commitment**

|                      | Procedural justice | Affective commitment |
|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Correlation  | 1                  | .881**               |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .001               |                      |
| N                    | 183                | 183                  |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above result shows the bivariate analysis between procedural justice and affective. The result revealed that procedural justice has a positive significant relationship with affective commitment (p<0.05; .001). This means that null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.

**Table 5 – Bivariate analysis between procedural justice and continuance commitment**

|                      | Procedural justice | Continuance commitment |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Pearson Correlation  | 1                  | .768**                 |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .000               |                        |
| N                    | 183                | 183                    |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Bivariate above shows that procedural justice has positive significant relationship with continuance commitment. The result also indicate a high correlation coefficient (.768**) and a significant level of .000 which implies that null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.

**Table 6 – Bivariate analysis between interactional justice and affective commitment**

|                      | Interactional justice | Affective commitment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Correlation  | 1                     | .770**               |
| Sig. (2-tailed)      | .000                  |                      |
| N                    | 183                   | 183                  |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 9 above shows the bivariate analysis between interactional justice and affective commitment. The result revealed that interactional justice has a positive significant relationship with affective commitment (p<0.05; 0.000) which implies that null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.
Table 7– Bivariate analysis between interactional justice and continuance commitment

|                      | Interactional justice | Continuance commitment |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Interactional justice| Pearson Correlation   | .778**                  |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)       | 1                      |
|                      | N                     | 183                    |
| Continuance          | Pearson Correlation   | .778**                  |
| commitment           | Sig. (2-tailed)       | .000                   |
|                      | N                     | 183                    |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above table shows the bivariate analysis between interactional justice and continuance commitment. The result revealed that interactional justice has a positive significant relationship with continuance commitment which means that null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.

Discussion of findings

Based on the results it was found that organisational justice dimensions were positively and significantly associated with employee commitment measures. The findings of this study have been shown to correspond with previous results of other researchers as presented here. Ismail (2009) findings revealed that interactional justice is significantly associated with pay for performance as well as with job satisfaction. Sania and Siraj (2013) findings indicated that distributive justice, interactional justice, temporal justice was significantly associated with job satisfaction. Aondoaver and Ernest (2013) finding shows that distributive justice is positively associated with extra-role behaviour indicators. Ghulam, Ikramullah, Khurram, Muhammad and Nadeem (2011) finding revealed that both procedural and distributive justice have positive and significant effect on workers’ commitment. Iqbal (2013) finding revealed that employee’s perception about procedural and interactional justice has a great affect on their job satisfaction.

Conclusion and recommendations

From the discussion of findings, this study concludes that organisational justice measured in terms of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice enhances employee commitment in selected private secondary schools in Nigeria. The following recommendations were made.

1) Proprietors and administrators of private secondary schools should treat teachers and non-teaching employees equally to enhance organisational commitment
2) The procedure of administering rewards to performing teachers should be made known to their colleagues to encourage competitiveness
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