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**ABSTRACT**

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 behaviours and productivity thus the main objective of this study was to investigate the effect of organizational justice on citizenship behaviour in Nigeria breweries. The study adopted the survey design using the questionnaire as the main instrument of data collection. A sample of 133 respondents was selected from Top management staff, middle management, lower management and casual staffs of Nigeria breweries, Ama plant using the stratified. The study employed regression analysis with the aid of Eviews 8 to analyze and answer the research questions. The findings from the study revealed that there is a significant relationship between distributive, procedural, interactional justice on employee commitments in Nigeria breweries. The study concludes that organizational justices have significant relationship on citizenship behaviour in Nigeria breweries. The study recommended that management of Nigeria breweries, should as much as possible provide sound conducive physical, social and mental working environment with adequate tools and facilities such as favourable ventilation & Temperature, Noise, Infrastructure and Interior and Amenities for employees to boast their moral and increase organizational effectiveness.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Background to the Study**

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 behaviours 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 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 behaviours 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).

Organizational justice refers to an employee’s perception of whether an event or situation is morally right, which is defined by the ethics, religion, equity, fairness or law. It is thus a subjective concept, where one is less concerned with what is just and rather more concerned with what people think or believe is just. Researchers have adopted a descriptive paradigm to study and understand why employees might view certain situations or events to be labelled just or unjust. It is regarded as a personal evaluation about organizational conduct and moral standing. (Cropanzano et al., 2007).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) can be seen as performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place (Deww 2011)

According to Nadim, Mohamed and Mahmudul (2004), in OCB, an individual‘s behaviour is discretionary, meaning he may choose to do it or not. This behaviour is not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system and in aggregate; it promotes the effective functioning of the organization. It must be very well understood that such behaviour could manifest itself in form of helping colleagues who have not been showing up, communicate with superior in advance if one knows he/she would be absent from work, aid superiors in accomplishing their task, participate in functions that would boost the image of the company.

The Nigerian breweries sector, like any other sector in the country has witnessed spates of increased organizational justice and citizenship behaviour both at local, state and national levels with various degrees of impact on the population (Okafor, 2012). Conflict has become a common occurrence in the existence and operations of organizations in the country, and Nigerian breweries is not left out. These organizational injustice are often the resultant effects of failure to amicably resolve perceived grievances/disagreement between the different stake-holders in the organization. The responses of employees to the dynamics of change in organizations sometimes hinder or bring closer the occurrence of conflict (Osabuohien, 2010). Since the complex structure of organizations creates opportunity for conflict to occur, the ability of management and employees to handle conflict is a sin qua non for effective productivity.

The Nigerian breweries Industry is one of the largest among all the industries in the country. It accounts among the largest component of the services sector in terms of GDP (Gross Domestic Product) and around 12 per cent of the total employment. The Nigerian brewery has come forth as one of the most dynamic and fast paced industries with several players entering the market. In any breweries organization, the employees deal with the customers on a one-to-one basis and thus, are the brand ambassadors of the organization and making it imperative for every organization to have a system wherein, employees are managed, developed, rewarded and retained in an appropriate manner. The present situation for retailers is that they experience high employee turnover, though industry experts point out that there is no lack of labour in the country. But training and developing an employee involves huge costs and time. One measure of increasing productivity, customer satisfaction and sales as an end outcome could be to look at employee perceptions of the organization. An often-overlooked construct is Organizational Justice. Tapping into these perceptions could help organizations formulate policies in a manner, which best suits, the organization as well as the employees.

In today’s competitive world, organizations are constantly trying their utmost limit to retain the best talent and outdo their competitors by doing the same things differently. Employees have become more aware of their rights and value the employer’s sense of justice and further expect and them to be fair or just at all times. Thus, fairness has become a prime aspect for organizations to take a deep look into - as it directly affects workplace attitudes and behaviour, organizational justice is a determinant towards achieving OCB. It describes the perception and understanding of fairness in the organization. Organizational justice further explains why employees retaliate against inequitable outcomes or inappropriate process and interaction. It is against this background that this study seeks to investigate the effect of organizational justice on citizenship behaviour of employees in Nigerian breweries.

**1.2 Statement of Problem**

It has been debated that organizational justice and citizenship behaviour can be an aversive or unpleasant emotional and physiological state resulting from adverse work experiences, particularly experiences that are uncertain or outside the employee’s control (Hart & Cooper, 2001). OCB refers to behaviour that is not formally requested or directly rewarded but can be functional to the operations of an organization (Smith et al., 1983). The interest of researchers focused on determining the antecedents to OCB (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). The notion of organizational justice has received considerable attention in industrial psychology, human resource management and organizational behaviour researches. Organizational Justice, as an antecedent to OCB was supported by many studies (Mayer and Gavin 2005). Along with organizational justice, organizational trust has frequently found as an antecedent of OCB (Guh et al., 2013). The relationship between organizational justice and OCB has been identified as a plausible explanation for regulating the impact of organizational Justice on OCB (Guh et al., 2013; Chhetri, 2014).

Chhetri, (2014) described the interpersonal conflict at work stressor, which captures the degree to which citizenship behaviour of a given employee. Similarly, their citizenship behaviour constraints include items tapping inadequate leadership or lack of necessary information. Marshall and Cooper’s (2009) model of work stressors included relationships with superiors and a lack of social support, while Kohli (2005) focused on supervisory misbehaviour. Each of these citizenship behaviour determinants seems to be capturing, in part, the interpersonal and informational facets of organizational justice. Still other citizenship behaviour determinants seem to overlap with procedural justice. Marshall and Cooper’s (2009) model includes lack of participation and managers’ inability to delegate as citizenship behaviour determinants, while others have focused on a lack of autonomy (Chesney 2001). Thibaut and Walker (2005) argued that influence was a vital component of procedural justice, and Levenson (2004) argued that procedures should be representative of employees’ views and opinions. Therefore, it is important for the concept and implications of organizational justice to be more recognizable. Despite the increasing breadth of the literature on organizational justice, there is a gap in the research on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviour levels in an organization. The importance of this investigation is to help broaden the understanding of organizational justice by highlighting variables that have not yet been investigated; to help the management in organizations better forecast, plan, and compensate for employee wellness issues. Therefore, this study is aimed toward establishing a link between organizational justice and e citizenship behaviour in Nigerian breweries.

**1.3 Objective of the Study**

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of organizational justice on citizenship behaviour in Nigerian breweries. The specific objective are

1. To examine the effect of distributive justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.
2. To determine the effect of procedural justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.
3. To ascertain the effect of interactional justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.

**1.4 Research Questions**

The following research questions are drawn to guide this research work;

1. To what extent has distributive justice affected employee commitment in Nigerian breweries?
2. To what extent has procedural justice affected employee commitment in Nigerian breweries?
3. To what extent has interactional justice affected employee commitment in Nigerian breweries?

**1.5 Research Hypotheses**

**H01:** There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries

**H02:** There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries

**H03:** There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.

**1.6 Significance of the Study**

This study examines the effect of organizational justice on citizenship behaviour in Nigerian breweries. The main rational for this research study is therefore to contribute to the broader research community by enhancing existing knowledge and generating new knowledge within the field of industrial and organisational psychology. Furthermore, this study addresses this topic from Nigerian parastatal work context and viewpoint by focusing on the Nigeria breweries. In addition, the study will be of immense benefit to a number of people. These include academics who are interested in furthering their knowledge of organisational justices and citizenship behaviour as the results obtained are capable of adding new insights to the present state of knowledge in the field and may therefore be found useful for teaching and for developing a body of management theory. This study will also be of great benefit to the government to providing useful insight in managing and strengthening the performance of government institutions.

The findings of this study would lead to the improvements in workplaces to help employees become more committed to their jobs. Theoretically, it is imperative to enhance our understanding of how organizational justice affects citizenship behaviour in a non-western country. Finally, the study will help managers in decision making especially in the areas of recruitment, selection, promotion, training, motivation, and instituting change in the organization

This study will also contribute to the body of existing knowledge on the role of organizational justice and citizenship behaviour.

**1.6 Scope of the Study**

This study seeks to assess the effect of organizational justice on citizenship behaviour in Nigerian breweries. The scope of the study will cover Nigerian breweries (Ama plant 9th mile) from 2012 – 2016, due to time, finance, size of the organization and proximity of the facility.

**1.7 Operational Definitions of Key Terms**

**Organizational Commitment**: This refers to a psychological state that binds the individual to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

**Organizational Justice:** An umbrella term used to refer to individual’s perceptions about the fairness of decisions and decision-making processes within an organization and the influences of those perceptions on behaviour (Martison et al. 2006).

**Citizenship Behaviour**: this can be described as performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.1 Conceptual Review**

**2.1.1 The Concept of Organizational Justice**

The fairness with which employees are treated by their respective organizations is a commonly explored topic. Organizational psychologists refer to this type of fairness as organizational justice. This concept has been the target of a great deal of research, and it has important implications for both organizations and their employees (Greenberg, 2004).

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. 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.

Organizational justice refers to the perceptions employees hold about the organization as being fair or unfair. These perceptions on justice have been linked to critical processes such as commitment, citizenship behaviours, satisfaction, and performance. (Colquitt, 2001) It has been recognized as a major component to get an insight into the attitudes of employees in an organization. Employee reactions can be grouped into three different notions of fairness. These came about in three different waves, or time periods or intellectual themes.

• The Distributive justice wave

• The Procedural justice wave

• The Interactional justice wave

**Distributive justice:**

The first established type of organizational justice is distributive justice which refers to justice in the acquisition of the results of decision making at the workplace (Hossein et al., 2010). Adams proposed his theory of equality four decades ago and in that he proposed that individuals tend to receive equal reward for their performed tasks. In other words, they require equal reward for the same amount of work done by other colleagues. According to Adams, equality is achieved when employees feel that their inputs (efforts) are equal to their outputs (rewards) as in other employees.

Employees who feel inequality react negatively as in the forms of avoiding work and poor organizational citizenship behaviour and worst of all, resignation from work. Historically, equality theory has focused on perceived justice of the amount of rewards distributed among individuals. Distributive justice has wide implications in organizational environment and researchers have explored its relationship with many other variables such as the quality and quantity of work. Since distributive justice focuses on outcomes it is predicted that this kind of justice is mainly related to cognitive, affective and behavioural reactions. Therefore, when a given outcome is perceived as unjust, this type of injustice must have affected the individual's feelings (e.g., anger, content, feeling of guilt or pride) understanding (e.g., slanted understanding of self or others' inputs and outputs) and finally their behaviours such as performance or turnover (Hossein et al., 2010).

**Procedural justice:**

Procedural justice refers to perceived justice of a procedure which is used to determine the distribution of rewards (Hossein et al., 2010). Similar to equality principle in discussing procedural justice individuals' perceptions play important roles and the reactions of individuals depend on their perception of the procedures and not on their real nature because psychologically individuals act upon their perceptions and not on the basis of the reality. Employees with increased perception of procedural justice look up positively at the superiors and organizations even if they express dissatisfaction with compensations, promotions and other personal outcomes (Robbins, 2005).

**Interactional justice:**

Interactional justice is the manner through which organizational justice is transferred from supervisors to subordinate employees and it includes components of the process of communication such as manners, honesty and courtesy between the source and the recipient. Since, interactional justice is determined by the management, this type of justice is related to cognitive, affective and behavioural reactions to the management or the supervisor. Therefore, when an employee feels interactional injustice, they will show a negative reaction to the organization instead of the supervisor. Therefore, one may predict that the employee is in general dissatisfied with their direct supervisors rather than the organization and the employee will have a lesser sense of commitment to the supervisor than to the organization. In addition, most of their negative attitudes are levelled at the supervisor rather than at the organization

**2.1.2 The Concept of Organizational citizenship behaviour**

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) was first put forth by Bateman and Organ in the early l 980's (Bienstock *et al.,* 2003). They assert that organizational citizenship behaviour includes cooperation between individuals in the workplace beyond and above their role requirements which may not necessarily lead to rewards. Korkmas and Arpachi define such behaviours at the workplace as a set of voluntary behaviours that is not part of the formal responsibilities of the individual yet improves the effective performance of the organization (Korkmaz and Arpachi, 2009).. Organ believes that organizational citizenship behaviour is an individualistic and voluntary behaviour which is not directly designed by formal reward systems in the organization yet promotes the effectiveness and performance of the organization (Cohen and Kol, 2004). This definition emphasizes three main characteristics of organizational citizenship behaviour:

• The behaviour is voluntary and not part of the pre-defined responsibilities of the employee

• This behaviour has organizational benefits, i.e., this behaviour develops the effective performance of the organization

• It is not explicitly or directly appreciated in the reward system of the organization

A review of the related literature shows that two approaches are considered in defining OCB. Organ and other previous researchers have discussed this behaviour as extra-role behaviour. In this respect, individuals' contributions at the workplace are beyond their defined responsibilities which are not directly or explicitly appreciated by the formal reward system of the organizational. A different breed of researchers, like Graham, suggests that organizational citizenship behaviour needs to be considered separate from performance. In this way, the problem to distinguish role and extra-role performances is resolved. In this view, organizational citizenship behaviour should be regarded as a global concept that includes all positive behaviours of individuals in the organization (Castro et *al., 2004*). Nevertheless there is not a consensus yet over the measurement of organizational citizenship behaviour as these behaviours are not directed necessarily by the supervisors.

Citizenship behaviours in organization: Graham believes that citizenship behaviour is represented in organizational obedience, organizational loyalty and organizational participation:

**Organizational obedience:** This term characterizes behaviours that their acceptability and need are recognized in a rational structure of order and regulations. Organizational obedience includes measures such as respecting organizational regulations, full performance of task and performance of tasks in line with organizational resources.

**Organizational loyalty:** Loyalty to an organization is different from loyalty to the self or others or different parts of the organization; it means the extent to which employees can sacrifice for the interests and support of their organization.

**Organizational participation**: This concept realizes through the active participation of employees in different affairs of the organization such as attending the meetings, sharing their ideas with others and awareness of current affairs of the organization.

Components of organizational citizenship behaviour: Organ provides the most established classification of components of organizational citizenship behaviour as follows:

• Altruism

• Conscientiousness

• Sportsmanship

• Civic virtue

• Courtesy

Civic virtue, conscientiousness and altruism are regarded as active and positive contributing factors. Civic virtue is a behaviour that reflects attention to participation in the social life of the organization. Conscientiousness is a behaviour that is beyond the requirements determined by the organization for the workplace. Altruism means helping others in relation to their own responsibilities (Castro et al., 2004).

Sportsmanship and considerateness mean avoiding any harm to the organization. Sportsmanship is the tendency to be patient against inevitable disturbances and workplace grievances without expressing any complaint. Considerateness means thinking about how one’s actions may affect others (Markoczy and Xin, 2004).

**2.1.3 The Concept of Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct with various conceptualizations. Allen and Meyer (1990) identified three components of organizational commitment namely, affective, continuance and normative commitment, which were found to be correlated but distinct (Meyer et al. 2002).

Affective commitment describes the extent to which an employee wants to be a part of an organization, and reflects the strength of the employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Allen and Meyer 1990).

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). 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.

**2.1.4 Organizational Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

In the literature, there are many studies which focus on the relationship between the perception of organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. These studies suggest that employees will show extra-role behaviour if they believe that actions and practices in the organization are honest and fair.

A study was conducted by Moorman (1991) in two management firms of America exploring the linkages between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. The results of the study indicated that procedural justice and interactional justice (two dimensions of organizational justice) were related to citizenship behaviour, while distributive justice (third dimension of organizational justice) had no such relationship. Tansky (1993), though, in her study found no effect of organizational fairness on citizenship behaviour of employees. Niehoff and Moorman (1993) reviewed the research work on organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour and concluded that the “employee perceptions of both distributive and procedural justice influenced OCB. [That is] If employees perceive that outcomes of their evaluations to be fair or perceive the process by which outcome allocation decisions are made to be fair, they will likely to reciprocate by performing behaviours to benefit their organization that go beyond the in-role performance of their job” (p. 533). In the same vein, Organ and Moorman (1993) noted that there is sufficient evidence regarding the significant role of justice in guaranteeing OCB. However, Schappe (1998) found no evidence of any relationship between procedural justice and citizenship behaviour. In another important study, Williams, Pitre, and Zuinubia (2000) found that the employees’ positive state of mind had positive relationship with performing organizational citizenship behaviour. They clarified that mere justice perception means positive state of mind. On the whole they confirmed the positive relationship between the perceptions of organizational justice and OCB. (Ince & Gul, 2011) also emphasized that employees’ positive perceptions of justice is the key factor that stimulates citizenship behaviour in organization. A meta-analysis by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, and Ng (2001), covering 183 studies on organizational justice, found that organizational justice is related to organizational citizenship behaviour alongside several other outcomes. Ishak and Alam (2009) conducted a study in a banking organization of Malaysia and concluded that “interactional justice contributed to the performance of altruism and consideration dimensions of OCB”. The other two types of organizational justice i.e. procedural justice and distributive justice had no effect on employees’ organizational citizenship behaviour. Elanain (2010) found low OCB as a result of negative perceptions regarding justice. Ahmad (2010) conducted a study on “Direct and interactive effects of organizational justice and perceptions of politics on personal and organizational outcomes” in Pakistan. The research had a sample of 608 employees of national and multinational banks. The study “highlighted the distinctive role of interactional justice in a collectivist culture to predict organizational commitment, job performance, OCB and turnover intention” (p. 108). Rangriz (2012) conducted a study on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour with a sample of 186 experts of Ministry of Economic Affairs and Finances in Iran. The results of the study indicated positive relationship of organizational justice with citizenship behaviour. Batool (2013) conducted a study in Pakistan's banking sector and found that organizational justice had “no considerable positive effect in the direction towards OCB of a banker” (p. 653). In a study conducted in a Social Security Organization (Tehran, Iran), Gharagheieh and Shokri (2014) also confirmed the positive significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviour. In the context of educational organizations, a study conducted in Malaysia found that fairness positively affected teachers’ organizational citizenship behaviour (Ahmad, 2006). In another study conducted among teachers of Iranian schools Heidari, Rajaeepoor, Davoodi, and Bozorgzadeh (2012) found significant relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviour. Iranzadeh and Chakherlouy (2011) found positive relationship between citizenship behaviour and organizational justice among the employees of Mohaghegh Ardebili University, Iran. The sample of the study consisted of 190 bureau employees and the members of different faculties. Tatlah, Saeed, and Iqbal (2011) conducted a study using a sample of 300 teachers and heads of 60 secondary schools in Punjab (Pakistan). The study revealed that two dimensions of OCB i.e. altruism and generalized compliance were significantly correlated with procedural and interactional justice. Iqbal, Aziz, and Tasawar (2012) explored the effect of justice on OCB at the University of the Punjab with a sample of 200 teachers. It was found that the procedural justice was the strongest predictor of OCB, while distributive justice had somewhat weak influence on OCB. In the public bank employee’s context, Farahbod, Azadehdel, Rezaei-Disgah, and Nezhadi-Jirdehi (2012) confirmed the effect of organizational justice on organizational citizenship behaviour. In another study in Pakistan, Danish et al. (2014) investigated the role of justice on teacher’s extra-role performance [OCB] in public-private sector universities of Pakistan. The sample was one hundred and fifty faculty members. They found that justice is significantly and positively related with the extra-role behaviour [OCB].

**2.2 Theoretical Review**

A theory has an important role to play in the acquisition of knowledge. It provides a better insight into the developmental process of an individual and constitute a wide range of philosophies about human nature. Similarly, various researchers have undertaken many practical studies relating to stress control methods resulting in the establishment of various models or theories of stress and justice. And some of these theories include;

**2.2.1 James-Lange: Theory of Emotion**

In 1884 and 1885, theorists William James and Carl Lange might have separately proposed their respective theories on the correlation of stress and emotion, but they had a unified idea on this relationship, emotions do not immediately succeed the perception of the stressor or the stressful event rather, they become present after the body’s response to stress. For instance, when you see a growling dog, your heart starts to race, your breath begins to go faster, then your eyes become wide open.

Also when a employees finds himself in an unsuitable working environment that is not favourable to him or her probably as a result of the arrangement of the office furniture or colour of the painted wall or arrangement of office equipments he tends to be stressed while working in such an office and this could be noticed by abnormal sweating while in a fully air conditioned office or some sort of body irritation (itching). Also when working in an environment that is not socially habitable for the banker, he or she is uncomfortable while working in such an office and this is evidenced by observed body irritation similar to reaction to environmental conditions. When a banker funds himself working in an office or environment that is not suitable or promote his psychological wellbeing, it could be noticed through some bodily changes such as migraine headaches, high body temperatures and others. According to James and Lange, the feeling of fear or any other emotion only begins after you experience these bodily changes. This means that the emotional behaviour is not possible to occur unless it is connected to one’s brain.

**2.2.2 Cannon-Bard: The Emergency Theory**

This theory is quite the opposite of what James and Lange proposed. According to the theorist Walter Cannon, emotion in response to stress can actually occur even when the bodily changes are not present. Cannon said that the visceral or internal psychological response of one’s body is more slowly recognized by the brain as compared with its function to release emotional response. He attempted to prove his theory by means of creating the so-called “decorticated cats” where in the neural connections of the body are separated from the cortex in the brain of the cats. When faced with a stressful response, the decorticated cats showed emotional behaviour which meant feelings of aggression and rage. This emotion was then manifested by bodily changes such as baring of teeth, growling and erect hair. To further enhance Cannon’s theory, theorist Philip Bard expanded the ideas of Cannon by arguing that a lower brain stem structure called the thalamus is important in the production of emotional responses. According to Bard, the emotional response releases first ad then sent as signals by the thalamus to the brain cortex for the interpretation alongside with the sending of signals to the sympathetic nervous system to begin the physiological response to stress. Therefore if a banker is faced with stress in the office or work environment due to environmental, social or psychological factors the noticeable evidences include body irritation, migraine headaches, high body temperatures and so many others. Therefore this theory argues that emotional responses to stress are not a product of the physiological response rather they occur simultaneously.

**2.2.3 The Schechter-Singer Theory**

Theorists Stanley Schechter and Jerome Singer argued that the appropriate identification of the emotion requires both cognitive activity and emotional arousal in order to experience and emotion. Attribution or the process where in the brain can identify the stress stimulus producing an emotion is also proposed. This when a banker is faced with work stress at the office probably as a result of environmental, social or psychological factors, the brain now tries to identify the source of the stress which could be environmental, social or psychological in natural. Therefore, the theory explains that we become aware of the reason behind the emotional responses and when the reason is not obvious, we start to look for environmental clues for the proper interpretation of the emotion to occur.

**2.3 Empirical Review**

This aspect seeks to inquire the opinion of different scholars in relation to organizational justice on citizenship behaviour of employees. Some of which include;

Najafi et al. (2011) conducted a study to determine the causal relations between organizational justice, psychological empowerment, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and OCB, by investigating the mediating role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. A sample of 280 educational experts from universities participated in the study. Questionnaires were administered to assess the five variables. The study produced a number of findings: Organizational justice directly influences job satisfaction and psychological empowerment and turnover intentions. Also psychological empowerment directly and positively influences job satisfaction and psychological empowerment. Job satisfaction positively influences organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour.

Organizational commitment directly influences organizational citizenship behaviour. Also organizational justice and psychological empowerment positively and indirectly influences organizational citizenship behaviour. The researchers concluded that if there is organizational justice and psychological empowerment within an organization, employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment will increase and these will in turn improve organizational citizenship behaviour.

The work done by Aydin and Ceylan (2009) who conducted a study on the role of organizational justices on citizenship behaviour. The study employed the use of correlation analysis and regression analysis to analyse the data. The study revealed that organizational justices has significant relationship with the cultural dimensions; involvement, collaboration, transmission of information, learning, care about clients, strategic direction, reward and incentive system, system of control, communication, coordination and integration.

Yilmaz and Ergun (2008) examined the effects of the four major organizational justice traits, involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission, on measures of firm effectiveness, using the survey method data was collected from manufacturing firms in Turkey. The data were analysed using the multiple regression analysis. The result indicated that the mission trait is the most prominent of the four traits in terms of fostering overall firm performance, sales growth, market share growth, and ROA. In addition, a firm’s ability to develop successful new products is influenced primarily by the adaptability and consistency traits. Employee satisfaction is determined for the most part by the involvement trait. Finally, while imbalanced combinations of certain pairs of cultural traits exert the expected negative effects on performance indicators, others seem to have positive effects.

Ehtesham, Muhammad and Muhammad (2011) conducted a study on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviour in Pakistan. The study adopted the exploratory research approach to explore the impact. Primary data was collected through questionnaires from 140 employees at the COMSATS Institute of Information Technology. The sample consists of both male and female faculty members. The regression and correlation statistical analysis were used. The results from the statistical analysis show that, involvement is highly correlated with consistency and adaptability. Similarly, the other dimensions of organizational culture have a positive significant relationship with the performance management practices.

Chiaburu & Lim (2008) conducted a study to find out the antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour as Manager Trustworthiness or Interactional Justice. 120 supervisor dyads were asked to participate and were administered questionnaires for manager trustworthiness and interactional justice. The results indicated that both factors influenced OCB and also, found that manager trustworthiness can act like a substitute by lending support for the importance of trustworthiness over and above interactional justice.

Blakely, Moorman & Andrews (2005), did a study on equity sensitivity as an explanation of individual differences in Organizational Citizenship Behaviours in response to the perceptions of organizational justice. Questionnaires were given to 150 MBA students for the three variables- equity sensitivity, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Organizational justice. Results indicated that as the positive perceptions of justice increase so does the level of OCB. It suggests that a fair working environment promotes the performance of OCB’s. The study also found that contrary to their expectations sensitivity did not vary OCB’s according to justice perceptions.

Fields, Pang and Chiu, (2000) studied the extent to which distributive and procedural justices predicted work outcomes like intention to stay, job satisfaction and evaluation of supervisors. The major focus of the study was to find out if cultural differences play any role in work outcomes being different. The researchers had conducted this study on the notion that no study had been conducted in Hong Kong, which examined the differences in justice levels and resulting organizational outcomes unlike in the United States. 783 workers were given questionnaires to measure the two kinds of justice, satisfaction, and turnover intent. The results indicated both kinds of justice influenced work outcomes like Job Satisfaction, Intention to stay in Hong Kong. It was also found that perceptions of justice did not affect evaluations of supervisors. It was also seen that justice perceptions differ between the two nations and this could be due to cultural factors such as power distance, individualism- collectivism.

Aryee , Budhwar and Chen (2002) did a study on an Indian public sector organization to test a social exchange model of work attitudes and behaviour. The researchers hypothesized that the three dimensions of justice were also related to the trust employees put in their supervisor and this would influence work attitudes like turnover intentions, organizational citizenship behaviour, organizational commitment, task performance and job satisfaction of employees. The sample constituted of 179 supervisor- subordinate dyads that were given different questionnaires. The results indicated that distributive justice correlated to turnover intentions, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour. Procedural justice correlated to Job satisfaction, turnover intentions and organizational commitment, whereas Interactional justice correlated to all the dimensions. Trust in the organization was a mediating factor for organizational outcomes like satisfaction, commitment, turnover intent and trust in supervisor helped in increasing organizational citizenship behaviour and task performance.

A survey of the empirical works presented above shows differing opinions on organization justice and its effect on citizenship behaviour of organizations. It can also be observed from the review of empirical studies from Nigeria perspective that studies focusing on parastatals from the Nigeria context are relatively scanty. Besides, empirical evidence on the relationship between organization justice and citizenship behaviour available in the literature are mixed and inconclusive. While some studies documented positive association, others suggested a negative association between organization justice and citizenship behaviour; thus, making the present study imperative for Nigeria. It is against this background that this study examines the effect of organization justice on citizenship behaviour of Nigerian breweries to fill the existing gap in the local literature.

**CHAPTER THREE**

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This chapter consists of research design, setting, participants, sampling, procedure and method of data analysis.

**3.1 Research Design**

The researcher used the survey method to investigate the effect of organizational justice and citizenship behaviour among staffs of Nigerian breweries (Ama manufacturing plant). The survey method is usually a quantitative method that requires standardized information in order to define or describe variables or to study the relationship between variables. The choice of survey method is however for obvious advantages including its effectiveness and for generating quantitative data on peoples’ attitude, opinion and behaviour. Saunders et al (1997) also opined that survey design. “Allows the collection of a large amount of data from a sizable population in a largely economic way based most often on questionnaires, those data are standardized allowing easy comparism”. Primary data is collected or obtained from questionnaire as a research instrument and secondary data is obtained from books, articles, journals and official websites.

* 1. **Population of the Study**

Population is the total number of element in which the research interest lies (Vohra, 2008). The population of any study is the totality of units having certain defined characteristics in common and could be finite or infinite.

The population of this study is made up of 133 staffs, of Ama Breweries, Ama manufacturing plant in Enugu state. Therefore, the population comprises of inventory management department (53), finance department (30), marketing department (20) and customers care unit (30) who can give credible information as regards the area of organizational justice and citizenship behaviour.

**3.3 Sample and Sampling Procedures**

Agburu (2009) defines “Sample” as that part of the universe which is selected for the purpose of investigation”. Sample size refers to that portion of the population to be observed or studied. It has to do with the magnitude of such a proportion of the population selected for study. Sampling is the process of examining a limited number of cases from all the available cases in a population. Agburu (2009) avers that sampling techniques provide a many methods for researchers to choose from in order to reduce the amount of data that are needed to be collected.

Therefore, the entire population of 133 staff of Ama Breweries, Ama manufacturing plant in Enugu state representing 100% of the population were purposively selected to be the sample of the study. The choice of the entire population is used for the study because the population is handy, manageable and accessible to the researcher.

The researcher employed purposive in addition to stratified sampling techniques during the process of data collection from the study respondents. The study used stratified sampling technique taking into account the different categories of employees to be covered and the levels of responsibilities and then purposive sampling techniques to allow the researcher select a sample with experience and knowledge about the study variables and this method was used to select staff but non manager respondents and clients’ respondents from the study area until the desired sample size of 133 staff was attained.

**3.5 Validity of the Instrument**

In establishing the face and content validity of the instrument in this research, prepared questionnaire was presented to two experts from the department of business administration, Godfrey Okoye University. The drafted questionnaire was given to these experts who are requested to the following;

1. Edit the instrument by correcting or expunging ambiguous statements wrong spelling, difficult items requiring explanations and overlapping content.
2. Remove irrelevant questions so as to encourage quick response
3. Review the number of items by removing unnecessary repetitions
4. Add other items considered to be relevant to the study based on research question
5. Make unnecessary recommendations that would improve the validity of the instrument.

**3.6 Reliability of the Instrument**

Reliability refers to the extent to which data collection techniques and procedure for data analysis is able to yield consistent results over time. It also refers to the degree to which results remain stable overtime and similar within a given period (Udofia, 2011). Other aspect of reliability concerns the internal consistency among the questions which is established. Instrument is considered reliable when it consistently produces the same result when applied to the same sample many times.

Data from the questionnaire was collected and tested to determine the reliability of the instrument using the Cronbach Alpha Method provided by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0). Thus, a content validity index of at least 0.70 makes the instrument reasonably content valid (Udofia, 2011).

**3.7 Techniques of Data Analysis**

There are two ways of carrying out analysis of quantitative data. These are the use of descriptive statistics to summarise with the view to gaining better understanding of the data set, and the inferential statistics, which can enable the testing of hypotheses, were applied in this study (Hair, Page & Samuel, 2007).

With the aid of Eviews 8, the descriptive analyses (mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage) was performed on all categories of data to show their general trends. Also, inferential statistics (simple regression analysis) was used to test the research hypotheses raised in the study.

The multiple regression analysis was used to establish the extent to which the independent variables (organizational justice) predicted the dependent variables (citizenship behaviour). The formulated hypotheses was tested using p-value statistics. The p-value was used because it is deemed appropriate since the sample size is greater than 30. A sig-value less than α=0.05 indicates that there is enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis, and thereby accept the alternative hypothesis. If sig>0.05, then we do not have adequate statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis or accept the alternative hypothesis.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

**4.0 Introduction**

This chapter contains the presentation, analysis, and discussion of results in line with the study objectives. The chapter presents; the descriptive statistics and the inferential statistics for the variables under study. Statistical tools such as tables showing frequencies, percentages and mean were used to summaries findings from the survey.

**4.1 Data Presentation**

The responses generated from the questionnaire distributed among sampled respondents on a five-point Likert scale are presented below. It is worth knowing that only 88 copies of the total number of the questionnaires were successfully filled and returned. The sub section below analyse the data generated from the responses from the questionnaires collected.

**4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

**Table 1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response** | | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| **Gende**r | Male  Female  **Total** | 50  38  **88** | 57  43  **100** |
| **Age** | 21-30 years  31-40 years  41-50 years  50 above  **Total** | 30  35  17  6  **88** | 34  40  19  **7**  **100** |
| **Level of Education** | OND/NCE  B.Sc/BA/HND  Post Graduate  **Total** | 26  43  18  **88** | 30  49  21  **100** |
| **Monthly Income** | Below 50,000  50,000 -150,000  150,001-500,000  500,001 – 1million  1 million above  **Total** | 15  43  17  11  3  **88** | 17  49  19  12  3  **100** |

***Sources: Field Survey, 2017***

Table 1 presents the demographic information of the respondents. The table shows the gender characteristics of the respondents. It shows that male respondents were the majority constituting 50 (57%) in the sample as compared to their female counterparts who were 38 (43%) of the entire sample. This shows that the views of the respondents were from both genders.

Table 1 also depicts the age of the respondents. The table revealed that 30 (34%) of the respondents falls within the age bracket of 21-30 years, 35(40%) respondents' age are between 31-40 years, while 17(19%) and 6(7%) respondents fall between the age of 41-50 years and 50 above years respectively.

Table 1 also depicts the level of education of the respondents. The table shows that 26(30%) of the respondents were holders of OND/NCE, while 43(49%) and 18 (21%) were holders of B.Sc/B.A/HND respectively. This shows that majority of the respondents were graduates and are educated to address the problem under investigation.

Table further depicts the monthly income of the respondents. The table shows that majority of the respondents, 43 (49%) earns between 50,000 – 150,000, while 17 (19%) and 15 (17%) of the respondents earns below 50,000 and 150,000 – 500,000 respectively. Furthermore 11(12%) and 3(3%) earns between 500,000 – 1million and above 1million respectively.

**4.1.2: Descriptive Statistics to examine the effect of distributive justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.**

**Table 2**

| **Description of Item** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** | **Total** | **Mean** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Each employee gets equal rights to all the benefits allocated to staffs | 34   |  | | --- | | (38.64%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 27   |  | | --- | | (30.68%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 5   |  | | --- | | (5.68%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 12   |  | | --- | | (13.64%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 10   |  | | --- | | (11.36%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 88  (100%) | 4.02 |
| 1. Regardless of employees commitment, all staff should get an equal share of reward or cost | 13  (14.77%) | 38  (43.18%) | 2  (2.27%) | 17  (19.32%) | 18  (20.45%) | 88  (100%) | 3.55 |
| 1. All employees should be committed to the organization regardless of their level or position | 30  (34.09%) | 35  (39.77%) | 3  (3.41%) | 12  (13.64%) | 8  (9.09%) | 88  (100%) | 4.02 |
| 1. the needs of all employees should be provided for without bias or favour | 25  (28.41%) | 40  (45.45%) | 4  (4.55%) | 12  (13.64%) | 7  (7.95%) | 88  (100%) | 3.99 |
| 1. Organizational resources should be shared responsibly among members | 45  (51.14%) | 14  (15.91%) | 1  (1.14%) | 19  (21.59%) | 9  (10.23%) | 88  (100%) | 4.09 |
| Overall Mean | 3.93 |  |  | | | | |
| Cronbach Alpha (α) | 0.98 |  | | | | |
| Valid N (listwise) | 88 | | | | | | |

***Source: Computation of Field data, 2017***

***Decision rule:***

***If mean <3.0 the respondents Disagree***

***If 3.0≤mean<3.5 the respondents are Undecided***

***If mean ≥3.5 the respondents Agree***

Table 2 shows the responses to the Likert-scale question and the sample mean (x). For the question on whether Each employee gets equal rights to all the benefits allocated to staffs, the responses show that 34 (38.64%) of the respondents strongly agree that Each employee gets equal rights to all the benefits allocated to staffs, 27 (30.68%) agreed, 5 (5.68%) were undecided, while 12 (13.64%) and 10 (11.36%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Each employee gets equal rights to all the benefits allocated to staffs. The associated sample mean of the responses is 4.02. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that, each employee gets equal rights to all the benefits allocated to staffs; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether Regardless of employees commitment, all staff should get an equal share of reward or cost, the responses show that 13 (14.77%) of the respondents strongly agree that Regardless of employees commitment, all staff should get an equal share of reward or cost, 38 (43.18%) agreed, 2 (2.27%) were undecided, while 17 (19.32%) and 18 (20.45%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Regardless of employees commitment, all staff should get an equal share of reward or cost. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.55. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that Regardless of employee’s commitment, all staff should get an equal share of reward or cost; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether All employees should be committed to the organization regardless of their level or position, the responses show that 30 (34.09%) of the respondents strongly agree that All employees should be committed to the organization regardless of their level or position, 35 (39.77%) agreed, 3 (3.41%) were undecided, while 12 (13.64%) and 8 (9.09%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that All employees should be committed to the organization regardless of their level or position. The associated sample mean of the responses is 4.02. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that all employees should be committed to the organization regardless of their level or position; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether the needs of all employees should be provided for without bias or favour, the responses show that 25 (28.41%) of the respondents strongly agree that the needs of all employees should be provided for without bias or favour, 40 (45.45%) agreed, 4 (4.55%) were undecided while 12 (13.64%) and 7 (7.95%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that the needs of all employees should be provided for without bias or favour. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.99. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that the needs of all employees should be provided for without bias or favour; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether Organizational resources should be shared responsibly among members, the responses show that 45 (51.14%) of the respondents strongly agree that Organizational resources should be shared responsibly among members, 14 (15.91%) agreed, 1 (1.14%) were undecided, while 19 (21.59%) and 9 (10.23%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Organizational resources should be shared responsibly among members. The associated sample mean of the responses is 4.09. This shows that Organizational resources should be shared responsibly among members; hence the mean is *≥* 3.5.

On the average, the respondents agreed that distributive justice has significant influence on employee commitment; hence, the overall mean (3.93) is *≥* 3.5.

**4.1.3: Descriptive Statistics to determine the effect of procedural justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.**

**Table 3**

| **Description of Item** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** | **Total** | **Mean** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. All disputes in the organization should be handled with all fairness | 45   |  | | --- | | (51.14%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 14   |  | | --- | | (15.91%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 4   |  | | --- | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 1.14% | | 7   |  | | --- | | (7.95%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 18   |  | | --- | | (20.45%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 88  (100%) | 4.02 |
| 1. Resources allocation should be done with due process. | 4  (4.55%) | 49  (55.68%) | 1  (1.14%) | 20  (22.73%) | 14  (15.91%) | 88  (100%) | 3.50 |
| 1. Unresolved disputes are handled with transparency. | 29  (32.95%) | 35  (39.77%) | 2  (2.27%) | 12  (13.64%) | 10  (11.36%) | 88  (100%) | 3.97 |
| 1. Poor Grievance handling increases employees lack of efficiency and commitment | 19  (21.59%) | 34  (38.64%) | 4  (4.55%) | 18  (20.45%) | 13  (14.77%) | 88  (100%) | 3.72 |
| 1. Attitude & Behaviour of Supervisor to lower staff encourages employees commitment | 12  (13.64%) | 43  (48.86%) | 1  (4.55%) | 23  (26.14%) | 9  (10.23%) | 88  (100%) | 3.67 |
| Overall Mean | 3.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cronbach Alpha (α) | 0.97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid N (listwise) | 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Computation of Field Data, 2017***

***Decision rule:***

***If mean <3.0 the respondents Disagree***

***If 3.0≤mean<3.5 the respondents are Undecided***

***If mean ≥3.5 the respondents Agree***

Table 5 shows the responses to the Likert-scale question and the sample mean (x). For the question on whether All disputes in the organization should be handled with all fairness, the responses show that 45 (51.14%) of the respondents strongly agree that All disputes in the organization should be handled with all fairness, 14 (15.91%) agreed, 4 (1.14%) were undecided, while 7 (7.95%) and 18 (20.45%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that All disputes in the organization should be handled with all fairness. The associated sample mean of the responses is 4.02. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that all disputes in the organization should be handled with all fairness; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether Resources allocation should be done with due process, the responses show that 4 (4.55%) of the respondents strongly agree that Resources allocation should be done with due process, 49 (55.68%) agreed, 1 (1.14%) were undecided, while 20 (22.73%) and 14 (15.91%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Resources allocation should be done with due process. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.50. This shows that Resources allocation should be done with due process; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether Unresolved disputes are handled with transparency, the responses show that 29 (32.95%) of the respondents strongly agree that Unresolved disputes are handled with transparency, 35 (39.77%) agreed, 2 (2.27%) were undecided, while 12 (13.64%) and 10 (11.36%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Unresolved disputes are handled with transparency. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.97. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that Unresolved disputes are handled with transparency; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether Poor Grievance handling increases employees lack of efficiency and commitment, the responses show that 19 (21.59%) of the respondents strongly agree that Poor Grievance handling increases employees lack of efficiency and commitment, 34 (38.64%) agreed, 4 (4.55%) were undecided, while 18 (20.45%) and 13 (14.77%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Poor Grievance handling increases employees lack of efficiency and commitment. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.72. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that Poor Grievance handling increases employees lack of efficiency and commitment; hence the mean is ≥3.5.

Furthermore, for the question on whether Attitude & Behaviour of Supervisor to lower staff encourages employees commitment, the responses show that 12 (13.64%) of the respondents strongly agree that Attitude & Behaviour of Supervisor to lower staff encourages employees commitment, 43 (48.86%) agreed, 1 (4.55%) were undecided, while 23 (26.14%) and 9 (10.23%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Attitude & Behaviour of Supervisor to lower staff encourages employees commitment. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.67. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that Attitude & Behaviour of Supervisor to lower staff encourages employee’s commitment; hence the mean is ≥3.5.

On the average, the respondents agreed that procedure justice has significant effect on employee commitment in Nigeria breweries; hence, the overall mean (3.78) is *≥* 3.5.

**4.1.4: Descriptive Statistics to ascertain the effect of interactional justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries**

**Table 4**

| **Description of Item** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** | **Total** | **Mean** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Improved working conditions of staff contribute to the performance of employees | 30   |  | | --- | | (34.09%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 24   |  | | --- | | (27.27%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 4   |  | | --- | | (4.55%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 12   |  | | --- | | (13.64%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 18   |  | | --- | | (20.45%) | |  | |  | |  | |  | | 88  (100%) | 3.80 |
| 1. Adequate compensation of staff improves the quality of products and services thereby increasing employees commitment | 27  (30.68%) | 32  (36.36%) | 1  (1.14%) | 14  (15.91%) | 14  (15.91%) | 88  (100%) | 3.83 |
| 1. The level of appreciation is justified, based on employee’s performance | 29  (32.95%) | 35  (39.77%) | 2  (2.27%) | 12  (13.64%) | 10  (11.36%) | 88  (100%) | 3.97 |
| 1. The method of appraisal is appropriate for the work completed | 24  (27.27%) | 28  (31.82%) | 12  (13.64%) | 10  (11.36%) | 14  (15.91%) | 88  (100%) | 3.84 |
| Overall Mean | 3.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cronbach Alpha (α) | 0.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Valid N (listwise) | 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

***Source: Computation of Field data, 2017***

***Decision rule:***

***If mean <3.0 the respondents Disagree***

***If 3.0≤mean<3.5 the respondents are Undecided***

***If mean ≥3.5 the respondents Agree***

Table 4 shows the responses to the Likert-scale question and the sample mean (x). For the question on whether Improved working conditions of staff contribute to the performance of employees, 24 (27.27%) agreed, 4 (4.55%) were undecided, while 12 (13.64%) and 18 (20.45%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Improved working conditions of staff contribute to the performance of employees. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.80. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that improved working conditions of staff contribute to the performance of employees; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether Adequate compensation of staff improves the quality of products and services thereby increasing employees commitment, the responses show that 27 (30.68%) of the respondents strongly agree that Adequate compensation of staff improves the quality of products and services thereby increasing employees commitment, 32 (36.36%) agreed, 1 (1.14%) were undecided, while 14 (15.91%) and 14 (15.91%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that Adequate compensation of staff improves the quality of products and services thereby increasing employees commitment. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.83. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that Adequate compensation of staff improves the quality of products and services thereby increasing employees commitment; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether the level of appreciation is justified, based on employee’s performance, the responses show that 29 (32.95%) of the respondents strongly agree that the level of appreciation is justified, based on employee’s performance, 35 (39.77%) agreed, 2 (2.27%) were undecided, while 12 (13.64%) and 10 (11.36%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that the level of appreciation is justified, based on employee’s performance. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.97. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that the level of appreciation is justified, based on employee’s performance; hence the mean is ≥ 3.5.

For the question on whether the method of appraisal is appropriate for the work completed, the responses show that 70 (23.33%) of the respondents strongly agree that the method of appraisal is appropriate for the work completed, 92 (30.67%) agreed, 18 (6.00%) were undecided while 5 (16.67%) and 70 (23.33%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that the method of appraisal is appropriate for the work completed. The associated sample mean of the responses is 3.60. This shows that most of the respondents agreed that the method of appraisal is appropriate for the work completed; hence the mean is *≥* 3.5.

On the average, the respondents agreed that interactional justice has significant effect on employee’s commitment in Nigeria breweries; the overall mean (3.83) is *≥* 3.5.

**Regression Analysis for all Estimated Models**

Regression analysis was carried out for each model so as to truly show how organizational justice affects citizenship behaviour.

The generated data was analyzed using the three models which adopts ordinary least square method in estimating the parameter of the model and is expressed in econometric form below:

**Model 1 (distributive justice** **Model)**

EC = β0 + β1 DJ + e............................................................(i)

**Model 2 (procedural justice** **Model)**

EC = β0 + β1 PJ + e............................................................(ii)

**Model 3 (interactional justice** **Model)**

EC = β0 + β1 IJ + e............................................................(iii)

where:

EC = Employees Commitment

DJ = Distributive Justice

PJ = Procedural Justice

IJ = Interactional Justice

e = error term

*β*0-*β1* = coefficient of independent variables

**4.1.5: Data Analysis of Regression Model 1 (Distributive justice Model)**

**Simple Regression Analysis**

**Table 5**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | -0.287605 | 0.469128 | -0.613062 | 0.5415 |
| QS | 1.125574 | 0.126358 | 8.907818 | 0.0000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.879889 | Mean dependent var | | 3.818182 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.873841 | S.D. dependent var | | 1.130003 |
| S.E. of regression | 0.819668 | Akaike info criterion | | 2.462631 |
| Sum squared resid | 57.77964 | Schwarz criterion | | 2.518934 |
| Log likelihood | -106.3558 | Hannan-Quinn criter. | | 2.485314 |
| F-statistic | 79.34922 | Durbin-Watson stat | | 2.264499 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

***Source: EViews 7 Output***

Table 6 above presents the regression result of the model. The result shows that the model is fit for estimation and the explanatory variable are properly selected, combined, and used. This can be confirmed by the value of F-statistics of 79.35 (p=0.00) is significant at 1% level of significance. This implies that the explanatory variable included in the model of the study is sufficient to explain the relationship between distributive justice and Employees Commitment.

R Square, the coefficient of determination, is the squared value of the multiple correlation coefficients. The coefficient of multiple determinations R2 measures the percentage of the total change in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent or explanatory variable. The result indicates a R2 of 87.99%, showing that 87.99% of the variations in employee commitment is explained by the influence of distributive justice in the model. While the remaining 12.01% (i.e. 100-87.99) of the variation could be explained by other variables not considered in this model.

The adjusted R-square compensates for the model complexity to provide a more fair comparison of model performance. The result is supported by the value of the adjusted R2 which is to the tune of 87.38% showing that if the entire population was used, the result will deviate by 61% (i.e 87.99-87.38).

The result of Durbin Watson test shows 2.2645, therefore, it is accepted that there is no auto-correlation or there exist negative correlation among the successive values of the variables in the model. Since, the Durbin Watson value is close to 2, the model is good. Therefore, there is no evidence of serial correlation in the model.

The regression constant is -28.8%, giving a predictive value of the dependent variable when all other variable are zero. The regression result revealed that distributive justice has significant impact on employee commitment in Nigeria breweries. This implies that a 1% increase in stress levels will decrease distributive justice by 112.6%.

**4.1.6 Data Analysis of Regression Model 2 (Procedural Justice Model)**

**Simple Regression Analysis**

**Table 6**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | -0.325142 | 0.458122 | -0.709728 | 0.4798 |
| EEFT | 1.170132 | 0.123393 | 9.482944 | 0.0000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.911159 | Mean dependent var | | 3.943182 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.905475 | S.D. dependent var | | 1.138238 |
| S.E. of regression | 0.800437 | Akaike info criterion | | 2.415148 |
| Sum squared resid | 55.10019 | Schwarz criterion | | 2.471451 |
| Log likelihood | -104.2665 | Hannan-Quinn criter. | | 2.437831 |
| F-statistic | 89.92622 | Durbin-Watson stat | | 2.321930 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

***Source: EViews 7 Output***

Table 7 above presents the regression result of the model. The result shows that the model is fit for estimation and the explanatory variable are properly selected, combined, and used. This can be confirmed by the value of F-statistics of 89.92 (p=0.000) is significant at 1% level of significance. This implies that the explanatory variable included in the model of the study is sufficient to explain the relationship between procedural justice and on employee commitment.

R Square, the coefficient of determination, is the squared value of the multiple correlation coefficients. The coefficient of multiple determinations R2 measures the percentage of the total change in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent or explanatory variable. The result indicates a R2 of 91.12%, showing that 91.12% of the variations in on employee commitment is explained by the influence of procedural justice in the model. While the remaining 8.88% (i.e. 100-91.12) of the variation could be explained by other variables not considered in this model.

The adjusted R-square compensates for the model complexity to provide a more fair comparison of model performance. The result is supported by the value of the adjusted R2 which is to the tune of 90.55% showing that if the entire population was used, the result will deviate by 57% (i.e 91.12-90.55).

The result of Durbin Watson test shows 2.3212, therefore, it is accepted that there is no auto-correlation or there exist negative correlation among the successive values of the variables in the model. Since, the Durbin Watson value is close to 2, the model is good. Therefore, there is no evidence of serial correlation in the model.

The regression constant is -32.51%, giving a predictive value of the dependent variable when all other variable are zero. The regression result revealed that procedural justice has a significant impact on employee commitment. This implies that a 1% increase in procedural justice will increase employee commitment by 117.01%.

**4.1.7: Data Analysis of Regression Model 3 (Interactional Justice Model)**

**Simple Regression Analysis**

**Table 7**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| C | -0.269241 | 0.510350 | -0.527562 | 0.5992 |
| EEFC | 1.089387 | 0.137461 | 7.925075 | 0.0000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.822069 | Mean dependent var | | 3.704545 |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.815349 | S.D. dependent var | | 1.166181 |
| S.E. of regression | 0.891691 | Akaike info criterion | | 2.631071 |
| Sum squared resid | 68.37969 | Schwarz criterion | | 2.687374 |
| Log likelihood | -113.7671 | Hannan-Quinn criter. | | 2.653754 |
| F-statistic | 62.80681 | Durbin-Watson stat | | 2.254074 |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000000 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

***Source: EViews 7 Output***

Table 8 above presents the regression result of the model. The result shows that the model is fit for estimation and the explanatory variable are properly selected, combined, and used. This can be confirmed by the value of F-statistics of 62.81 (p=0.000) is significant at 1% level of significance. This implies that the explanatory variable included in the model of the study is sufficient to explain the relationship between interactional justice and employee commitment.

R Square, the coefficient of determination, is the squared value of the multiple correlation coefficients. The coefficient of multiple determinations R2 measures the percentage of the total change in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent or explanatory variable. The result indicates a R2 of 82.21%, showing that 82.21% of the variations in employee commitment is explained by the influence of interactional justice in the model. While the remaining 17.79% (i.e. 100-82.21) of the variation could be explained by other variables not considered in this model.

The adjusted R-square compensates for the model complexity to provide a more fair comparison of model performance. The result is supported by the value of the adjusted R2 which is to the tune of 81.53% showing that if the entire population was used, the result will deviate by 68% (i.e 82.21-81.53).

The result of Durbin Watson test shows 2.2541, therefore, it is accepted that there is no auto-correlation or there exist negative correlation among the successive values of the variables in the model. Since, the Durbin Watson value is close to 2, the model is good. Therefore, there is no evidence of serial correlation in the model.

The regression constant is -26.92%, giving a predictive value of the dependent variable when the explanatory variable is zero. The regression result revealed that interactional justice has significant impact on employee commitment. This implies that a 1% increase in interactional justice will increase employee commitment by 108.9%.

**4.2.1 Test of Hypothesis One**

**H01:** There is no significant relationship between distributive justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries**.**

**Decision Rule 1:** To test this hypothesis, table 5 was used. The strength of the relationship between distributive justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries is measured by the calculated p-value = 0.00 and a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (0.00<*p-value*<0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, we conclude that distributive justice has significant impact on employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.

**4.2.2 Test of Hypothesis Two**

There is no significant relationship between procedural justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries

**Decision Rule 2:** To test this hypothesis, table 7 was used. The strength of the relationship between Interactional Justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries is measured by the calculated p-value = 0.00 and a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (0.00<*p-value*<0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, we conclude that procedural justice has significant impact on employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.

**4.2.3 Test of Hypothesis Three**

There is no significant relationship between interactional justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.

**Decision Rule 3:** To test this hypothesis, table 6 was used. The strength of the relationship between Procedural Justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries is measured by the calculated p-value = 0.00 and a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (0.00<*p-value*<0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, we conclude that there is significant effect of interactional justice on employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.

**4.4 Discussion of Findings**

From the result of the data analysis, the following findings have been deduced;

The study revealed that there is significant relationship between distributive justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries. The findings is in consonant with the findings of Ekienabor (2016), Awadh, Gichinga, & Ahmed (2015) and Nyangahu & Bula (2015) whose results indicated that there is an impact of job stress on the employees service delivery. productivity of employees. They indicated that When higher level of stress exist with no managerial concern for solution consequently lowering the employee performance; staking organizational reputation and loss of skilled employees, these situations call for immediate concern from organization management for employing effective stress management practices to increase employee satisfaction and overall employee performance.

The study revealed that there is significant relationship between procedural justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries. The finding is in consistent with the work of Alam, Gouhar and Shafiq (2015) and Ekundayo, (2014) whose result revealed that employees in the banking sector in Pakistan are confronting with heavy work load, conflict at work and physical work environment. This is an alarming situation of job stress for the employees of banking sector in Pakistan and motivation can be utilized in order to reduce the stress and improve employee's efficiency.

The study also revealed that there is significant relationship between interactional justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries. The finding is in consonant with the study of Ekienabor (2016), Ali, Raheem, Nawaz, and Imamuddin (2014), Ashfaq and Muhammad (2013), Dar, Akmal, Naseem and Khan (2011), and Badar & Kashif (2011), that organizational climate and its components significantly predict job stress among public administration employees. The results highlight that employee age acts as the most powerful predictor of job stress. The analysis of the perceived work stress suggests that recognition is a significant suppressor of job stress among public administration employees, followed by opportunities for professional advancement and work itself. The significance of this research lies in its contribution to the knowledge and understanding of determinants that could improve employees’ effectiveness among public administrators in developing economies.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**5.0 Introduction**

The aim of this chapter is to summarize the main findings of the study, discuss some of the possible recommendation and identify areas for further research. The chapter is structured into summary of the study, conclusion of the study, recommendations of the study and suggestions for further research.

**5.1 Summary of Findings**

The study empirically investigated the effect of organizational justice on citizenship behaviour in Nigerian breweries. The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To examine the effect of distributive justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.
2. To determine the effect of procedural justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.
3. To ascertain the effect of interactional justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries.

Consequently, three research questions were drawn and tested to provide answers to our study. To carry out the research work effectively, the survey research design was used for the study. The population of the study consists of administrative staffs of Nigeria breweries. The study however sampled only 133 Staffs of Nigeria breweries. The analysis techniques used to analyze the data derived from the five point Likert scale questionnaires administered was descriptive statistics and regression analysis.

The study arrived at the following findings;

1. There is significant relationship between distributive justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.
2. There is significant relationship between procedural justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.
3. There is significant relationship between interactional justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries.

**5.2 Conclusion**

This can be concluded that the employees’ perception of organizational justice will influence and develop employees’ psychological capital, and in turn, employees tend to exhibit organizational citizenship behaviour. The results reported here may only be generalized to employees in multimedia organizations. Caution must be exercised in generalizing the findings from this sample to other private organization in the study area. Another limitation of this study is that there was no effort to compare this sample group with other groups of business, such as employees in manufacturing industries, which is another important industry in Nigeria. Doing so may offer information about the differences or similarities of the groups for the rationale of future research and understanding into the findings.

The study concludes that there is a significant between distributive, procedural, and interactional justice on employee commitments. The findings revealed that high employee commitment affects distributive justice of employees.

The study also concludes that procedural justice has significant impact on employee commitments in Nigerian breweries. The findings revealed that medical, educational and psychological services are needed to be enjoyed by employees without favour and bias. Stress is a major challenge to employees and it has adverse effects.

Furthermore the study concludes that there is significant relationship between interactional justice and employee commitments in Nigerian breweries. This implies that the effective management of employees through practices of training and development, reward, recognition, compensation, empowerment, and appraisal system, promotion practices, empowerment and social security or pension and job rotation, employee participation, merit-based promotion and performance-based have the tendency of increasing employees effectiveness. The study therefore concludes that organizational justices have significant influence on citizenship behaviour in Nigerian breweries.

**5.3 Recommendations**

From the conclusion, it is therefore imperative to recommend the following;

1. For organizations to attain it desired growth in all key performance indicators, they should develop, implement and maintain competitive and equitable compensation and benefits policies and programmes that enable banks to motivate and retain highly qualified people that can perform optimally under stressful conditions. Also the organization should design and implement staff development and training plans to ensure that employees have the necessary knowledge, skills and competencies and are continuously being developed for performance excellence in their current and future responsibilities and promote the personal development, physical and mental wellbeing of staff and improving quality service delivery.
2. Managers should understand that different individuals hold dissimilar opinions about stress. Also, not all employees are outspoken and willing to be honest with their managers. Therefore, managers should have the initiative to interact with employees and keep them informed about any occupational stress. By maintaining communication and listening to employees, managers can understand their unfulfilled needs and challenges to stress to increase their efficiency.
3. Managers can discover to what extent stress affects employees and take corrective actions immediately to support them. For example, managers should be aware that occupational stress may result into increased workload, creating fatigue and low spirits among employees, which affects employee’s effectiveness. Bank managers should continue to take the issue of human resource development (capacity building for performance) seriously as a way of improving on employees' level of productivity.

**5.4 Suggestions for Further Research**

This study suggests further research to explore other measures of managing employee’s citizenship behaviour. Also, a cross sectional study of similar study with large sample size needs to be carried out in the manufacturing sector.
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**Research Questionnaire**

This questionnaire is designed to obtain data for the purpose of an academic exercise only. The response of the respondent shall be treated confidentially.

**Section A: DEMOGRAPHICS**

Please Tick the option applicable to you.

NAME: …………………………………………………… (OPTIONAL)

1. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]
2. Age: 21-30yrs [ ]

31-40yrs [ ]

41-50yrs [ ]

50 above [ ]

1. Educational Qualification:

OND/NCE [ ]

B.sc/B.A/HND [ ]

M.sc/M.A/MBA [ ]

PhD [ ]

Professional Qualification [ ]

1. Monthly Income: Below 50,000 [ ]

50,001 – 150,000 [ ]

150,001 – 500,000 [ ]

500,001 – 1million [ ]

1 million Above [ ]

**Instructions**

Keys to responses categories

Strongly Agree - (SA)

Agree - (A)

Undecided - (U)

Disagree - (D)

Strongly Disagree - (SD)

Indicate response by Ticking (√) as appropriate

**SECTION B: To examine the effect of distributive justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/NO** | **Statement** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** |
| 1 | Each employee gets equal rights to all the benefits allocated to staffs |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Regardless of employees commitment, all staff should get an equal share of reward or cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | All employees should be committed to the organization regardless of their level or position |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | the needs of all employees should be provided for without bias or favour |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Organizational resources should be shared responsibly among members |  |  |  |  |  |

**Section C: To determine the effect of procedural justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/NO** | **Statement** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** |
| 1 | All disputes in the organization should be handled with all fairness |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Resources allocation should be done with due process |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Unresolved disputes are handled with transparency |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Poor Grievance handling increases employees lack of efficiency and commitment |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Attitude & Behaviour of Supervisor to lower staff encourages employees commitment |  |  |  |  |  |

**Section D: To ascertain the effect of** **interactional justice on employee commitment in Nigerian breweries**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Statement** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** |
| 1 | Improved working conditions of staff contribute to the performance of employees? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Adequate compensation of staff improves the quality of products and services thereby increasing employees commitment |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | The level of appreciation is justified, based on employee’s performance |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | The method of appraisal is appropriate for the work completed |  |  |  |  |  |