

Effects of Employees' Perception of Organizational Injustice on Commitment to Work among Staff of Lagos State Fire Service

Emmanuel E. ETIM (M.Sc)¹ & Gbolabo O. OKUDERO, (M.Sc)²

¹Department of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution, NOUN

emmaetim1@gmail.com

²Ph.D Student, Department of Human Resources and Industrial Relations,

Lagos State University, Ojo – Lagos

gbolabimbo@gmail.com

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Corresponding Author:* emmaetim1@gmail.com

Abstract

Human resources managers have attempted, at different points, to figure out ways to remedy and prevent the perception of organizational injustice among employees. The perception of injustice has been found to be one of the most influential factors that affect commitment in the workplace. This study examines the effects of employees' perception of injustice on commitment to work among staff of Lagos State Fire Service. The survey research design was utilized, through the administration of the questionnaire, for the collection of factual data that are measurable and quantifiable. Equity and Social exchange theories were applied to aid proper understanding of this phenomenon. Four research hypotheses were formulated and tested. Findings revealed that perceived distributive, procedural, interpersonal, as well as informational injustices, affect employees' commitment to work as exhibited among Fire Fighters in Lagos State. It was recommended that managers should ensure that employees perceive justice and fairness as they discharge their duties in the organization. They should introduce reward determination processes and practices, performance evaluation as well as employee-manager relationship. Findings of this research will contribute to knowledge on the drivers of employees' commitment to work and sustainable employer-employee relations.

Keywords: *Commitment, Employees, Justice, Management, Organization.*

1. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Organizational justice as one of the major constructs in various multi-disciplinary fields revolves around social and management sciences. It is often seen as the individual's perception of fairness in every action taken by the management both internally and externally which ascertains morality in accordance with basic norms, ethics, religion or laws across diverse contexts and culture (Dajani and Mohammed, 2017). Epistemologically, organizational justice is traceable to France, in 1964, where it was adopted to describe employees' perception of transparency in the work place (Chen, Wu, Chang, Lin, Kung, Weng, & Lee, 2015). In the course of time, the concept has metamorphosed through various developmental stages. Prior to this, it was distributive justice that was identified, followed by procedural justice and interactional justice. However, by late 2012, interactional justice was subdivided into two subcategories which include informational justice and interpersonal justice, making a total of four dimensions of organizational justice (Syed, 2017).

From the works of Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland (2007), organizational justice is a situation where employees perceive equity, fairness and justice in the system. The perception of justice by the employees is capable of boosting productivity because an enabling work environment is believed to have been created, an environment or system where the individual concern of the employee is also cherished, as against a system where they (employees) are not allowed to make contributions in decisions, including those affecting them. Belongingness in itself has positive effects on supervisors and supervisees as well as the government and the masses (Duke & Etim, 2018). It has been observed that where efforts to attain success becomes threatening, demoralizing and dampening, it becomes imperative for managers to develop techniques, strategies for goal actualization (Coffman and Gonzalez Molina, 2002). It is pertinent to delineate that fairness and justice at work place are inevitable (Ambrose 2002). It is worthy of note that this, as a matter of importance cuts across the various routes of communication in the work place including task allocation or rewards, benefits appropriation as well as social interaction between supervisors and workers. No matter the circumstance, and at every point in time, justice must be ensured (Coetzee, 2005). Further, Greenberg (1986) noted that when rewards are to be shared, consistent and unbiased procedures must be followed. Also, there should be respectful interpersonal interaction between supervisors and workers (Judge &

Colquitt, 2004). Management should strengthen those structures that are necessary in enhancing workers' perception of fairness in the workplace.

Organizational commitment, on the other hand, has been seen as an emotional attachment to the organization as a whole (Allen & Meyer, 1990). It is a situation whereby an employee feels devoted to the organization by accepting responsibilities, as well as putting all efforts to ensure that the organization achieve its goals (Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Fang, 2001). Organizational commitment, in a nutshell, connotes employees' involvement in the organization (Omoniyi & Etim, 2017; Akah & Etim, 2018). The understanding of employees' perception of justice with respect to commitment to work would go a long way in helping human resources managers to develop appropriate compensation schemes as well as the know-how to run their respective organizations, whether public or private. Owners of capital or human resources practitioners who desire to achieve the overall objectives of the organization would agree with the fact that employees are and will remain the most valuable assets an organization has; hence, they must be treated with all amounts of fairness and dignity. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate and recommend solutions to employees' perception of injustice which affects their commitment to work in the organization. It will consider distributive, procedural, informational and interpersonal justice and their impacts to commitment in Lagos State Fire Service.

1.2. Objectives of the Study

- i) To investigate the extent to which distributive justice influences employees' commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.
- ii) To investigate employees' perception of procedural justice and its effect on commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.
- iii) To examine the effect of interactional justice perception on the commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.
- iv) To examine the impact of informational justice on employees' commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.

1.3. Hypotheses

Ho1: Perceived distributive injustice will affect employees' commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.

Ho2: Employees who perceive more procedural injustice would be less committed to work in Lagos State Fire Service.

Ho3: The more the perceived interactional injustice among employees, the lesser their commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.

Ho4: Perceived informational injustice will influence employees' commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORIES

2.1 Organizational Justice

There are several attempts to explicate the concept organizational justice. The scope of organizational justice is only limited by one's imagination. Hubbel & Chory-Assad (2005) described it as the extent to which employees perceive the treatment given to them in the work place. Organizational justice as a concept goes as far as examining whether or not these treatments are fair enough with respect to the outcome which the employee receives from the organization. No worker wants to be treated unfairly by managers or supervisors (Eib, 2015); at such, it beacons on managers and supervisors to carefully check and ensure the employees that are working under them do not perceive any form of poor treatment, as this may affect their commitment to the organization. Formerly, distributive, procedural and interactional justice were identified as dimensions of organizational justice. However, further studies have added interpersonal justice to the list (Konovsky, 2000). Interactional justice was further divided into informational justice and interpersonal justice. Further, these two subcategories must be considered separately (Syed, 2017). Below are the four basic dimensions of organizational justice;

- Distributive Justice

Distributive justice has to do with perceived even-handedness in terms of granting monetary and other rewards to an employee who has invested quality time and service in the work place. Distributive justice appears first in among the dimensions of organizational justice. In the views of Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, (2002); Ramamoorthy & Flood, (2004); Alder & Ambrose (2005); and Greenberg, (2006); workers perceive this dimension of justice by determining whether the rewards they receive is commensurate with the effort or the input they make. At this point, we can make reference to the equity theory which explains how people make conscious efforts to match the ratio of their input to what they gain from the organization as well as comparing it with what their counterparts in other establishments get. More, if the outputs (rewards) meet their

expectations, as compared to their counterparts. Therefore, it can be deduced from the aforementioned that unequal pay package or bonus issued to staff of the same level will be perceived as injustice on the staff who earns less.

- **Procedural Justice**

According to Syed (2017) employees judge the fairness of procedures by the following. First, process control; how far they can make decisions about outcomes. Second, decisions control; their influence over the decision. This dimension of justice comes to play during the analysis (or decision-making process) regarding outcomes and rewards. It is no news that employees would like to participate when decisions are being made, especially if the decisions are related to, or affects them directly. Employees who perceive procedural justice believes that the employers' or managerial decisions are legitimate Tallman, Phipps, & Matheson (2009). This belief of legitimacy gives employees more reasons to be committed to the organization.

- **Interactional Justice**

Another dimension of justice is the interactive justice. Interactional justice is a subcategory of interpersonal justice. It considers employees perceived fairness about the level of interpersonal relationship and treatment that is applied during procedures in the organization. Here, attention is paid to what is termed as 'truth', as well as the need for mutual understanding (Fortin, 2008). In like manner, it is normal for an employee to perceive some treatments in the organization as unfair, even though these treatments are actually not to his detriment. Fair interactions can improve employees' attitude and conduct in an organization (Colquitt et al., 2001).

- **Informational Justice**

Informational justice refers to the social aspect of procedural justice, thus focusing more on the information people receive regarding why certain procedures were conducted (Colquitt et al., 2001). Informational justice has to do with the quality and quantity of information at the disposal of employees during reward decisions, courtesy of their employers or supervisors (Colquitt, 2001). It is very important that the information provided to employees during this all important session must be sincere, adequate and clear (Fortin, 2008). The aforementioned features explain informational justice and justify manager's decisions (Eib, 2015). Further, employees are more satisfied when they realize that honesty, politeness and respect are intrinsic in these processes.

- **Social Exchange Theory**

Social exchange theory, according to Malinowski, (1922), is among the most significant theoretical patterns that are used for the understanding of workplace behavior. Its venerable roots can be traced back to at least the 1920s), bridging such disciplines as anthropology (Sahlins, 1972), social psychology (Gouldner, 1960), and sociology (Blau, 1964). The social exchange theory explains how employees behave when they perceive injustice in the organization. These behaviours are determined by the level of injustice perceived. The social exchange theory points to some exchange principles as key determinants of commitment in human relationship. The most influential among these principles is reciprocity, which is central to justice principle and explains employees' actions and behaviours when they feel that there is a misbalance or unfairness in the exchange (Cropanzano & Mitchell 2005).

- Equity Theory

Equity theory was propounded by Adams in the 60s to explain employees' satisfaction, especially when they compare their earnings with that of their counterparts (especially those in the same level) in other organizations. In the view of Adams, employees often seek to either maintain a balance or have a comparative advantage whenever they compare their input with what they receive or their earnings (Kaur, Aggarwal and Khaitan, 2004; Vinchur & Koppes, 2011). The theory explains further the level of de-moralization felt by employees when treated unfairly as compared to their counterparts in other organizations or workplace. Here, employees compare his input/output ratio with his contemporaries (Khalifa and Truong, 2010). According to Huseman, Hatfield, and Miles (1987), four propositions capture the objectives of the theory: First, individuals evaluate the ratio of their outcomes from what they input into the organization, as compared to what is obtained by others; Second, if the comparison is negative, then inequality exists; Third, the more the inequality, the more the feeling of distress; and fourth, this may further degenerate into a cognitive distortion of input or possibly a termination of relationship.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts the survey research design. The study population is the aggregation of overall Fire Service employees in Lagos State. Questionnaire is the main data collection instrument for this study. However, oral/personal interview was also applied for clarity. Questionnaires were administered by the researcher during a day sensitization programme organized for fight for fire fighters in Lagos State on the topic: "Combating fire disaster" held on Monday 26th June, 2017. Lagos State Fire Service has a total number of Five Hundred and Seven (507) fire fighters. Four

hundred (400) questionnaires were administered out of which Three Hundred and Six (306) were duly filled and returned. The population consists of people from varying age brackets, educational level and sex (26.6% Women). This is summarized in table 1. Chi-square was used to show how the hypotheses conformed to the result of the questionnaire as well as to test the validity and reliability of the study instrument. The research hypotheses formulated in this study were tested at the 0.05 degree of statistical significance.

4. RESULTS

Ho1: The extent to which distributive justice is perceived by employees will influence their commitment to work

Table 1: Chi-Square (X^2) Distribution Table

Response	O	E	o-e	$(o-e)^2$	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{E}$
SA	72	61.2	10.8	116.64	1.91
A	146	61.2	84.8	7191.04	117.5
U	56	61.2	-5.2	27.04	0.44
SD	22	61.2	-39.2	1536.64	25.12
D	10	61.2	-51.2	2621.44	42.8
TOTAL	306	306	0	11492.8	$X^2 = 187.77$

Level of significance = 0.05; df = 61.2; Cal $-X^2 = 187.77$; Tab $-X^2 = 80.232$

Source: Researcher's fieldwork (2017)

The analysis on table 2 shows that 72 respondents representing 23.5% of the distribution strongly agreed to the view that their compensation level does not reflect what they contribute to the organization; 146 respondents representing 47.7% agreed; 56 representing 18.3% were undecided; while 22 respondents representing 7.2% of the distribution strongly disagreed and 10 respondents representing 3.3% disagreed.

Ho2: Employees who perceive more procedural injustice would be less committed to work

Table 2: Chi-Square (X^2) Distribution Table

Response	O	E	o-e	$(o-e)^2$	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{E}$
					E

SA	160	61.2	98.8	9761.44	159.5
A	48	61.2	-13.2	174.24	2.85
U	36	61.2	-25.2	635.04	10.38
SD	20	61.2	-41.2	1697.44	27.7
D	42	61.2	-19.2	368.64	6.02
TOTAL	306	306	0	12636.8	X² = 206.45

Level of significance = 0.05; df = 61.2; Cal $-X^2 = 206.45$; Tab $-X^2 = 80.232$

Source: Researcher's fieldwork (2017)

The analysis on table 3 shows that 160 respondents representing 52.3% of the distribution strongly agreed to the view that they cannot express their feeling during those procedures in the organization; 48 respondents representing 15.7% agreed; 36 representing 11.8% were undecided; while 20 respondents representing 6.5% of the distribution strongly disagreed and 42 respondents representing 13.7% disagreed.

Ho3: The more the perception of interactional injustice among employees, the lesser their commitment to work

Table 3: Chi-Square (X²) Distribution Table

Response	O	E	o-e	(o-e) ²	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{E}$
SA	60	61.2	-1.2	1.44	0.02
A	138	61.2	76.8	5895.24	96.37
U	48	61.2	-13.2	174.24	2.85
SD	26	61.2	-35.2	1239.04	20.25
D	34	61.2	-27.2	739.84	12.1
TOTAL	306	306	0	8052.8	X² = 131.59

Level of significance = 0.05; df = 61.2; Cal $-X^2 = 131.59$; Tab $-X^2 = 80.232$

Source: Researcher's fieldwork (2017)

The analysis on table 4 shows that 60 respondents representing 19.6% of the distribution strongly agreed; 138 respondents representing 45.1% agreed; 48 respondents representing 15.7% were undecided; while 26 respondents representing 8.5% of the distribution strongly disagreed and 34 respondents representing 11.1% disagreed.

Ho4: The extent to which informational justice is perceived by employees will tend to influence

Table 4: Chi-Square (X^2) Distribution Table

Response	O	E	o-e	$(o-e)^2$	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{E}$
SA	122	61.2	60.8	3696.64	60.4
A	80	61.2	18.8	353.44	5.78
U	56	61.2	-5.2	27.04	0.44
SD	28	61.2	-33.2	1102.24	18.0
D	20	61.2	-41.2	1697.44	27.7
TOTAL	306	306	0	6876.8	$X^2 = 112.32$

Level of significance = 0.05; df = 61.2; Cal $-X^2 = 112.32$; Tab $-X^2 = 80.232$

Source: Researcher's field work (2017)

The analysis on table 4 shows that 122 respondents representing 39.9% of the distribution strongly agreed to the view that they cannot express their feeling during those procedures in the organization; 80 respondents representing 26.1% agreed; 56 representing 18.3% were undecided; while 28 respondents representing 9.2% of the distribution strongly disagreed and 20 respondents representing 6.5% disagreed.

4.1: Discussion of Results

In the course of this study, the researcher subjected the four hypotheses stated in chapter one to testing and analysis using the Chi-square (X^2) distribution. After the presentation and analysis of data and the test of stated hypotheses, the following findings, which will be discussed below emerged to support some already existing positions regarding the perception of organizational justice, as it affects employees' commitment to work. As Coffman and Gonzalez (2002) noted, when the efforts to achieve success are threatened by discouraging conditions of work, there is a declining commitment to work by employees; hence, it becomes pertinent for managers to introduce innovative approaches and new strategies for winning this competition. Other findings in this study revealed the following;

First, perceived distributive injustice will affect employees' commitment to work. This lends credence to the findings of Tallman, Phipps, & Matheson (2009), who observed that "resource allocation is important for physicians to be able to deliver healthcare services and accomplish their goals. Although physicians do not determine how and where resources are allocated, they may be able to influence distribution of resources through participation in decision making

processes”. The same applies to every other employee, irrespective of the nature of work; an employee should participate in the decision making.

Second, procedural injustice affects employees’ commitment to work. According to Tallman, Phipps, & Matheson (2009), procedural justice provides employees the belief that organizational and managerial decisions are legitimate. This belief of legitimacy gives employees more reasons to be committed to the organization. It was earlier observed that employees’ perceptions of procedural injustice would be positively associated with their sense of work alienation (powerlessness and social isolation) (Ceylan and Sulu, 2011).

Third, perceived interactional injustice has severe negative impact on employees’ commitment to work. Accordingly, alienation is defined as an agent of dehumanization, by which the worker becomes an object responding to work rather than an influential subject capable of fulfilling himself/herself at work Sookoo (2014). This definition agrees with other previous researchers, namely, Mottaz (1981) and Nair & Vohra (2009). Workers who become victims of alienation give more importance and attention to the external or instrumental rewards (salary) than their job performance and are likely to quit their jobs (Abraham, 2000).

Fourth, perceived informational justice affects employees’ commitment to work. This goes in consonance with the position of Cropanzano and Prehar (2001) who observed that the perception of an informational justice develops a feeling of belittlement and degradation which demotivates the individuals and prevents them from engaging in long term exchange relationships with their organization (Cobb and al., 1995). The informational justice is part of the social exchange frame that rules the relationship of the individual with his organization.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The thrust of this study was to examine the influence of perceived organizational injustice on employees’ commitment to work in Lagos State Fire Service. It has been observed that perceived injustice discourages smooth relationship between employees and managers or supervisors, as every employee desires an environment where he is wanted and his contributions are appreciated. The effect of such atmosphere on employee commitment to work cannot be over-emphasized. This is the situation that makes employees get more committed, internalized organizational goals and in many cases, sacrifice their time in a bid to achieve organizational

objectives. Managers are saddled with the responsibility of putting forward some new strategies for winning, especially when the competition for achieving success is discouraging.

The study recommends that organizations should make provisions for structures that will encourage robust interaction between employees and managers. Also, procedural, distributive as well as informational justice should be watchwords in the management of every organization. Further, the use of uniform and transparent compensation structure should be in place, together with a participatory management system.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. Organizational cynicism; Bases and consequences. *Genetic, social, and general psychology monographs*, 2000;126(3); 269.
- Akah, A & Etim, E. E. Bureaucracy and affective commitment in Lagos state civil service. *Journal International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field*. 2018;4(4): 99-103
- Alder, G. S., & Ambrose, M. L. Towards understanding fairness judgments associated with computer performance monitoring; An integration of the feedback, justice, and monitoring research. *Human Resource Management Review*. 2005;15: 43–67.
- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 1990; 63: 1–17.
- Ambrose, M L, Contemporary justice research; A new look at familiar questions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 2002;89:803-812.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes; test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2002;23:267–285.
- Blau, P. M. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York; John Wiley. 1964.
- Brooks, A., & Zeitz, G. The Effects of Total Quality Management and Perceived Justice on Organizational Commitment of Hospital Nursing Staff. *Journal of Quality Management*. 1999; 4(1):69-93

- Chen, S. Y., Wu, W. C., Chang, C. S., Lin, C. T., Kung, J. Y., Weng, H. C., ... & Lee, S. I. Organizational justice, trust, and identification and their effects on organizational commitment in hospital nursing staff. *BMC health services research*. 2015;15(1):1.
- Cobb, A., Folger, R., and Wooten, k. the role justice plays in organizational change, *Public Administration Quarterly*. 1995;19 (2):135-151.
- Coetzee M. The fairness of Affirmative Action; An Organizational Perspective, Doctoral paper at University of Pretoria doctoral paper. 2005 <http://hdl.handle.net/2263/29685>.
- Coffman, C., & Gonzalez-Molina, G. *Follow this path*. New York; Warner Books. 2002
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Judge, T. A., & Shaw, J. C. Justice and personality; Using integrative theories to derive moderators of justice effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 2006; 100:110-127.
- Colquitt, J., Conlon, D., Wesson, M., Porter, C., & Ng, K. Justice at the millennium; A meta-analytic review of 25 years of justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2001; 86, 425-445.
- Conlon, D. E., Meyer, C. J., & Nowakowski, J. M. How does organizational justice affect performance, withdrawal, and counterproductive behavior? In J. Greenberg & J.A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational justice*, 301-328. Mahwah, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum. 2005
- Cropanzana, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*. 2007;34-48.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory; An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of management*. 2005;31(6):874-900
- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. The management of organizational justice. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*. 2007;34-48.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A., and Chen, P.Y. Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice», *Group and Organizational Management*. 2002;27, 324-351.
- Dajani, M. A. Z and Mohamad, M. S. Perceived organizational injustice and counterproductive behaviour; The mediating role work alienation evidence from the Egyptian public sector. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 2017;12(5):192-198.

- Duke, O. O., Etim, E.E. Improving Nigeria's national security through National Youth Service Corps. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning*. 2018;4(10): 55-72.
- Eib, C. (2015). Processes of organizational justice; Insights into the perception and enactment of justice. (Doctoral dissertation). Stockholm; Department of Psychology, Stockholm University. 2015
- Fang, Y. Turnover propensity and its causes among Singapore nurses, an empirical study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 2001; 12(5):859–871.
- Fortin M. Perspectives on organizational justice; Concept clarification, social context integration, time and links with morality. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 2008;10 (2): 93–126.
- Gouldner, A. W. The norm of reciprocity; A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*. 1960;25:161-178.
- Greenberg, J. Losing sleep over organizational injustice; Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2006;91:58–69.
- Greenberg, J. (Ed.). *Organizational behavior; The state of the science*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ; Erlbaum. Bies, R.J., Moag, J.F. Interactional Justice; Communication Criteria of Fairness. In; R.J. Lewicki, B.H. Sheppard, M.H. Bazeman (Eds.). *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*. Greenwich, CT; JAI Press. 1986:43–55.
- Huseman, R. C Hatfield, J. D and Miles, E. W. A New Perspective on Equity Theory; The Equity Sensitivity Construct. *Academy of Management Review*. 1987;12(2):222-234.
- Judge, T. A., & Colquitt, J. A. Organizational Justice and Stress; The Mediating Role of Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2004;89(3):395-404.
- Kaur, R., Aggarwal, P., and Khaitan, N. Equity Sensitivity. *The International Journal Of Business & Management*. 2004;2(6):230-233
- Khalifa, M. and Truong, Q. The Relationship between Employees Perceptions of Equity and Job Satisfaction in the Egyptian Private Universities. *Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics*. 2010;3(5):135-150.
- Konovsky, M. A. Understanding Procedural Justice and Its Impact on Business Organizations. *Journal of Management*. 2000;26:489-511.

- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 2007;35:644-656.
- Malinowski, B. *Argonauts of the western Pacific; An account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagoes of Melansian New Guinea*. London; Routledge. 1922
- Nair, N., & Vohra, N. Developing a new measure of work alienation. *Journal of Workplace Rights*. 2009;14(3):293-309.
- Omoniyi, G. O. & Etim, E. E. Bureaucracy and organizational commitment in Lagos State Civil Service. *The International Journal of Business and Management*. 2017;5(8):15-25
- Ramamoorthy, N., & Flood, P. C. Gender and Employee Attitudes; The Role of Organizational Justice Perceptions. *British Journal of Management*. 2014;15:247–258.
- Sahlins, M. *Stone age economics*. New York; Aldine. 1972
- Sookoo, N. Perceptions of injustice and alienation dynamics within the workplace. *Journal of the Department of Behavioural Sciences*. 2014;3(1):81-99.
- Syed, T. H. R. *Employees' Responses to Perceived Organizational Injustice; Examining the Role of Psychological Capital*. A research thesis submitted to the Department of Management & Social Sciences, Capital University of Science and Technology, Islamabad. 2017:1-178.
- Tallman, R., Phipps, K., & Matheson, D. Justice perception in Medical Administrative Governance. *International Journal of Business Research*. 2009;(7):147-155.
- Vinchur, A.J., & Koppes, L.L. A historical survey of research and practice in industrial and organizational psychology. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Washington; APA. 9-36. 2011